

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

on the

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

for

ADVERTISING MEDIA SERVICES (RFP No. 362-2023-0002)

Prepared by the Evaluation Committee Issued March 2, 2023 I.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Texas Lottery Commission (Commission) issued a Request for Proposals for Advertising Media Services (the RFP) on September 13, 2022. The RFP was issued pursuant to the Texas Lottery Commission's authority granted under Tex. Govt. Code ch. 466 and 16 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §401.101. The scoring matrix was published in the RFP and encompassed all of the factors required to be considered by the Evaluation Committee in evaluating Proposals, as set forth in 16 TAC §401.101, and by Section 2.15 of the RFP.

The Evaluation Committee was appointed by Gary Grief, Executive Director, on June 10, 2022. Ryan Mindell chaired the Evaluation Committee, which included the following Committee members: Heidi Moreno, Ray Page, Ed Rogers, and Nelda Trevino. On September 19, 2022, Ed Rogers was removed due to scheduling conflicts, and Robert Tirloni was appointed as a replacement.

On September 27, a Pre-Proposal conference was held via TEAMS (teleconference platform). Thirteen prospective proposers attended the conference.

The RFP provided an opportunity for prospective proposers to submit written questions. Questions were received from eight prospective proposers. The Commission responded to the questions in writing and posted the responses on the Texas Lottery Commission website and the Electronic State Business Daily on October 12.

Proposals were due by 4 p.m., November 1, 2022. The Commission received seven timely submitted Proposals from the following firms:

- Aletheia Marketing & Media, LLC
- Atkins International, LLC dba The Atkins Group
- Buntin Group, Inc.
- GDC Marketing & Ideation (F. Guerra DeBerry)
- LatinWorks Marketing, LLC dba THIRD EAR
- One PytchBlack, LLC
- Sensis, Inc.

Contracts staff reviewed the Proposals for compliance and completeness. Copies of the Proposals were then distributed to each member of the Evaluation Committee for their independent review. Contracts staff maintained the original Proposals.

II.

SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

- 1. Prior to issuance of the RFP, each member of the Evaluation Committee reviewed the "Request for Proposal (RFP) Guidelines for Evaluation Committee Members."
- 2. Prior to issuance of the RFP, each Committee member signed a Non-Disclosure and Conflict of Interest Statement.
- 3. The agency's HUB Coordinator reviewed the Proposers HUB Subcontracting Plan (HSP). The HUB Coordinator determined that additional information was required from two Proposers. Contracts staff emailed the clarification letters. The responses were received and included in the review by the HUB Coordinator. The HUB Coordinator determined that all Proposers demonstrated the required good faith effort. Contracts staff informed the Evaluation Committee of these findings.
- 4. The Office of the Controller (OC) reviewed the financial soundness of the Proposers. The OC determined that additional information was required from four Proposers. Contracts staff emailed the clarification letters requesting the necessary information. PytchBlack opted to withdraw its proposal. Therefore, it was not evaluated. The OC determined that the remaining Proposers met the minimum requirements for financial soundness. Contracts staff reported the results to the Evaluation Committee.
- 5. After completion of the review in paragraphs 3 and 4 above, the following Proposals were evaluated by the Evaluation Committee:
 - Aletheia Marketing & Media, LLC
 - Atkins International, LLC dba The Atkins Group
 - Buntin Group, Inc.
 - GDC Marketing & Ideation (F. Guerra DeBerry)
 - LatinWorks Marketing, LLC dba THIRD EAR
 - Sensis, Inc.
- 6. The Evaluation Committee met and agreed to use the canceled RFP references received. Since the reference questionnaire was so recent, Contracts staff distributed the same reference questions to those references that did not respond previously. Contracts staff distributed the responses to the Evaluation Committee for its consideration and review.
- 7. Contracts staff also searched the Comptroller of Public Accounts database for vendor performance reports and did not find any negative reports for the Proposers.
- 8. The Evaluation Committee met as a group via TEAMS on several occasions between December 14, 2022, and February 16, 2023, to thoroughly review and discuss the Proposals.
- 9. Between January 31 through February 2, 2023, pursuant to RFP Section 2.16, each Proposer made an oral presentation of its Proposal to the Evaluation Committee via TEAMS.

- 10. On February 16, at a 9:00 a.m. meeting, each member of the Evaluation Committee independently scored the technical portion of the Proposals using the scoring matrix published in the RFP. Scoring sheets were turned in to Contracts staff electronically. Contracts staff and the assigned attorney reviewed each score sheet for completeness. Following the technical scoring, Contracts staff opened and shared the cost proposals via TEAMS with the Evaluation Committee. The meeting was then adjourned. Contracts staff completed the Cost Proposal tabulation spreadsheet to determine the cost points for each of the Proposers. It was reviewed for accuracy by both the Contracts staff and the assigned attorney. Contracts staff then added the cost points to all scoring sheets for the Proposers.
- 11. The Evaluation Committee members re-convened at 2:15 p.m. on February 16. The Evaluation Committee received the computation of cost in the cost points spreadsheet. Contracts staff distributed a worksheet showing the analysis and compilation of the cost points. The electronic score sheets were then returned to the Committee members, and each Evaluation Committee member verified that the scores for the cost portion were added to the technical score to determine the final score for the Proposers. Each Committee member signed and submitted individual scoring sheets to Contracts staff via DocuSign. The scoring summary matrix was compiled by Contracts staff and distributed to the Evaluation Committee. The individual scoring sheets, together with the scoring summary sheet prepared by Contracts staff, are attached. Below are the final results for each Proposer out of a possible 1000 points:
 - LatinWorks Marketing, LLC dba THIRD EAR = 882
 - Atkins International, LLC dba The Atkins Group = 822
 - GDC Marketing & Ideation (F. Guerra DeBerry) = 766
 - Sensis, Inc. = 739
 - Buntin Group, Inc. = 718
 - Aletheia Marketing & Media, LLC = 676

III.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing, the undersigned members of the Evaluation Committee recommend that the Commission name LatinWorks Marketing, LLC dba THIRD EAR the Apparent Successful Proposer, and enter into contract negotiations with this company. In accordance with Texas Lottery Commission Rule 16 TAC §401.101(f)(4), if a contract cannot be negotiated with the Apparent Successful Proposer on terms the agency determines reasonable, then negotiations with that Proposer will be terminated, and negotiations will be undertaken with the next highest scored Proposer. If no contract is executed, the agency may cancel the solicitation.

EVALUATION COMMITTEE REPORT AGREEMENT

The undersigned members of the Evaluation Committee have worked diligently to conduct and document a fair and impartial evaluation for the procurement of Advertising Media Services, and have been actively involved in the process summarized in this final report. The undersigned members of the Evaluation Committee support the findings and recommendations contained herein.

| Ryan Mindell, Evaluation Committee Chair | |
|--|--|
| Heidi Moreno, Evaluation Committee Member Hulli Moreno | |
| Ray Page, Evaluation Committee Member Raymond C. Page | |
| Robert Tirloni, Evaluation Committee Member Jant Committee | |
| Nelda Trevino, Evaluation Committee Member Mlda Trevino | |

BEST VALUE VERIFICATION

In accordance with Tex. Govt. Code §2155.0755, I have reviewed the best value standard utilized for the procurement of Advertising Media Services and acknowledge that the agency has complied with the agency's purchasing and contract management manuals and the Comptroller's Procurement and Contract Management Guide in this purchase.

In accordance with Tex. Govt. Code §2261.255, my signature below acknowledges that the solicitation and purchasing methods and contractor selection process for the procurement of Advertising Media Services comply with state law and agency policy.

| Juanita Rylee |
|-----------------------------------|
| Signature |
| Juanita Rylee |
| Printed Name |
| |
| Contracts and Procurement Manager |
| Title |
| 3/2/2023 |
| Date |

In accordance with Tex. Govt. Code §2261.0525, my signature below acknowledges that the agency assessed each vendor's response to the solicitation using the evaluation criteria published in the solicitation and the final calculation of scoring of responses was accurate.

| Juanita Rylee |
|-----------------------------------|
| Signature |
| Juanita Rylee |
| Printed Name |
| Contracts and Procurement Manager |
| Contracts & Procurement Manager |
| 3/2/2023 |
| Date |

Proposer: Third Ear

| | Total Possible Points | % of Total | 1 RM | 2 HM | 3 RP | 4 RT | 5 NT | Total | Average |
|--|--------------------------|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|---------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or | | | | | | | | | |
| services | 100 | 10% | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 320 | 64 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 64 | 320 | 64 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 440 | 460 | 490 | 475 | 450 | 2315 | 463 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | | | | | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector | | | | | | | | | |
| entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 | 75 | 95 | 80 | 95 | 425 | 85 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 110 | 135 | 145 | 100 | 145 | 635 | 127 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 130 | 140 | 150 | 150 | 145 | 715 | 143 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | | |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith | | | | | | | | | |
| effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | 1000 | |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | | 90% | 760 | 810 | 880 | 805 | 835 | 4090 | 818 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 824 | 874 | 944 | 869 | 899 | | 882 |

Proposer: Atkins Group

| | Total Possible Points | % of Total | 1 RM | 2 HM | 3 RP | 4 RT | 5 NT | Total | Average |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|---------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or | | | | | | | | | |
| services | 100 | 10% | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 350 | 70 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 350 | 70 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 400 | 425 | 450 | 400 | 425 | 2100 | 420 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | | | | | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector | | | | | | | | | |
| entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 | 85 | 85 | 80 | 80 | 410 | 82 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 100 | 135 | 100 | 100 | 140 | 575 | 115 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 120 | 140 | 125 | 150 | 140 | 675 | 135 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | | |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith | | | | | | | | | |
| effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail 900 | n/a 90% | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | 2722 | |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | - | | 700 | 785 | 760 | 730 | 785 | 3760 | 752 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 770 | 855 | 830 | 800 | 855 | | 822 |

Proposer: GDC Marketing

| | Total Possible Points | % of Total | 1 RM | 2 HM | 3 RP | 4 RT | 5 NT | Total | Average |
|--|--------------------------|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|---------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or | | | | | | | | | |
| services | 100 | 10% | 58 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 290 | 58 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 58 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 290 | 58 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 360 | 375 | 375 | 400 | 415 | 1925 | 385 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | | | | | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector | | | | | | | | | |
| entities. | 100 | 10% | 70 | 80 | 75 | 80 | 70 | 375 | 75 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 120 | 130 | 120 | 100 | 130 | 600 | 120 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 120 | 125 | 115 | 150 | 130 | 640 | 128 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | | |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith | | | | | | | | | |
| effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | | |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 670 | 710 | 685 | 730 | 745 | 3540 | 708 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 728 | 768 | 743 | 788 | 803 | | 766 |

Proposer: Sensis

| | Total Possible | % of | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|---------|
| | Points | Total | 1 RM | 2 HM | 3 RP | 4 RT | 5 NT | Total | Average |
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or | | | | | | | | | |
| services | 100 | 10% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 500 | 100 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 500 | 100 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or | 700 | 500/ | | | | | 400 | | |
| services. | 500 | 50% | 290 | 325 | 325 | 300 | 400 | 1640 | 328 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the | | | | | | | | | |
| agency, considering: The quality of the Proposer's past performance in | | | | | | | | | |
| contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, | | | | | | | | | |
| with other state entities, or with private sector | | | | | | | | | |
| entities. | 100 | 10% | 70 | 75 | 65 | 80 | 70 | 360 | 72 |
| chartes. | 100 | 1070 | 70 | 7.5 | 00 | 00 | 70 | 300 | 12 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 120 | 130 | 115 | 100 | 130 | 595 | 119 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the | | | | | | | | | |
| requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 100 | 125 | 100 | 150 | 125 | 600 | 120 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | | |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith | | | | | | | | | |
| effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | | |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 580 | 655 | 605 | 630 | 725 | 3195 | 639 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 680 | 755 | 705 | 730 | 825 | | 739 |

Proposer: Buntin Group

| | Total Possible Points | % of Total | 1 RM | 2 HM | 3 RP | 4 RT | 5 NT | Total | Average |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|---------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or | | | | | | | | | |
| services | 100 | 10% | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 440 | 88 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 88 | 440 | 88 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 280 | 305 | 300 | 300 | 390 | 1575 | 315 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | | | | | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector | | | | | | | | | |
| entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 | 80 | 70 | 80 | 70 | 380 | 76 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 110 | 130 | 90 | 100 | 130 | 560 | 112 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 130 | 130 | 100 | 150 | 125 | 635 | 127 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | | |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith | | | | | | | | | |
| effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. Technical Proposal Subtotal | Pass/Fail 900 | n/a 90% | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | 2450 | 630 |
| | | | 600 | 645 | 560 | 630 | 715 | 3150 | 630 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 688 | 733 | 648 | 718 | 803 | | 718 |

Proposer: Aletheia

| | Total Possible | % of | 4.04 | 0.1184 | 0.00 | 4.87 | 5 NT | Tartal | A |
|---|----------------|-------|------|--------|------|------|------|--------|----------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or | Points | Total | 1 RM | 2 HM | 3 RP | 4 RT | 5 NT | Total | Average |
| services | 100 | 10% | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 200 | 50 |
| services | 100 | 10% | 58 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 290 | 58 |
| C. A. D IS 14 4 1 | 100 | 100/ | 50 | | | 50 | | | 50 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 58 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 290 | 58 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or | | | | | | | | | |
| services. | 500 | 50% | 260 | 315 | 325 | 300 | 395 | 1595 | 319 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the | | | | | | | | | |
| agency, considering: | | | | | | | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in | | | | | | | | | |
| contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, | | | | | | | | | |
| with other state entities, or with private sector | | | | | | | | | |
| entities. | 100 | 10% | 60 | 75 | 75 | 80 | 70 | 360 | 72 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 100 | 125 | 90 | 100 | 130 | 545 | 109 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the | | | | | | | | | |
| requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 100 | 115 | 100 | 150 | 125 | 590 | 118 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | | |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith | | | | | | | | | |
| effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | Pass | | |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 520 | 630 | 590 | 630 | 720 | 3090 | 618 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 578 | 688 | 648 | 688 | 778 | | 676 |

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 260 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 60 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 100 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 100 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 520 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 578 |

Evaluator Name Ryan Mindell

Signature Any Mille

Date 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 315 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 75 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 125 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 115 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 630 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 688 |

Evaluator Name Heidi Moreno

Signature Hild Moreno

Date 2.16.23

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 325 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 75 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 90 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 100 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 590 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 648 |

Evaluator Name: Raymond C. Page

Signature Raymond C. Page Date: 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 300 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 100 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 150 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 630 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 688 |

Evaluator Name Robert Tirloni

Signature

Post Cur

Date

2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 395 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 130 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 125 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 720 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 778 |

Evaluator Name Nelda Trevino

Signature Mula Truvino Date 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 400 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 100 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 120 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 700 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 770 |

Evaluator Name Ryan Mindell

Signature for mille

Date 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 425 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 85 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 135 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 140 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 785 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 855 |

Evaluator Name Heidi Moreno

Signature

Date 2.16.23

Heidi Moreno

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 450 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 85 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 100 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 125 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 760 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 830 |

Evaluator Name: Raymond C. Page

Signature Raymond C. Page Date: 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 400 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 100 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 150 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 730 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 800 |

Evaluator Name Robert Tirloni

Signature Pout fur

Date

2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 425 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 140 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 140 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 785 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 855 |

Evaluator Name Nelda Trevino

Signature Mula Truins Date 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 88 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 88 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 280 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 150% | 110 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 130 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 600 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 688 |

Evaluator Name Ryan Mindell

Signature by Mill

Date 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 88 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 88 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 305 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 150% | 130 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 130 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 645 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 733 |

Evaluator Name Heidi Moreno

Signature

Heidi Moreno

Date 2.16.23

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 88 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 88 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 300 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 150% | 90 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 100 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 560 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 648 |

Evaluator Name: Raymond C. Page

Signature Raymond C. Page Date: 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 88 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 88 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 300 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 150% | 100 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 150 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 630 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 718 |

Evaluator Name Robert Tirloni

Signature Paut Pur

Date

2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 88 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 88 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 390 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 150% | 130 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 125 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 715 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 803 |

Evaluator Name Nelda Trevino

Signature Mula Truino Date 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 360 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 120 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 120 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 670 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 728 |

Evaluator Name Ryan Mindell

Signature by Mill

Date 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 375 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 130 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 125 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 710 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 768 |

Evaluator Name Heidi Moreno

Signature

Heidi Moreno

Date 2.16.23

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 375 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 75 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 120 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 115 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 685 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 743 |

Evaluator Name: Raymond C. Page

Signature Raymond C. Page Date: 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 400 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 100 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 150 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 730 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 788 |

Evaluator Name Robert Tirloni

Signature Faut Cur

Date

2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 58 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 415 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 130 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 130 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 745 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 803 |

Evaluator Name Nelda Trevino

Signature Mula Truins Date 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 100 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 100 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 290 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 120 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 100 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 580 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 680 |

Evaluator Name Ryan Mindell

Signature for mille

Date 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 100 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 100 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 325 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 75 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 130 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 125 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 655 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 755 |

Evaluator Name Heidi Moreno

Signature Heidi Moreno

Date 2.16.23

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 100 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 100 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 325 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 65 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 115 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 100 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 605 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 705 |

Evaluator Name: Raymond C. Page

Signature Raymond C. Page Date: 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 100 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 100 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 300 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 100 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 150 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 630 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 730 |

Evaluator Name Robert Tirloni

Signature Paut Pau

Date

2/16/2023

PROPOSER NAME:_Sensis

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 100 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 100 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 400 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 70 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 130 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 125 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 725 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 825 |

Evaluator Name Nelda Trevino

Signature Mula Truins Date 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 64 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 64 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 440 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 110 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 130 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 760 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 824 |

Evaluator Name Ryan Mindell

Signature for mill

Date 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 64 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 64 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 460 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 75 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 135 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 140 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 810 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 874 |

Evaluator Name Heidi Moreno

Signature

Heidi Moreno

Date 2.16.23

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 64 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 64 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 490 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 95 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 145 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 150 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 880 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 944 |

Evaluator Name: Raymond C. Page

Signature Raymond C. Page Date: 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 64 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 64 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 475 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 80 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 100 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 150 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 805 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 869 |

Evaluator Name Robert Tirloni

Signature Faut fur

Date 2/16/2023

| Advertising Media Services RFP | Possible Points | % of Total | Points |
|--|--------------------|---------------|--------|
| The Proposer's price to provide the goods or services. | 100 | 10% | 64 |
| Cost Proposal Subtotal | 100 | 10% | 64 |
| The probable quality of the offered goods and/or services. | 500 | 50% | 450 |
| The agency's evaluation of the likelihood of the Proposal to produce the desired outcome for the agency, considering: | | | |
| The quality of the Proposer's past performance in contracting with the Texas Lottery Commission, with other state entities, or with private sector entities. | 100 | 10% | 95 |
| The qualifications of the Proposer's personnel. | 150 | 15% | 145 |
| The experience of the Proposer in providing the requested goods or services. | 150 | 15% | 145 |
| The financial status of the Proposer. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Whether the Proposer performed the good faith effort required by the HUB subcontracting plan. | Pass/Fail | n/a | Pass |
| Technical Proposal Subtotal | 900 | 90% | 835 |
| TOTAL | 1000 | 100% | 899 |

Evaluator Name Nelda Trevino

Signature Mula Trevino

Date

2/16/2023

| Solicitation Name/Number: | Advertising Media Services RFP / 362-2023-0002 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bidder/Proposer's Name: | Aletheia Marketing & Media LLC |

| I. Did Bidder/Proposer complete and sign the HSP form? Yes ⊠ No □ | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| II. Does Bidder/Proposer intend to subcontract? Yes ⊠ No □ | | | | | |
| III. If Bidder/Proposer intends to subcontract, did Bidder/Proposer use: | | | | | |
| ☐ Option 1 – Select one or more HUBs for 100% of identified subcontracting opportunities? | | | | | |
| ☑ Option 2 - Meet or exceed the HUB contract goal? | | | | | |
| ☐ Option 3 - Perform HUB Outreach? | | | | | |
| A. <u>Bidder/Proposer Does Not Intend to Subcontract</u> | | | | | |
| Did Bidder/Proposer: Provide an explanation of how they will perform the entire contract with the us of their own equipment, supplies, materials and/or employees? Yes □ No □ N/A ☒ | Э | | | | |
| B. <u>Bidder/Proposer Intends to Subcontract</u> | | | | | |
| Option 1: Bidder/Proposer will utilize 100% HUB subcontractors. Did Bidder/Proposer: | | | | | |
| I. Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes □ No □ | | | | | |
| II. Provide a copy of Attachment A for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes □ No □ | | | | | |
| III. Identify all selected HUB certified subcontractors in Section A-2 of Attachment A? Yes □ No □ | | | | | |
| IV. Provide the approximate dollar amount and expected contract percentage? Yes \square No \square | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Option 2: Bidder/Proposer will meet or exceed the HUB contract goal. Did Bidder/Proposer: | | | | | |
| I. Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes ⊠ No □ | | | | | |
| II. Provide a copy of Attachment A for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes ⊠ No □ | | | | | |
| III. Identify all selected subcontractors in Section A-2 of Attachment A? Yes ⊠ No □ | | | | | |
| IV. Provide the approximate dollar amount and expected contract percentage? Yes ⊠ No □ | | | | | |
| V. Demonstrate that the aggregate HUB subcontracting percentage (for HUBs utilized by the Bidder/Proposer for five years or less) meets or exceeds the HUB contract goal? Yes ⊠ No □ | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Solicitation Name/Number: | Advertising Media Services RFP / 362-2023-0002 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bidder/Proposer's Name: | Aletheia Marketing & Media LLC |

| l. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2 | ?? Yes □ No □ | |
|-------|---|---|---------------------|
| II. | Provide a copy of Attachment B for each identified | ed subcontracting opportunity? Yes | i □ No □ |
| III. | Identify that they would utilize their protégé as a | subcontractor and include a valid m | nentor/protégé |
| | agreement? Yes □ No □ | | |
| IV. | Identify at least three HUB vendors contacted for | r each subcontracting opportunity? | Yes □ No □ |
| V. | Send notices to HUBs no later than seven working | ng days prior to the submission of th | neir bid/proposal? |
| | Yes □ No □ | | |
| VI. | Identify at least two minority/women trade organi | zations or business development ce | enters |
| | contacted for each subcontracting opportunity? | Yes □ No □ | |
| VII. | Send notices to organizations no later than seve bid/proposal? Yes □ No □ | n working days prior to the submiss | ion of their |
| VIII. | Provide copies of all notices, fax confirmations, e | e-mails, etc., to demonstrate that no | tices were |
| | sent to both HUBs and organizations? Yes □ | No □ | |
| IX. | Identify all selected subcontractors in Section B- | 4 of Attachment B? Yes ☐ No ☐ | |
| Χ. | Provide the approximate dollar amount and expe | ected contract percentage? Yes | No □ |
| XI. | Provide justification for the selection of any non-l | · | |
| Λι. | Frovide justification for the selection of any hori- | TOB Subcontractors: Tes - No | |
| Co | omments: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | he Texas Lottery Commission HUB Coordinator having | | Bidder or Proposer, |
| red | ecommends, based on HSP requirements, that this HSP | 'is: | |
| | Acceptable 🛭 Unacce | eptable □ | |
| | | | |
| | ric Williams | Cric Williams | 12/01/2022 |
| HU | UB and Compliance Coordinator | Signature | Date |
| Jua | uanita Rylee | <u>Cric Williams</u> Signature <u>Quanita Rylse</u> Signature | 12/01/2022 |
| | ontracts and Procurement Manager | Agnature T | Date |
| | | | |
| 1 | | | |

| Solicitation Name/Number: | Advertising Media Services RFP / 362-2023-0002 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bidder/Proposer's Name: | Atkins International, LLC DBA The Atkins Group |

| I. II. III. | Did Bidder/Proposer complete and sign the HSP form? Yes ☒ No ☐ Does Bidder/Proposer intend to subcontract? Yes ☒ No ☐ If Bidder/Proposer intends to subcontract, did Bidder/Proposer use: ☒ Option 1 — Select one or more HUBs for 100% of identified subcontracting opportunities? ☐ Option 2 - Meet or exceed the HUB contract goal? ☐ Option 3 - Perform HUB Outreach? |
|--------------------------|--|
| | A. <u>Bidder/Proposer Does Not Intend to Subcontract</u> |
| | Bidder/Proposer: Provide an explanation of how they will perform the entire contract with the use seir own equipment, supplies, materials and/or employees? Yes □ No □ N/A ☒ |
| | B. <u>Bidder/Proposer Intends to Subcontract</u> |
| Opti | ion 1: Bidder/Proposer will utilize 100% HUB subcontractors. Did Bidder/Proposer: |
| I. II. III. IV. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes ☒ No ☐ Provide a copy of Attachment A for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes ☒ No ☐ Identify all selected HUB certified subcontractors in Section A-2 of Attachment A? Yes ☒ No ☐ Provide the approximate dollar amount and expected contract percentage? Yes ☒ No ☐ omments: |
| | |
| Opt | ion 2: Bidder/Proposer will meet or exceed the HUB contract goal. Did Bidder/Proposer: |
| - | |
| l. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes \(\Bar \) No \(\Bar \) |
| II. | Provide a copy of Attachment A for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes \(\Delta \) No \(\Delta \) |
| III. IV | Identify all selected subcontractors in Section A-2 of Attachment A? Yes □ No □ Provide the approximate dollar amount and expected contract percentage? Yes □ No □ |
| IV. V. | Demonstrate that the aggregate HUB subcontracting percentage (for HUBs utilized by the Bidder/Proposer for five years or less) meets or exceeds the HUB contract goal? Yes \(\) No \(\) |
| C | omments: |
| | |
| | |

| Solicitation Name/Number: | Advertising Media Services RFP / 362-2023-0002 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bidder/Proposer's Name: | Atkins International, LLC DBA The Atkins Group |

| l. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? | ? Yes □ No □ | |
|---|---|---|-------------------------|
| II. | Provide a copy of Attachment B for each identified | d subcontracting opportunity? | Yes □ No □ |
| III. | Identify that they would utilize their protégé as a s | subcontractor and include a vali | id mentor/protégé |
| | agreement? Yes □ No □ | | |
| IV. | Identify at least three HUB vendors contacted for | each subcontracting opportunit | tv? Yes □ No □ |
| V. | Send notices to HUBs no later than seven working | • | • |
| | Yes □ No □ | 3 7 - 1 | |
| VI. | Identify at least two minority/women trade organiz | zations or business developme | nt centers |
| | contacted for each subcontracting opportunity? Y | • | |
| VII. | | | nission of their |
| • | bid/proposal? Yes □ No □ | mening days prior to the odding | |
| VIII. | Provide copies of all notices, fax confirmations, e- | -mails. etc to demonstrate tha | t notices were |
| | sent to both HUBs and organizations? Yes □ N | | |
| IX. | Identify all selected subcontractors in Section B-4 | | оП |
| Χ. | Provide the approximate dollar amount and exped | | |
| | | , , | |
| XI. | Provide justification for the selection of any non-H | IOB subcontractors? Yes 🗆 | NO □ N/A □ |
| C | Comments: | | |
| | onments. | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Th | he Texas Lottery Commission HUB Coordinator having re | | nis Bidder or Proposer, |
| | ecommends, based on HSP requirements, that this HSP | | • • |
| | Acceptable ⊠ Unaccep | otable 🗆 | |
| | · | | |
| Fr | ric Williams | Tic Williams | 12/01/2022 |
| | IUB and Compliance Coordinator | Signature | Date |
| ١. | and the Police | Tic Williams Signature Quanita Rylse Signature | 10/01/0000 |
| | uanita Rylee Contracts and Procurement Manager | Signature | 12/01/2022 Date |
| | Simuoto and i roodiomont Managor | Januaro / | Dato |
| | | | |

| Solicitation Name/Number: | Advertising Media Services RFP / 362-2023-0002 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bidder/Proposer's Name: | The Buntin Group, Inc. |

| I. | Did Bidder/Proposer complete and sign the HSP form? Yes ⊠ No □ |
|----------|--|
| II. | Does Bidder/Proposer intend to subcontract? Yes ⊠ No □ |
| III. | If Bidder/Proposer intends to subcontract, did Bidder/Proposer use: |
| | ☑ Option 1 – Select one or more HUBs for 100% of identified subcontracting opportunities? |
| | ☐ Option 2 - Meet or exceed the HUB contract goal? |
| | ☐ Option 3 - Perform HUB Outreach? |
| | A. <u>Bidder/Proposer Does Not Intend to Subcontract</u> |
| | Bidder/Proposer: Provide an explanation of how they will perform the entire contract with the use eir own equipment, supplies, materials and/or employees? Yes □ No □ N/A ☒ |
| | B. <u>Bidder/Proposer Intends to Subcontract</u> |
| Opti | on 1: Bidder/Proposer will utilize 100% HUB subcontractors. Did Bidder/Proposer: |
| l. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes ⊠ No □ |
| II. | Provide a copy of Attachment A for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes ⊠ No □ |
| III. | Identify all selected HUB certified subcontractors in Section A-2 of Attachment A? Yes ⊠ No □ |
| IV. | Provide the approximate dollar amount and expected contract percentage? Yes ⊠ No □ |
| С | omments: |
| | |
| | |
| Opti | ion 2: Bidder/Proposer will meet or exceed the HUB contract goal. Did Bidder/Proposer: |
| I. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes □ No □ |
| II. | Provide a copy of Attachment A for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes □ No □ |
| III. | Identify all selected subcontractors in Section A-2 of Attachment A? Yes □ No □ |
| IV. | Provide the approximate dollar amount and expected contract percentage? Yes \(\sqrt{N} \) No \(\sqrt{N} \) |
| V. | Demonstrate that the aggregate HUB subcontracting percentage (for HUBs utilized by the |
| | Bidder/Proposer for five years or less) meets or exceeds the HUB contract goal? Yes □ No □ |
| C | omments: |
| | |
| | |
| 1 | |

| Solicitation Name/Number: | Advertising Media Services RFP / 362-2023-0002 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bidder/Proposer's Name: | The Buntin Group, Inc. |

| I. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes □ No □ |
|----------|---|
| II. | Provide a copy of Attachment B for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes □ No □ |
| III. | Identify that they would utilize their protégé as a subcontractor and include a valid mentor/protégé agreement? Yes □ No □ |
| IV. | Identify at least three HUB vendors contacted for each subcontracting opportunity? Yes □ No □ |
| V. | Send notices to HUBs no later than seven working days prior to the submission of their bid/proposal? Yes □ No □ |
| VI. | Identify at least two minority/women trade organizations or business development centers |
| | contacted for each subcontracting opportunity? Yes □ No □ |
| VII. | Send notices to organizations no later than seven working days prior to the submission of their bid/proposal? Yes No |
| VIII. | Provide copies of all notices, fax confirmations, e-mails, etc., to demonstrate that notices were |
| | sent to both HUBs and organizations? Yes □ No □ |
| IX. | Identify all selected subcontractors in Section B-4 of Attachment B? Yes □ No □ |
| Χ. | Provide the approximate dollar amount and expected contract percentage? Yes ☐ No ☐ |
| XI. | Provide justification for the selection of any non-HUB subcontractors? Yes \(\Delta \) N/A \(\Delta \) |
| Λι. | Provide justification for the selection of any hori-hob subcontractors: Tes - No - N/A - |
| C | omments: |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Th re | ne Texas Lottery Commission HUB Coordinator having reviewed the HSP documents for this Bidder or Proposer, commends, based on HSP requirements, that this HSP is: |
| | Acceptable ☑ Unacceptable □ |
| | ic Williams Tric Williams 12/01/2022 |
| _ | ic Williams |
| ' ' | |
| | anita Rylee <u>Juanta Rylee</u> 12/01/2022 |
| Co | ontracts and Procurement Manager Signature Date |
| | |

| Solicitation Name/Number: | Advertising Media Services RFP / 362-2023-0002 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bidder/Proposer's Name: | F. Guerra DeBerry, LLC |

| I. II. III. | Did Bidder/Proposer complete and sign the HSP form? Yes ☒ No ☐ Does Bidder/Proposer intend to subcontract? Yes ☒ No ☐ If Bidder/Proposer intends to subcontract, did Bidder/Proposer use: ☐ Option 1 – Select one or more HUBs for 100% of identified subcontracting opportunities? ☒ Option 2 - Meet or exceed the HUB contract goal? ☐ Option 3 - Perform HUB Outreach? | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | A. <u>Bidder/Proposer Does Not Intend to Subcontract</u> | | |
| | Did Bidder/Proposer: Provide an explanation of how they will perform the entire contract with the use of their own equipment, supplies, materials and/or employees? Yes □ No □ N/A ☒ | | |
| | B. <u>Bidder/Proposer Intends to Subcontract</u> | | |
| Opti | on 1: Bidder/Proposer will utilize 100% HUB subcontractors. Did Bidder/Proposer: | | |
| I. II. III. IV. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes \(\subseteq \text{No} \subseteq \) Provide a copy of Attachment A for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes \(\subseteq \text{No} \subseteq \) Identify all selected HUB certified subcontractors in Section A-2 of Attachment A? Yes \(\subseteq \text{No} \subseteq \) Provide the approximate dollar amount and expected contract percentage? Yes \(\subseteq \text{No} \subseteq \) | | |
| Co | omments: | | |
| | | | |
| Option 2: Bidder/Proposer will meet or exceed the HUB contract goal. Did Bidder/Proposer: | | | |
| l. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes ⊠ No □ | | |
| II. | Provide a copy of Attachment A for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes ⊠ No □ | | |
| III. | Identify all selected subcontractors in Section A-2 of Attachment A? Yes ⊠ No □ | | |
| IV. | Provide the approximate dollar amount and expected contract percentage? Yes ☒ No ☐ | | |
| V. | Demonstrate that the aggregate HUB subcontracting percentage (for HUBs utilized by the Bidder/Proposer for five years or less) meets or exceeds the HUB contract goal? Yes ⊠ No □ | | |
| Co | omments: | | |
| | | | |

| Solicitation Name/Number: | Advertising Media Services RFP / 362-2023-0002 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bidder/Proposer's Name: | F. Guerra DeBerry, LLC |

| I. | . Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes \square | No □ | | |
|-------|---|---|------|--|
| II. | I. Provide a copy of Attachment B for each identified subcontr | acting opportunity? Yes ☐ No ☐ | | |
| III. | II. Identify that they would utilize their protégé as a subcontrac agreement? Yes □ No □ | tor and include a valid mentor/protégé | ÷ | |
| IV. | V. Identify at least three HUB vendors contacted for each subc | contracting opportunity? Yes No [| | |
| V. | V. Send notices to HUBs no later than seven working days price Yes □ No □ | or to the submission of their bid/propo | sal? | |
| VI. | VI. Identify at least two minority/women trade organizations or b | business development centers | | |
| | contacted for each subcontracting opportunity? Yes □ No | D 🗆 | | |
| VII. | VII. Send notices to organizations no later than seven working of bid/proposal? Yes □ No □ | days prior to the submission of their | | |
| VIII. | VIII. Provide copies of all notices, fax confirmations, e-mails, etc. | to demonstrate that notices were | | |
| | sent to both HUBs and organizations? Yes □ No □ | , | | |
| IX. | • | ment B? Yes □ No □ | | |
| Χ. | • | | | |
| XI. | | | | |
| Λι. | Al. Provide justification for the selection of any non-riob subco | Titlactors: Tes 🗆 NO 🗆 N/A 🗀 | | |
| C | Comments: | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | The Texas Lottery Commission HUB Coordinator having reviewed the recommends, based on HSP requirements, that this HSP is: | HSP documents for this Bidder or Propo | ser, | |
| | Acceptable ☑ Unacceptable □ | | | |
| | Erio Williama | Villiams 12/01/2022 | | |
| | Eric Williams HUB and Compliance Coordinator Signature | Date | | |
| | | Date 12/01/2022 Date 12/01/2022 Date | | |
| | Juanita Rylee Juand | ta Rylse 12/01/2022 | | |
| | Contracts and Procurement Manager Signature | Date | | |
| | | | | |

| Solicitation Name/Number: | Advertising Media Services RFP / 362-2023-0002 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bidder/Proposer's Name: | LatinWorks Marketing, LLC D/B/A ThirdEar |

| I. II. III. | Did Bidder/Proposer complete and sign the HSP form? Yes ☒ No ☐ Does Bidder/Proposer intend to subcontract? Yes ☒ No ☐ If Bidder/Proposer intends to subcontract, did Bidder/Proposer use: ☐ Option 1 – Select one or more HUBs for 100% of identified subcontracting opportunities? ☒ Option 2 - Meet or exceed the HUB contract goal? ☐ Option 3 - Perform HUB Outreach? | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| | A. <u>Bidder/Proposer Does Not Intend to Subcontract</u> | | |
| | Did Bidder/Proposer: Provide an explanation of how they will perform the entire contract with the use of their own equipment, supplies, materials and/or employees? Yes □ No □ N/A ☒ | | |
| | B. <u>Bidder/Proposer Intends to Subcontract</u> | | |
| Opt | ion 1: Bidder/Proposer will utilize 100% HUB subcontractors. Did Bidder/Proposer: | | |
| I. II. III. IV. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes □ No □ Provide a copy of Attachment A for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes □ No □ Identify all selected HUB certified subcontractors in Section A-2 of Attachment A? Yes □ No □ Provide the approximate dollar amount and expected contract percentage? Yes □ No □ | | |
| С | omments: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Opt | ion 2: Bidder/Proposer will meet or exceed the HUB contract goal. Did Bidder/Proposer: | | |
| I. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes ⊠ No □ | | |
| II. | Provide a copy of Attachment A for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes ⊠ No □ | | |
| III. | Identify all selected subcontractors in Section A-2 of Attachment A? Yes ⊠ No □ | | |
| IV. | Provide the approximate dollar amount and expected contract percentage? Yes $oximes$ No $oximes$ | | |
| V. | Demonstrate that the aggregate HUB subcontracting percentage (for HUBs utilized by the Bidder/Proposer for five years or less) meets or exceeds the HUB contract goal? Yes ☒ No ☐ | | |
| С | omments: | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Solicitation Name/Number: | Advertising Media Services RFP / 362-2023-0002 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bidder/Proposer's Name: | LatinWorks Marketing, LLC D/B/A ThirdEar |

| l. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section | ı 2? Yes □ No □ | | |
|-----------|--|--|---------------------|--|
| II. | Provide a copy of Attachment B for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes □ No □ | | | |
| III. | Identify that they would utilize their protégé as | a subcontractor and include a valid | mentor/protégé | |
| | agreement? Yes □ No □ | | | |
| IV. | Identify at least three HUB vendors contacted to | for each subcontracting opportunity | ? Yes □ No □ | |
| V. | Send notices to HUBs no later than seven wor | king days prior to the submission of | their bid/proposal? | |
| | Yes □ No □ | | | |
| VI. | Identify at least two minority/women trade orga | anizations or business development | centers | |
| | contacted for each subcontracting opportunity? | ? Yes □ No □ | | |
| VII. | II. Send notices to organizations no later than seven working days prior to the submission of their bid/proposal? Yes □ No □ | | | |
| VIII. | Provide copies of all notices, fax confirmations | . e-mails. etc to demonstrate that r | notices were | |
| | sent to both HUBs and organizations? Yes □ | | | |
| IX. | • | | | |
| Χ. | • | | | |
| | · | | | |
| ΛI. | XI. Provide justification for the selection of any non-HUB subcontractors? Yes □ No □ N/A □ | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | e Texas Lottery Commission HUB Coordinator havin | | Bidder or Proposer, | |
| red | recommends, based on HSP requirements, that this HSP is: | | | |
| | Acceptable ☑ Unacceptable □ | | | |
| | | Eig William | 40/04/0000 | |
| | c Williams IB and Compliance Coordinator | Signature | 12/01/2022 Date | |
| 110 | and Compliance Coordinator | Signature | Date | |
| | anita Rylee | Cric Williams Signature Quanita Rylse Signature | 12/01/2022 | |
| Co | ntracts and Procurement Manager | % ∕gnature <i>∫</i> | Date | |
| | | | | |
| 1 | | | | |

| Solicitation Name/Number: | Advertising Media Services RFP / 362-2023-0002 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bidder/Proposer's Name: | One PytchBlack, LLC, DBA PytchBlack |

| l. II. III. | Did Bidder/Proposer complete and sign the HSP form? Yes ☒ No ☐ Does Bidder/Proposer intend to subcontract? Yes ☐ No ☒ If Bidder/Proposer intends to subcontract, did Bidder/Proposer use: ☐ Option 1 – Select one or more HUBs for 100% of identified subcontracting opportunities? ☐ Option 2 - Meet or exceed the HUB contract goal? ☐ Option 3 - Perform HUB Outreach? | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | A. <u>Bidder/Proposer Does Not Intend to Subcontract</u> | | | |
| | Did Bidder/Proposer: Provide an explanation of how they will perform the entire contract with the use of their own equipment, supplies, materials and/or employees? Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐ | | | |
| | B. <u>Bidder/Proposer Intends to Subcontract</u> | | | |
| Opti | on 1: Bidder/Proposer will utilize 100% HUB subcontractors. Did Bidder/Proposer: | | | |
| I. III. IV. | Identify all selected HUB certified subcontractors in Section A-2 of Attachment A? Yes □ No □ | | | |
| Opti | Option 2: Bidder/Proposer will meet or exceed the HUB contract goal. Did Bidder/Proposer: | | | |
| l. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes \square No \square | | | |
| II. | Provide a copy of Attachment A for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes \square No \square | | | |
| III. | Identify all selected subcontractors in Section A-2 of Attachment A? Yes □ No □ | | | |
| IV. | Provide the approximate dollar amount and expected contract percentage? Yes ☐ No ☐ | | | |
| V. | Demonstrate that the aggregate HUB subcontracting percentage (for HUBs utilized by the Bidder/Proposer for five years or less) meets or exceeds the HUB contract goal? Yes □ No □ | | | |
| Co | omments: | | | |

| Solicitation Name/Number: | Advertising Media Services RFP / 362-2023-0002 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bidder/Proposer's Name: | One PytchBlack, LLC, DBA PytchBlack |

| l. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section | 2? Yes □ No □ |] | |
|-----------|--|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| II. | Provide a copy of Attachment B for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes □ No □ | | | s □ No □ |
| III. | Identify that they would utilize their protégé as a | a subcontractor ar | nd include a valid | mentor/protégé |
| | agreement? Yes □ No □ | | | |
| IV. | Identify at least three HUB vendors contacted for | or each subcontra | cting opportunity? | Yes □ No □ |
| V. | Send notices to HUBs no later than seven work | king days prior to t | he submission of | their bid/proposal? |
| | Yes □ No □ | | | |
| VI. | Identify at least two minority/women trade orga | nizations or busin | ess development o | centers |
| | contacted for each subcontracting opportunity? | Yes □ No □ | | |
| VII. | 3 7 1 | | | sion of their |
| \/III | bid/proposal? Yes □ No □ Provide copies of all notices, fax confirmations, | e-mails etc to d | lemonstrate that n | otices were |
| V 111. | sent to both HUBs and organizations? Yes □ | | | olioca were |
| IX. | • | | | |
| IЛ. Х. | , | | | |
| Λ. | • • | • | · · | |
| XI. | XI. Provide justification for the selection of any non-HUB subcontractors? Yes \Box No \Box N/A \Box | | | |
| | | | | |
| Co | Comments: | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Th | e Texas Lottery Commission HUB Coordinator having | a reviewed the HSP | documents for this | Bidder or Proposer |
| | recommends, based on HSP requirements, that this HSP is: | | | |
| | Acceptable ☑ Unacceptable □ | | | |
| Fri | c Williams | Fig. Wil | Miama | 12/01/2022 |
| | JB and Compliance Coordinator | Signature | xwiiw | Date |
| | · | Signature Quanita | 0 0 | 10/01/02 |
| | anita Rylee ntracts and Procurement Manager | Signatura | <u>eyeee</u> | 12/01/2022 Date |
| | miacis and Froculement Manager | Jygnatule | V | Dale |
| | | | | |

| Solicitation Name/Number: | Advertising Media Services RFP / 362-2023-0002 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bidder/Proposer's Name: | Sensis |

| I. | Did Bidder/Proposer complete and sign the HSP form? Yes ⊠ No □ | | | |
|------|---|--|--|--|
| II. | Does Bidder/Proposer intend to subcontract? Yes ⊠ No □ | | | |
| III. | · | | | |
| | ☑ Option 1 – Select one or more HUBs for 100% of identified subcontracting opportunities? | | | |
| | ☐ Option 2 - Meet or exceed the HUB contract goal? | | | |
| | ☐ Option 3 - Perform HUB Outreach? | | | |
| | A. <u>Bidder/Proposer Does Not Intend to Subcontract</u> | | | |
| | Did Bidder/Proposer: Provide an explanation of how they will perform the entire contract with the use of their own equipment, supplies, materials and/or employees? Yes □ No □ N/A ☒ | | | |
| | B. <u>Bidder/Proposer Intends to Subcontract</u> | | | |
| Opti | ion 1: Bidder/Proposer will utilize 100% HUB subcontractors. Did Bidder/Proposer: | | | |
| l. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes ⊠ No □ | | | |
| II. | , | | | |
| III. | Identify all selected HUB certified subcontractors in Section A-2 of Attachment A? Yes ⊠ No □ | | | |
| IV. | · | | | |
| С | omments: | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Opti | ion 2: Bidder/Proposer will meet or exceed the HUB contract goal. Did Bidder/Proposer: | | | |
| l. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes □ No □ | | | |
| II. | Provide a copy of Attachment A for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes □ No □ | | | |
| III. | Identify all selected subcontractors in Section A-2 of Attachment A? Yes □ No □ | | | |
| IV. | Provide the approximate dollar amount and expected contract percentage? Yes ☐ No ☐ | | | |
| V. | Demonstrate that the aggregate HUB subcontracting percentage (for HUBs utilized by the Bidder/Proposer for five years or less) meets or exceeds the HUB contract goal? Yes □ No □ | | | |
| C | omments: | | | |
| | | | | |
| - | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Solicitation Name/Number: | Advertising Media Services RFP / 362-2023-0002 |
|---------------------------|--|
| Bidder/Proposer's Name: | Sensis |

| I. | Identify subcontracting opportunities in Section 2? Yes [| J No □ | | |
|----------------|---|----------------------------|---------------------|--|
| II. | Provide a copy of Attachment B for each identified subcontracting opportunity? Yes □ No □ | | | |
| III. | | | | |
| IV. | /. Identify at least three HUB vendors contacted for each su | ubcontracting opportunity? | Yes □ No □ | |
| V. | . Send notices to HUBs no later than seven working days Yes □ No □ | prior to the submission of | their bid/proposal? | |
| VI. | I. Identify at least two minority/women trade organizations | or business development (| centers | |
| | contacted for each subcontracting opportunity? Yes | • | | |
| VII. | 3 1. <i>3</i> | | sion of their | |
| VIII. | III. Provide copies of all notices, fax confirmations, e-mails, | etc to demonstrate that n | otices were | |
| V 1111. | sent to both HUBs and organizations? Yes \(\Bar{\cup} \) No \(\Bar{\cup} \) | | | |
| IX. | Identify all selected subcontractors in Section B-4 of Atta | chment B? Yes □ No □ | | |
| Χ. | · | | | |
| XI. | 3 | | | |
| | To the judanication to discussion of any non-ried substitutions. Too is 1471 | | | |
| Comments: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | The Texas Lottery Commission HUB Coordinator having reviewed recommends, based on HSP requirements, that this HSP is: | the HSP documents for this | Bidder or Proposer, | |
| | Acceptable ☐ Unacceptable ☐ | | | |
| 1 | | 11/10/200 | 40/04/0000 | |
| | Eric Williams HUB and Compliance Coordinator Signature | Williams | 12/01/2022 Date | |
| ПС | TIOB and Compliance Coordinator Signature | <i>;</i> | Date | |
| Jua | Juanita Rylee Quar | Williams uita Rylee | 12/01/2022 | |
| Co | Contracts and Procurement Manager Signatur | e / | Date | |
| | | | | |



INTEROFFICE MEMO

Gary Grief, Executive Director

LaDonna Castañuela, Charitable Bingo Operations Director

To: Roxanne Koltermann

Contracts Coordinator

Thru: Annika Guarnero

Financial Operations Manager

From: Michelle Glass www

Date: December 7, 2022

Re: Financial Soundness Review for Advertising Media Services RFP

Please find below the summary of the Office of the Controller's Financial Soundness Review for Advertising Media Services RFP

| Financial Soundness Review for Advertising | |
|--|-----------|
| Media Services RFP | PASS/FAIL |
| Aletheia Marketing & Media, LLC | Pass |
| The Atkins Group | Pass |
| Buntin Group | Pass |
| GDC Marketing & Ideation (GDC) | Pass |
| PytchBlack | Withdrawn |
| Sensis | Pass |
| LatinWorks Marketing LLC dba Third Ear | Pass |