

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 220000000758

The Department of Technology, Management & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of Freedom of Information Act, 220000000500 and has recommended an award to Kunz Leigh & Associates Inc, in the amount of \$439,500, pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#).

Bidders who were not recommended for the award are encouraged to schedule a debriefing session with the Solicitation Manager. The debriefing session will provide the bidder with the State’s rationale on why the bidder was not recommended for the award. The Solicitation Manager may be contacted as follows:

Jeremy Lyon, Solicitation Manager.

LyonJ5@michigan.gov

517-230-2858

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide a proposal. The term of this contract is 5 years, with up to 5 renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on 12/3/2021 for 74 days The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of 2/15/2022.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*
Cho Consulting, Inc	132 North Euclid Ave Suite A, Upland, CA 918786 S. Corp	NO
GovQA/Granicus	1999 Broadway, Suite 3600 Denver, CO 80202	NO
Kunz Leigh & Associates, Inc	28081 Southfield Road Lathrup, Village, MI 48076-2816	NO
Pyramid Solutions	30200 Telegraph Road, Suite 440 Bingham Farms, MI 48025	NO

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

EVALUATION SYNOPSIS

I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

Proposal Instructions: Mandatory Minimum Requirements

Minimum Requirements	
1.0	The solution must adhere to and be in compliance with all public and non-public Policies Standards and Procedures (PSP). This includes but is not limited to NIST SP 800-53 Rev 5.1 Moderate-Impact Security Baseline compliance. Once a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) is signed, non-public PSPs will be provided and PSPs must be reviewed, acknowledged, and accepted by Bidder as part of their proposal submission.
2.0	The solution must be able to integrate with MILogin for public, external users, and internal SOM users.
3.0	The solution must allow for vehicle and driver record requests through the FOIA external site. This will be comprised of a page that states the need for submitting a FOIA request.
4.0	The solution must allow for online submittal of FOIA requests and include invoicing, redaction, tracking, in solution communication, and reporting and searching capabilities.
5.0	The solution must be PCI-compliant, and Bidder must provide PCI Compliance documentation applicable to the redirect to CEPAS, including an annual PCI Report on Compliance (ROC) and Self-Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ) documentation.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

Evaluation Criteria Name	Evaluation Weight
• Schedule A – Statement of Work	30
• Schedule A, Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet	40
• Attachment 1, Resume Templates	15
• Vendor Questions Worksheet	15
• Providing security documents requested in Schedule A and Schedule E	
Total Weight	100

The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by, *Jeremy Lyon*, Solicitation Manager in collaboration with Subject Matter Experts and Joint Evaluation Committee, *which* consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Doug Novak (MDOS)	Chad Bassett (MDOS)
Jack Lee (MDOS)	Khyla Craine (MDOS)
Jennifer Sitts (MDOS)	Gena Hyde (MDOS)
Autumn Pelkey (MDOS)	Scott Wager (DTMB)
Dan Klodt (DTMB)	Tracy Jo Devereaux (DTMB)
Jeremy Lyon (DTMB) – Solicitation Manager	Elizabeth Roberts (DTMB)
	Venu Singichetti (DTMB)
	Dave Pell (DAG)
	Suzann Hassan (DAG)
	Mike Bartkowiak (DTMB)
	Mike Brady (MDOS)
	Adam Fracassi (MDOS)
	Michele Halm (MDOS)
	Melissa Noll (MDOS)

The evaluators have disqualified the following proposals, per the Potential Supplier Instructions.

III. Evaluation Results

Description & Point Value	Bidder A Cho Consulting, Inc	Bidder B GovQA, LLC	Bidder C Kunz Leigh & Associates, Inc	Bidder D Pyramid Solutions, Inc
Vendor Questions Worksheet 15 Points	7.500	7.500	15.000	11.250
Attachment 1, Bidder Resumes 15 Points	00.00	11.250	11.250	11.250
Schedule A - Statement of Work 30.00 Points	24.349	26.624	29.767	25.170
Schedule A – Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet 40 Points	36.285	39.600	37.854	36.544
Total: 100	68.134	84.974	93.872	84.214

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

Evaluation Scores:

Bidder A

Vendor Name: Cho Consulting, Inc Score: 68.134 points

Cho Consulting, Inc	Possible Points	Technical Score	Comments
Schedule A - Statement of Work	30.00	24.349	<p>Section 3 – IT Environment Responsibilities, Bidder Box #3 Bidder did not provide the User Complementary Controls that SGRRS has in place for Microsoft Azure hosting.</p> <p>Section 4 – ADA Compliance, Bidder Box #1 Bidder indicated that part of the</p>

		<p>application is not ADA compliant for SOM employees.</p> <p>Section 8 - End User and IT Operating Environment, Bidder Box #1 Bidder did not include endpoint changes for the second connection of MiLogin SSO. The bidder did not finish the sentence explaining CaseGuard solution requirements.</p> <p>Section 8 - End User and IT Operating Environment, Bidder Box #2 Bidder did not address locally installed CaseGuard testing and update procedures on state workstations.</p> <p>Section 8 - End User and IT Operating Environment, Bidder Box #3 Bidder did not address their intention to support future operating system updates and compatibility with CaseGuard, CaseGuard software updates, or the support of future MiLogin connection changes. The bidder did not address future browser updates or changes.</p> <p>Section 8 - End User and IT Operating Environment, Bidder Box #4 The Bidder did not address their intention to support future operating system updates and compatibility with CaseGuard, CaseGuard software updates, or the support of future MiLogin connection changes.</p> <p>Section 8 - End User and IT Operating Environment, Bidder Box #5 Bidder did not explain, the proposed update procedures is largely unacceptable because the process will not work with state managed devices.</p> <p>Section 9 - Software, Bidder Box #3 Bidder did not describe requirements for access to individual workstations for</p>
--	--	--

		<p>CaseGuard or other PDF utility tool installation, configuration, updates, etc. The bidder did not indicate how state records would be accessed or retrieved by the solution.</p> <p>Section 9 - Software, Bidder Box #5 "Bidder's definition of licensing costs and the related "per transaction fees" pricing model was not well explained for MDOS to consider financial impact when using a new system". Did not meet requirement.</p> <p>Section 11 – Training Services, Bidder Box #2 Document provided by Bidder that contained Training information did not provide the requested “examples of clearly written instructions and documentation” of what training materials would look like.</p> <p>Section 12 – Transition Responsibilities, Bidder Box. Bidder did provide transition out plan, but the transition in plan had minimal detail.</p> <p>Section 13 – Documentation, Bidder Box. Bidder did provide enough detail and did not cover all system components.</p> <p>Section 17 – Contractor Personnel Requirements, Bidder Box. Bidder did not answer the question – specifically the work the offshore resource will be doing.</p> <p>Section 19 – Meetings, Bidder Box. Bidder did provide a complete response but was not willing to participate in the MISAP.</p> <p>Section 21 - Project Management & Implementation Approach, Bidder Box #, 3, 4 & 5, Bidder indicated an MS Project</p>
--	--	---

			Plan was uploaded separately. Evaluator found no evidence of a MS Project Plan uploaded in order to evaluate.
Schedule A – Table 1, Business Specification Worksheet	40	39.600	<p>Section 3 - ID, requirement #15. Bidders Answer indicates multiple staff on one task – does not meet requirement.</p> <p>Section 8 – Tracking, Searching, Sorting, and Prioritizing of FOIA Request and Appeal requirement #35. Bidders Answer indicates requestor has to select priority or select media request and was not responsive to tracking appeals.</p> <p>Section 8 – Tracking, Searching, Sorting, and Prioritizing of FOIA Request and Appeal, requirement #37. Bidders Answer seems to be about flagging a request at review stage, when the requirement is for flagging requestors. Unclear if it is possible to flag the requestor.</p> <p>Section 9 - Redaction, requirement #41, 42, 43, 44 & 45. Bidder failed to check a box.</p> <p>Section 10 - Reports, requirement #55.. Bidder failed to check a box speaking to current capability vs configuration, etc.</p> <p>Section 10 - Reports, requirement #56. Bidder failed to provide details in column D.</p> <p>Schedule A - Table 1 – Business Specifications Worksheet, Section – 10 Reports, requirement #58. Bidder failed to check a box.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #60. Bidder states current capability for this requirement; however, the SimpliGov</p>

		<p>platform only complies with four out of the five Trust Criteria. "Not Privacy." The FOIA solution itself does not have a SOC 2 Type 2 report.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #63. Bidder failed to answer the specifics for the requirement.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #64. Bidder failed to answer the specifics for the requirement</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #67 Bidder failed to answer the specifics for the requirement</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #69. Bidder states current capability for this requirement; however, the SimpliGOv platform only complies with four out of the five Trust Criteria. "Not Privacy." The FOIA solution itself does not have a SOC 2 Type 2 report. Internal, Microsoft Azure should have been included in the response. The bidder provided the Azure SOC report.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #70. Bidder did not provide the Complementary User Entity controls they have in place for using SimpliGov or Azure.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #71. Bidder checked current capability box; however, appeared to still be researching answers while submitting proposal. Bidder lists third parties that were not previously disclosed.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #73. Bidder failed to check a box.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #74. Bidder indicated the data is not yet</p>
--	--	--

		<p>hosted in a FedRAMP moderate authorized environment. The bidder indicated the data is not yet hosted in a FedRAMP moderate authorized environment.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #76. Bidder failed to check a box. Bidder only responded about the application and not the operating system.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #77. Bidder failed to recognize MiLogin would address this. Bidder failed to check a box.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #78. Bidder indicates requires configuration; provides no details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #79. Bidder indicates requires configuration; provides no details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #80. Bidder indicates requires configuration; provides no details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #81. Bidder indicates requires configuration; provides no details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #82. Bidder indicates requires configuration; provides no details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #83. Bidder response did not address system time accuracy requirement.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #84. Bidder did not address operating system authentication requirements. Did not indicate whether or not MiLogin would be leveraged for the application.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #85. Bidder failed to check a box and bidder does not provide details</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #86. Link provided by bidder does not address requirement, leads to an instruction page on attachments in regards to an overall user manual – no mention of configuration or technical baseline reference.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #87. Bidder failed to check a box. Comment references SOC II report that indicates that third party is writing the code. The answer does not address how Novinzio will create a FOIA solution using multiple third-party software options in a secure manner.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #88. Bidder refers to documents we could not find or was not provided. Alternative link was not provided. Bidder failed to check a box.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #89. Bidder failed to check a box.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #90. Bidder failed to check a box.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #91. Bidder failed to check a box and bidder does not provide details. Failed to answer, it is not hosted by the State of Michigan.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #92. Bidder does not provide details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #94. Bidder does not provide details in column D.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #95 Bidder failed to address SimpliGov created accounts at the operating system level and application level.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #96. Bidder does not provide details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #97. Bidder does not provide details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #99 Bidder does not provide details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #100. Bidder does not provide details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #101. Bidder does not provide details in column D</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #102. Bidder does not provide details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #103. Bidder does to provide details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #104. Bidder does not provide details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #106. Bidder does not provide details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #108. Bidder does not provide details in column D.</p>
--	--	---

			<p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #110. Bidder does not provide details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #111. Bidder does not provide details in column D.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #112. Bidder does not provide details in column D.</p> <p>Section 12 – Mobile Application, requirement #114. Bidder does not provide details in column D.</p>
Vendor Questions Worksheet	15	7.500	<p>Vendor only has 5 employees</p> <p>Experience 1&2 have not been fully implemented or supported. All still in progress of being rolled out. The Los Angeles City Planning project started in Dec 20. Previous experience with a FOIA system is not listed.</p>
Bidder Resumes (Attachment 1)	15	00.00	<p>Attachment 1, Bidder Resumes – Information incomplete, information just provided to evaluate. Sam Stickler is listed twice, with conflicting information. No PmP cert and no formal cert. David O’Connell was listed as security officer but not mentioned in the other project under experience. Security Officer does not have any experience or certificates listed. Jennifer Gough is listed as the training lead but not in the other project under experience and her information is incomplete.</p>
TOTAL	100	68.134	

Bidder B
Vendor Name: GovQA, LLC Score: 84.974 points

GovQA, LLC	Possible Points	Technical	Comments
Schedule A - Statement of Work	30.000	26.624	<p>Section 3 - IT Environment Responsibilities, Bidder Box #3. Bidder provided terms that do not address Security. Bidders answer to Schedule E response does not directly state they will maintain compliance with Data Security Requirements.</p> <p>Section 5 - User Type and Capacity, Bidder Box #2 Bidder did not provide any specific application latency response times. The bidder deferred to internet speeds rather than application performance details.</p> <p>Section 9 - Software, Bidder Box #6 Bidder did not list third parties that are mentioned in other parts of the document such as Microsoft. Did not list: OCR, Redis, PrizmDoc Redaction Server, Solr Document Search Server and SFTP that are listed as Third-Party Apps Hosted within GovQA Boudnar.</p> <p>Section 11 – Training Services, Bidder Box #1 Bidder did not provide the requested following: “typical class size, materials to be provided, class duration, on-site or web based.</p> <p>Section 12 - Transition Responsibilities, Bidder Box. Bidder did not provide planning provisions for identification of input data required or for input data field mapping. Transition out identifies the use of a customer portal without any details relating to the security of that environment. Pricing information provided in the document.</p> <p>Section 19 - Meetings, Bidder Box Bidder indicated that a Security Plan Assessment was not required due to using MiLogin. This demonstrates a lack</p>

		<p>of understanding of how the system works and disregards the importance of security in a solution. The bidder should not exclude MDOS from participation in security procedures due to other agencies using the solution.</p> <p>Section 21 - Project Management & Implementation Approach, Bidder Box #2 SEM documentation and related project artifacts are required for all SOM implementations. Waiving certain SUITE templates is not acceptable. Supplemental artifacts can be used in lieu of SUITE templates (as agreed to between vendor and MDOS and must meet the same threshold for content covered in the SUITE template). Some documents listed not applicable by the bidder are required by SOM Policy and required by the System Security Plan (SSP).</p> <p>Section 21 - Project Management & Implementation Approach, Bidder Box #3 Vendor States: Exceptions are Network Diagram Design, EASA dev and approval as not needed. An EASA is required but it will be a pretty basic one.</p> <p>Section 21 - Project Management & Implementation Approach, Bidder Box #4 Bidder did not provide the requested WBS that corresponds with milestone dates for the State. Instead, a sample WBS was provided. Additionally, the provided WBS did not allocate time for security review or SUITE documentation.</p> <p>Section 21 - Project Management & Implementation Approach, Bidder Box #5 Bidder did not provide the WBS, specific to this bid, requested above, which would have guided this response.</p>
--	--	--

<p>Schedule A – Table 1, Business Specification Worksheet</p>	<p>40</p>	<p>39.600</p>	<p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #60. Bidder did not verify the Availability domain.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #68. Bidder did not provide the requested information or documentation regarding maintenance plans and record keeping.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #69. Bidder did not address all five AICPA trust criteria in the SOC report. Minimally</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #70. Bidder did not provide the Complementary User Entity controls they have in place for using Azure. Does</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #71. Bidder did not provide the list of Azure products used in this solution.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #83. Bidder response did not address system time accuracy requirement.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #86. Bidder did not provide the requested documentation/information.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #97. This requirement is only optional if hosted by the SOM. Vendor stated: Not applicable. Hosted by GovQA in Azure Government platform.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #100. Bidder did not provide the details or tools used.</p>
<p>Vendor Questions Worksheet</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>7.500</p>	<p>Vendor Questions Worksheet, Experience 1&2 have not been fully implemented or supported. All still in progress of being rolled out. The one for Los Angeles City Planning in LA started in Dec 20.</p>

			- Previous experience with a FOIA system is not listed
Bidder Resumes (Attachment 1)	15	11.250	Attachment 1, Bidder Resumes – Vendor experience for PM and IM does not meet 5-year threshold. Experience listed begins in 2018 (4 years ago) and does not demonstrate 5 years of experience.
TOTAL	100	84.974	

Bidder C

Vendor Name: Kunz Leigh & Associates, Inc Score: 93.872

Kunz Leigh & Associates, Inc	Possible Points	Technical	Comments
Schedule A - Statement of Work	30.000	29.767	Section 5 – User Type and Capacity, Bidder Box #2 Bidder did not provide any specific application latency response times.
Schedule A – Table 1, Business Specification Worksheet	40	37.854	<p>Section 6 – In-Solution Communication, requirement #23. The Bidders solution is not currently capable of in-solution communication.</p> <p>Section 7 – FOIA Templates, requirement #30. Bidder solution does not allow staff to preview populated templates before they are sent to a customer. The button of “complete” once template is generated sends the letter which is not intuitive (“send”) would be easier to interpret.</p> <p>Section 9 - Redaction, requirement #43. Bidder solution is not currently capable of keeping the original document once redacted.</p> <p>Section 9 - Redaction, requirement #44. Bidder response as written indicates a less desired approach of overall</p>

		<p>document exemption vs having redaction tied to specific selected text.</p> <p>Section 10 – Reports, requirement #54. A complete system activity audit log report is not available, there are no existing canned reports, the presenter was not able to demonstrate requested reports during the demo.</p> <p>Section 10 – Reports, requirement #55. The scheduled report feature is not readily available.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #60. Bidders stated they met all 5 trust criteria. Supporting material provided indicates bidder meets 3 of the trust criteria, not 5. Application itself does not have a SOC report.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #69. Bidders stated they met all 5 trust criteria. Supporting material provided indicates bidder meets 3 of the trust criteria, not 5. Application itself does not have a SOC report.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #70. Bidder did not provide the complementary controls that the bidder has or would have in place for using Azure Gov cloud as the proposed solution. In the Bidder Question Response, the bidder referred to section 2.2 of the KL&A SOC report. This section does not specifically indicate the user complementary controls required by Microsoft to be implemented by KL&A.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #81. Bidder solution does not generate audit records in alignment with SOM requirements. The bidder indicated customization would be required to</p>
--	--	---

		<p>support this functionality. The bidder did not indicate whether or not they are willing to make these customizations. The system does not generate complete audit records. A search using operators is required to view audit records. The presenter was not able to demonstrate a complete audit record during the demo. The system does not track record views – it only tracks activity. The system has a bug that shows “Admin User” instead of the person’s name.</p> <p>Section 11 - Security, requirement #84. Bidders did not address operating system authentication requirements.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #85. Bidder did not provide a description of the security controls or design/implementation controls for the application.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #89. Bidder Question: Did not provide correct documentation/information.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #90. The Bidder did not answer the question at all. The bidder also did not include details regarding the proposed Azure environment. In the Bidder Clarifying Question, the bidder provided one way to prevent DDOS attacks</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #91. The Bidder did not answer the question at all. The bidder also did not include details regarding the proposed Azure environment.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #93. The Bidder did not answer the question at all. The bidder also did not include details regarding the proposed Azure environment.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #94. The bidder did not provide the complementary controls that the bidder has or would have in place for using Azure Gov cloud as the proposed solution.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #99. Bidder did not provide an explanation on how the requirement will be met.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #100. Bidder did not provide an explanation on how the requirement will be met.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #101. Bidder did not provide an explanation on how the requirement will be met.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #105. Bidder did not provide an explanation on how the requirement will be met.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #108. Bidder did not provide an explanation on how the requirement will be met.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #109. Bidder did not provide an explanation on how the requirement will be met.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #112. The presenter did not demonstrate release notes or maintenance activity as requested. Instead, the presenter spoke about project updates and communication when asked during the demo.</p>
--	--	---

Vendor Questions Worksheet	15	15.000	
Bidder Resumes (Attachment 1)	15	11.250	Attachment 1, Bidder Resumes – Bidder describes the Security Officer experience as a DevOps Engineer. Security Officer does not have any security accreditations. Security Officer did not have the 5 years of experience expected.
TOTAL	100	93.872	

Bidder D

Vendor Name: Pyramid Solutions, Inc Score: 84.214

Pyramid Solutions, Inc	Possible Points	Technical Score	Comments
Schedule A - Statement of Work	30.000	25.170	<p>Section 3 - IT Environment Responsibilities, Bidder Box #2, Bidder relied on Appian and did not address Pyramid Solutions' willingness or the proposed FOIA solution's ability to comply with Schedule E or PSP's. Further, Pyramid was initially not willing to sign SOM's NDA for the PSP's.</p> <p>Section 3 - IT Environment Responsibilities, Bidder Box #3, Bidder relied on Appian and did not address Pyramid Solutions' willingness or the proposed FOIA solution's ability to comply with Schedule E or PSP's.</p> <p>Section 3 - IT Environment Responsibilities, Bidder Box #4, Bidder did not complete the Component Matrix. Bidder did not answer all questions in the bidder box.</p> <p>Section 3 - IT Environment Responsibilities, Bidder Box #5,</p>

		<p>Bidder did not answer all questions in the bidder box.</p> <p>Section 5 - User Type and Capacity, Bidder Box #2, Bidder did not provide any specific application latency response times.</p> <p>Section 8 - End User and IT Operating Environment , Bidder Box #5, The bidder did not include how changes made by Pyramid Solutions would be communicated. Additionally, the bidder did not explain how MDOS would receive notifications from Appian - via Pyramid or directly from Appian.</p> <p>Section 8 - End User and IT Operating Environment, Bidder Box #6, Bidder did not address how Pyramid collaborates with its customers.</p> <p>Section 9 - Software, Bidder Box #1, Bidder did not provide details for proposed Software (name, type, version, release number, etc.) and its functionality.</p> <p>Section 9 - Software, Bidder Box #3, Bidder response partially indicates it cannot fully adhere or bidder did not fully understand what the solution needed to provide.</p> <p>Section 9 - Software, Bidder Box #5, Bidder did not provide sufficient detail in the response. Bidder response did not fully address the clarifications requested on external user licensing structures. The high level response from the bidder indicates critical flaws and concerns around the external user licensing structure.</p>
--	--	--

			<p>Section 9 - Software, Bidder Box #6, The bidder's response indicates uncertainty regarding the specific redaction tool proposed. The expectation was to have a vetted redaction solution. The requirement is partially addressed, but not in a suitable manner.</p> <p>Section 9 - Software, Bidder Box #9, Bidder did not provide details for proposed Software (name, type, version, release number, etc.) and its functionality. Partially</p> <p>Section 10 - Integration, Bidder Box #1, Describes CEPAS only, failed to address Milogin in the bidder box.</p> <p>Section 11 - Training Services, Bidder Box #1, Bidder did not provide the requested following: "typical class size, materials to be provided, class duration, on-site or web based.</p> <p>Section 11 - Training Services, Bidder Box #2, Bidder left box blank but did address what the bidder box was requesting in the bidder box below.</p> <p>Section 12 - Transition Responsibilities, Bidder Box #1, Bidder response in Schedule G indicates 'no data migration included'. Data migration is a primary component of Transition plans.</p> <p>Section 21 - Project Management & Implementation Approach, Bidder Box #3, Bidder left box blank but did address what the bidder box was requesting in the bidder box below.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Section 21 - Project Management & Implementation Approach, Bidder Box #4, WBS provided by bidder does not include System Security Plan (SSP) tasks.</p> <p>Section 21 - Project Management & Implementation Approach, Bidder Box #5, Bidder clarification response indicates they did not review the SSP tasks listed in 21. Project Management & Implementation Approach Milestone matrix.</p>
Schedule A – Table 1, Business Specification Worksheet	40	36.544	<p>Section 5 - Integration with CEPAS, requirement #22. Bidder did not explain; PCI requirements apply to redirects. Although requirements are lighter than full card processing requirements, the system must still be PCI compliant for redirects.</p> <p>Section 6 – In-Solution Communication, requirement #23. In solution communication did not appear to be user friendly. It was not clear during the demo if this functionality was fully available.</p> <p>Section 7 – FOIA Templates, requirement #26. HTML knowledge may be needed to adjust templates to meet MDOS needs. Vendor solution was not user friendly. MDOS has concerns regarding the usability and functionality of this approach.</p> <p>Section 8 – Tracking, Searching, Sorting, and Prioritizing of FOIA Request and Appeal, requirement #31. Bidder alludes to a phased approach, in the requirement above for this functionality, where all</p>

		<p>functionalities would not exist at go live.</p> <p>Section 8 – Tracking, Searching, Sorting, and Prioritizing of FOIA Request and Appeal, requirement #32. Bidder alludes to a phased approach, in the requirement above for this functionality, where all functionalities would not exist at go live.</p> <p>Section 9 – Redaction, requirement #41. Bidder was not able to answer the question of whether or not the redaction tool flattened the file or removed metadata.</p> <p>Section 10 – Reports, requirement #54. The system is not built, so the bidder was not able to demonstrate reporting options in this requirement.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #60. Bidder response did not include Pyramid Solutions, it only addressed Appian.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #64. Bidder does not verify deletion of any single system administrator role that would have access to both system and security related capabilities. Information provided from responses to clarification questions indicates Pyramid may have a master admin role with both sets of capabilities.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #66. Bidder response does not support requirement c.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #67. Bidder does not identify they</p>
--	--	--

		<p>will provide support for GRC process.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #70. The bidder did not provide the requested User Entity controls in place by the bidder for using the Appian platform.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #72. Failed to state that all data would be stored in the United States.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #77. Bidder failed to recognize MiLogin would address this. Operating system level controls were not addressed.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #79. Bidder failed to check a box.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #83. The bidder did not address system clock mapping or synchronization. Bidder response did not address system time accuracy requirement. Bidder states "Currently the system clock does not include synchronization". This indicates it does not fully meet the requirement.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #84. Bidder failed to validate encryption requirements.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #87. Bidder did not provide requested documentation.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #88. Bidder failed to check a box. Bidder addressed Pyramid's flaw remediation but neglected to include</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Appian's flaw remediation processes.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #89. The configuration of user roles does not provide sufficient controls to prevent information transfer. The bidder did not acceptably address the controls required to prevent information transfer or unauthorized access. FedRAMP certification does not provide these controls for Pyramid's application.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #90. Bidder did not address availability of the application.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #91. The bidder did not provide the requested list of networking protections in place.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #93. The bidder's response did not indicate as requested whether or not Pyramid be providing encryption key management for the solution.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #95. Bidder did not address the Appian accounts for this requirement.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #99. Bidder did not address entry tools like WAF and IPS or actions taken with system scans.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #100. Bidder did not address compliance or willingness to comply with MiSOC monitoring standards and procedures.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #101. The bidder did not address</p>
--	--	---

			<p>whether or not Pyramid will use integrity verification tools.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #103. Bidder did not address version control for Appian software.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #105. Bidder failed to identify frequency of scanning in compliance with State requirements.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #108. Bidder did not indicate or provide evidence that security patches are up to date. Bidder did not provide explanation of how the solution would be kept patched and updated.</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #112. Bidder did not address maintenance, explain how this specification would be delivered, or who will be responsible for these items (Pyramid or Appian).</p> <p>Section 11 – Security, requirement #113. Bidder failed to recognize that this requirement would not apply to them because they are a cloud-based service.</p> <p>Section 13 – Public Record Archive and FAQs, requirement #115. "Bidder's response indicated the functionality was not included in their proposal scope; therefore, bidder does not meet the requirement."</p>
Vendor Questions Worksheet	15	11.250	Experience listed is not related to FOIA

Bidder Resumes (Attachment 1)	15	11.250	Attachment 1, Bidder Resumes – Security Officer does not have any security accreditations. Security Officer did not have the 5 years of experience expected. Resources did not list Titles in the box that requested “Title/Percentage of time.
TOTAL	100	84.214	

V. Oral Presentations/Demonstrations - Oral Presentations/Demonstrations allowed the State to confirm and adjust scoring accordingly.

VI. Pricing Summary

After evaluating all RFP Bidders, Kunz Leigh & Associates Inc, is the chosen bidder for the award of the RFP. The JEC team conducted several rounds of negotiations with the bidder and was able to come up with a savings of \$27,500, along with the elimination of the \$25,000 annual licensing fee. Saving all together \$152,500 for the initial term if the agreement.

Pricing was evaluated for the bidders who passed technical. The following is a summary of their price proposals:

	Deliverable	GovQA	Kunz Leigh & Associates	Pyramid
1	Implementation	\$0	\$314,500	\$1,510,833
2	Licensing	\$48,500 Annual (5)	\$0	\$1,047,440 (5 years)
3	Maintenance & Support	\$0	\$25,000 (annual)	\$2,214,704
	Total Price	\$242,500	\$439,500	\$4,772,977

After evaluating

VII. Award Recommendation

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offered the best value to the State of Michigan. Best value is based on the proposal meeting the minimum point threshold and offering the best combination of the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions Evaluation Process* section, and price. Best value factors for Award Recommendation included the bidder scoring the highest on Statement of Work elements, security, answers to vendor questions worksheet, and the no-licensing fee pricing model that represents long-term cost savings.

Award Recommendation is made to **Kunz Leigh & Associates, Inc** in the amount of \$439,500.