



STATE OF MICHIGAN ENTERPRISE PROCUREMENT

Department of Technology Management & Budget
525 W. Allegan Street, PO Box 30026, Lansing, MI 48909

Recommendation of Award

RFP 171-22000002193

The Department of Technology, Management & Budget's Procurement office has completed the evaluation of **RFP # 171-22000002193 for an education unique person identifier solution** and has recommended an award to eScholar, LLC in the amount not to exceed \$6,488,420.00 State Administrative Board approval. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#). The term of this contract is five base years with five additional optional renewal years.

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:

Jarrod Barron, Solicitation Manager
Barronj1@michigan.gov
517-284-7045

Respondents/Bidders

The RFP was posted on SIGMA on 5/11/2022. The following companies submitted a response by the published due date of 6/8/2022:

Respondent/Bidder	Address City, State Zip	SDVOB*	Responsive Proposal
Accenture, LLP	161 N Clark St, Chicago, IL 60601	No	No
Carahsoft Technology Corporation	11493 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 100, Reston, VA 20190	No	Yes
Computer Power Solutions of Illinois, Ltd	235 Southwoods Ctr, Columbia, IL 62236	No	No
eScholar, LLC	222 Bloomingdale Road Suite 107, White Plains, NY 10605	No	Yes
International Business Machines	1 New Orchard Road, Armonk, New York 10504-1722	No	Yes
KPMG, LLP	345 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10154-0102	No	No
SAS Institute Inc	100 SAS Campus Drive, Cary, NC 27513	No	No
Telos Corporation	19886 Ashburn Road, Ashburn VA 20147	No	Yes

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

Evaluation Synopsis

I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it can 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.

To avoid disqualification, the Bidder must provide documentation to support the following:

Minimum Requirements	
1.	Contractor must be able to offer a Commercial off the Shelf (COTS) Solution as an independent application/system, physically installed by SOM, or hosted by the Contractor.
2.	Solution must integrate into an educational landscape with the issuance and management of unique person identifiers at the state level.
3.	Solution must support the creation/maintenance of unique person records and associated configurable identifiers that are human and machine consumable and unique across all education sectors. The identity model for the unique education person identifier must be a person-centric model.
4.	Solution must demonstrate the ability to integrate and consume one or more historical education unique person identifiers. Historical education unique person identifiers can consist of active and inactive identifiers as deemed at the time of transition to the new Solution.
5.	Solution must contain a selectable, configurable, robust matching engine (e.g. probabilistic/ fuzzy matching/ Machine Learning (ML))

If all mandatory minimum requirements are met, the State will evaluate each proposal based on the following factors:

Evaluation Criteria Name	Evaluation Weight
Project Scope <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 1-15 and 20-23 Schedule D – Service Level Agreement Schedule E – Data Security Requirements Schedule G – Transition In/Out Plan 	30
Solution Requirements / Specifications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule A, Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet 	40
Staffing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 16-19 Attachment 1, Resume Templates 	15
Company Background <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vendor Questions Worksheet 	15
Total Weight	100

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

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Jarrod Barron, DTMB Trina Anderson, CEPI Kimberly Crawford, DTMB Drew Finkbeiner, MDE	Ralph Beckon, DTMB Katelyn Boswell Gallaher, MDE Russel Fernandes, DTMB-Contractor Shirin Gilmore, CEPI Kim Harter, CEPI Thomas Howell, CEPI Brandon Johnson, DTMB Lindsey McCann, CEPI Meghann Omo, CEPI Barry Tiedeman, CEPI Simon Wang, DTMB Jean Williams, MDE

III. Evaluation Results

The JEC determined that four of the eight bidders' proposals met the mandatory minimum requirements:

#	Business Specification	Accenture	Carahsoft	CPSI	eScholar	IBM	KPMG	SAS	Telos
1	Contractor must be able to offer a Commercial off the Shelf (COTS) Solution as an independent application/system, physically installed by SOM, or hosted by the Contractor.	PASS	PASS	FAIL. Nonresponsive. Failed to provide required explanations.	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS
2	Solution must integrate into an educational landscape with the issuance and management of unique person identifiers at the state level.	FAIL. Response was focused on user accounts as opposed to unique record identifiers.	PASS	PASS	PASS	PASS	FAIL. Response was focused on user accounts as opposed to unique record identifiers.	PASS	PASS
3	Solution must support the creation/maintenance of unique person records and associated configurable identifiers that are human and machine consumable and unique across all education sectors. The identity model for the unique education person identifier must be a person-centric model.	FAIL. Response was focused on user accounts as opposed to unique record identifiers.	PASS	FAIL. Nonresponsive. Failed to provide required explanations.	PASS	PASS	FAIL. Response was focused on user accounts as opposed to unique record identifiers.	FAIL. Response implies meeting the specification requires customization.	PASS
4	Solution must demonstrate the ability to integrate and consume one or more historical education unique person identifiers. Historical education unique person identifiers can consist of active and inactive identifiers as deemed at the time of transition to the new Solution.	FAIL. Nonresponsive. No discussion of integration, only how to consume and store.	PASS	FAIL. Nonresponsive. Failed to provide required explanations.	PASS	PASS	FAIL. Nonresponsive. Failed to provide details on historical identifiers and on how integration would be performed.	FAIL. Nonresponsive. Failed to provide details on historical identifiers and on how integration would be performed.	PASS
5	Solution must contain a selectable, configurable, robust matching engine (e.g. probabilistic/ fuzzy matching/ Machine Learning (ML))	FAIL. Response discusses user attributes, not unique record identifiers.	PASS	FAIL. Nonresponsive. Failed to provide required explanations.	PASS	PASS	FAIL. Response was focused on user accounts as opposed to unique record identifiers. Response appears to indicate additional third-party software would be required to meet this requirement.	FAIL. Meeting the specification requires customization.	PASS

The JEC then determined that three of the four proposals met the minimum 80 technical evaluation point threshold. The JEC derived the technical scores below from the bidders' written proposals:

DEDUCTIONS SUMMARY

Criteria	Carahsoft	eScholar	IBM	Telos
Project Scope • Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 1-15 and 20-23 • Schedule D – Service Level Agreement • Schedule E – Data Security Requirements • Schedule G – Transition In/Out Plan	-7	-4	-9	-2
Solution Requirements / Specifications • Schedule A, Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet	-4	-6	-11.5	-0.5
Staffing • Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 7-10 • Attachment 1, Resume Templates	-3.5	-4	-6	-4.5
Company Background • Vendor Questions Worksheet	-5	-3	-7	-3
Total Technical Evaluation Deductions	-19.5	-17	-33.5	-10
Technical Evaluation Score	80.5	83	66.5	90

EVALUATION SCORING BREAKDOWN

Project Scope					
PROPOSAL SECTION	Description	Carahsoft	eScholar	IBM	Telos
Sec 5: ADA Compliance	Proposed solution does not fully support ADA requirements.	-1	-1	-1	-1
SOW Sec 8: Data Retention and Removal	Failed to explain how the data retention, deletion and retrieval requirements will be met and describe its data management capabilities (storage limitations, duration, etc.).		-1		
SOW Sec 10: Software	Failed to identify any third-party components, including open source components included with or used in connection with the proposed Solution.	-1			
SOW Sec 12: Migration	Failed to provide sufficient detail related to how bidder would migrate data.	-1			-1
SOW Sec 13: Training Services	Failed to provide examples of training documentation.	-1			
SOW Sec 14: Transition Responsibilities / Schedule G	Failed to provide Transition In Plan.			-1	
SOW Sec 14: Transition Responsibilities / Schedule G	Failed to provide Transition Out Plan.		-1	-1	
SOW Sec 16: Additional Products & Services	Solution uses an end-of-life product (Adobe Flash Player).			-1	
SOW Sec 22: Project Control and Reports	Failed to describe specific reports the Contractor will provide after contract execution and during the lifecycle of the contract, including all required scheduled reporting and details around the how and when metrics are captured/validated.			-1	
Schedule D – Service Level Agreement	Failed to accept as presented.	-1		-1	
Schedule E – Data Security Requirements	Failed to accept as presented.	-1	-1	-1	
Schedule F - Disaster Recovery Plan	Failed to provide a Disaster Recovery Plan that details how the State's minimum security areas will be handled.	-1			
General	Inserted URLs in lieu of answering many questions directly, in contravention of RFP instructions.			-2	
	Deductions Subtotal	-7	-4	-9	-2

Solution Requirements / Specifications					
SPECIFICATIONS SECTION	Description	Carahsoft	eScholar	IBM	Telos
6.2, 6.3	Specifications require customization.	-1			
19.6	Specification requires future enhancement.	-0.5			
10.3, 11.3, 11.6, 13.3, 15.3, 16.9, 18.1	Specifications require future enhancement.		-3.5		
6.7, 11.3, 11.4, 12.4	Specifications require customization.			-2	
10.1	Failed to explain how they will deliver the business Specification.	-0.5			
14.2 & 14.3	Solution is limited in what State can do with this database.	-1			
16.6	Nonresponsive answer.	-0.5			
19.12	Solution does not meet requirement.	-0.5			

7.3, 7.5, 11.2, 14.4, 19.6	Solution does not meet requirements.		-2.5		
6.1, 10.3, 11.5, 19.2	Solution does not meet requirements.			-2	
6.3, 11.7, 19.9, 19.10, 19.11	Nonresponsive answers.			-2.5	
6.4, 8.1, 14.1, 14.4, 16.3, 16.13, 19.4, 19.8, 19.12	Incomplete responses.			-4.5	
General	Inserted URLs in lieu of answering many questions directly, in contravention of RFP instructions.			-0.5	
8.1	Incomplete responses.				-0.5
	Deductions Subtotal	-4	-6	-11.5	-0.5

Staffing					
PROPOSAL SECTION	Description	Carahsoft	eScholar	IBM	Telos
Project Manager Resume	Failed to demonstrate 5 years of experience facilitating meetings w/ clients & stakeholders.		-0.5		
Project Manager Resume	Failed to provide years that 5 years of experience managing projects of similar size and scope of this solicitation was obtained.			-0.5	-0.5
Project Manager Resume	Failed to provide years that 5 years of experience facilitating meetings w/ clients & stakeholders was obtained.			-0.5	-0.5
Project Manager Resume	Proposed resource does not have Project Management Professional or Scrum Certification.	-0.5			-0.5
Lead Functional Consultant Resume	Failed to provide years that 2 years of experience working with the specific Contractor Solution in a Functional Consultant capacity was obtained.			-0.5	-0.5
Lead Functional Consultant Resume	Failed to provide years that 2 years of experience in a similar State level installation, configuration, implementation was obtained.			-0.5	-0.5
Lead Technical Consultant Resume	Failed to provide years that 2 years of experience working with the specific Contractor Solution in a Technical Consultant capacity was obtained.			-0.5	
Lead Technical Consultant Resume	Failed to provide years that 2 years of experience in a similar State level installation, configuration, implementation was obtained.			-0.5	
Security Officer Resume	Failed to complete resume template	-2			
Security Officer Resume	Failed to provide years that 5 years of experience managing the security for similar size and scope of this solicitation was obtained.			-0.5	-0.5
Security Officer Resume	Failed to provide years that 5 years of experience facilitating compliance for clients & stakeholders was obtained.			-0.5	-0.5
Security Officer Resume	Failed to demonstrate 5 years of experience managing the security for similar size and scope of this solicitation.		-0.5		
Security Officer Resume	Failed to demonstrate 5 years of experience facilitating compliance for clients & stakeholders.		-0.5		
Security Officer Resume	Proposed resource does not have active security certification.		-0.5	-0.5	
Lead Data Architect Resume	Failed to provide years that 5 years of experience conducting data modeling of similar size and scope of this solicitation was obtained.			-0.5	-0.5
Lead Data Architect Resume	Failed to provide years that 5 years of experience with data migration of similar size and scope of this solicitation was obtained.			-0.5	-0.5
Lead Data Architect Resume	Failed to demonstrate 5 years of experience conducting data modeling of similar size and scope of this solicitation.	-0.5	-0.5		
Lead Data Architect Resume	Failed to demonstrate 5 years of experience with data migration of similar size and scope of this solicitation.	-0.5	-0.5		
Test Lead Resume	Failed to provide years that 5 years of experience as a Test Lead for a similar size and scope of solicitation was obtained.			-0.5	
Test Lead Resume	Failed to demonstrate experience in automated testing, writing test cases, and assuring test case traceability to acceptance criteria.		-0.5		
Resource Allocation Time	Relatively low resource allocation time.		-0.5		
	Deductions Subtotal	-3.5	-4	-6	-4.5

Background and Experience

VENDOR QUESTIONS WORKSHEET SECTION	Description	Carahsoft	eScholar	IBM	Telos
Prior Experience 1	Similar scope but not similar size	-1			
Prior Experience 1	Nonresponsive			-2	
Prior Experience 1	Partial overlap to scope				-1
Prior Experience 2	Not similar scope.	-2			
Prior Experience 2	Partial overlap to scope		-1		
Prior Experience 2	Nonresponsive			-2	
Prior Experience 3	Not similar scope.	-2			
Prior Experience 3	Partial overlap to scope, not similar size.		-1		
Prior Experience 3	Not similar size. Insufficient information to determine whether similar scope.			-2	
Prior Experience 3	Not similar scope.				-2
Contract Terms	Requested changes to State contract terms.		-1	-1	
	Deductions Subtotal	-5	-3	-7	-3

VI. Oral Presentations & Pricing

Oral presentations were conducted, and pricing was evaluated. The following is a 10-year cost summary of the proposals that passed technical evaluation:

ITEM	Carahsoft	eScholar	Telos
Software, Maintenance & Support Years 1-5	3,129,430.00	1,231,336.00	10,906,644.58
Hosting	Included in Software Costs	1,892,279.00	Included in Software Costs
Implementation & MORE Integration	2,542,821.75	205,000.00	4,379,293.93
Training & Documentation	35,714.00	35,000.00	406,400.65
BASE YEARS SUBTOTAL	5,707,965.75	3,363,615.00	15,692,339.16
Software, Maintenance & Support Years 6-10	3,200,142.00	875,314.00	10,932,360.40
Hosting	Included in Software Costs	2,238,391.00	Included in Software Costs
Integration Roadmap	117,346.00	11,100.00	1,204,423.50
OPTION SERVICES SUBTOTAL	3,317,488.00	3,124,805.00	12,136,783.90
Base Years Total	5,707,965.75	3,363,615.00	15,692,339.16
Optional Services Total	3,317,488.00	3,124,805.00	12,136,783.90
TEN YEAR TOTAL	\$9,025,453.75	\$6,488,420.00	\$27,829,123.06

VII. Award Recommendation

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offers 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 factors stated in Technical Evaluation Criteria of the RFP and price. The JEC has determined that eScholar, LLC will provide the best value to the State and recommends award be made to eScholar, LLC in the amount not to exceed \$6,488,420.00 pending State Administrative Board approval.