

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 240000000117

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP 230000002563 – Digital Marketing and Advertising Services for the Michigan Lottery and has recommended an award to Daniel Brian & Associates, Inc. in the amount of \$17,332,000.00, 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:

Marissa Gove, Solicitation Manager.

Govem1@michigan.gov

517-449-8952

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide Digital Marketing and Advertising Services for the Michigan Lottery. The term of this contract is 2 years, with up to 4 renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on July 5, 2023 for 35 days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of August 9, 2023.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
9Rooftops Marketing, LLC	6 Anolyn Court Bluffton, SC 29910	No	No
Daniel Brian & Associates, Inc.	222 S. Main St. Rochester, MI 48307	No	No
Virtual Marketing, LLC dba Fusion92	440 W. Ontario St. Chicago, IL 60654	No	No
Gray Television Inc.	4370 Peachtree Road NE, Suite 400 Atlanta, GA 30319	No	No
Advance Local Media LLC dba MLive Media Group	169 Monroe Ave NW, Suite 200 Grand Rapids, MI 49503	No	No
Ovative Group, LLC	729 North Washington Ave, 10th Floor Minneapolis, MN 55401	No	No

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

**GDBE: Geographically Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

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: Evaluation Process

The State will evaluate each proposal based on the following factors:

Step 1: The following chart represents particular factors that will be utilized to score Step 1. Bidders who receive a minimum score of 96 will pass Step 1 and a limited number of Bidders will be further evaluated based on the criteria identified in Step 2. Bidders who do not meet the minimum point threshold in Step 1 will not be considered for award.

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1	48
2.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-3	15
3.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4-8	20
4.	Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience	7
5.	Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience	30
	Total	120

Step 2: Oral Presentation – MSL Campaign

A limited number of Bidders who pass Step 1 will be required to make an oral presentation to the State as follows: The top 6 Bidders with the highest-ranking scores who pass Step 1 will be contacted after the initial JEC meeting to establish a date and time for the oral presentation. Oral presentations are preferred to be held in person, however, can be held virtually if the bidder chooses. In the case of a tie or if the State deems otherwise necessary, the number of bidders could change. The Schedule F will be utilized for the oral presentation. Note that the response to Schedule F does not have to be submitted with the initial RFP response.

Bidders will be evaluated on their ability to create a strategically sound presentation detailing their marketing solutions for the MSL Campaign as detailed in Schedule F and in alignment with all Contract requirements. Oral presentations will last no longer than three hours, including responses to questions fielded from the JEC.

The following chart represents particular factors that will be utilized to score Step 2. Bidders who receive a minimum score of 80 in Step 2 will be considered for award. Bidders who do not meet the minimum point threshold in Step 2 will not be considered for award.

	Oral Presentation Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Company Information/Quality of presentation	10
2.	Project Management Plan	10
3.	Research Plan/Methodology Rationale	25
4.	Media and Message Plan and Value Add	25
5.	Creative and Messaging Concepts/Innovation/Cutting-edge Strategy	30
	Total	100

The full scoring criteria can be found in the solicitation document.

II. Evaluation Method

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

Voting
Zac Strickler Digital Gaming Operations Manager MSL
Marissa Gove Category Specialist DTMB
Brenden Miller Paid Media Strategist MSL
Abby Harvey Department Specialist MSL

III. Evaluation Results

A. 9Rooftops Marketing, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that 9Rooftops Marketing, LLC, based on a score of 117, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 47/48

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Section 1.1.4 Creative Development, B, the bidder did not provide details on their plan to meet this requirement.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-3 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4-8 18/20

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 4.1 Project Plan, A-C, the bidder did not provide a project plan representative of the steps requested.
- b. Section 4.1 Project Plan, D, the bidder lacked some detail on how they will balance existing programs with new projects/campaigns.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience **7/7**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience **30/30**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

Total Score: 117/120

B. Daniel Brian & Associates, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Daniel Brian & Associates, Inc., based on a score of 104, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 **34/48**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 1.1.1 Strategic Consultation, the bidder did not provide a detailed plan for meeting the strategic consultation requirement.
- b. Section 1.1.4 Creative Development, B, the bidder did not provide details on their plan to meet this requirement.
- c. Section 1.1.4, Creative Development, C, the bidder did not provide animated media examples and the level of complexity of samples did not match market expectations.
- d. Section 1.1.5 Media Selection, A, the bidder lacked details on their plan to meet the media selection requirement.
- e. Section 1.1.5 Media Selection, B, the bidder lacked detail on their plan to provide an in-depth evaluation of all media vehicles.
- f. Section 1.1.5 Media Selection, C-E, the bidder lacked detail on their plan to meet this requirement.
- g. Section 1.1.5 Media Selection, F, the bidder lacked details on their plan to meet this requirement.
- h. Section 1.1.5, Media Selection, G-J, the bidder lacked detail on their plan to meet this requirement.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-3 **15/15**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4-8 **20/20**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience 7/7

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience 28/30

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Experience 2, the bidder did not go into detail regarding the scope of work performed.
- b. Experience 3, the bidder did not go into detail regarding the scope of work performed.

Total Score: 104/120

C. Virtual Marketing, LLC dba Fusion92

The Evaluation Team determined that Virtual Marketing, LLC dba Fusion92, based on a score of 119, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 47/48

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a. Section 1.1.5 Media Selection, F, the bidder lacked details on their plan to meet this requirement.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-3 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4-8 20/20

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience 7/7

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience 30/30

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

Total Score: 119/120

D. Gray Television Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Gray Television Inc., based on a score of 89, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 30/48

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 1.1.3 Message Development, the bidder lacked details on their plan to meet the message development requirement.

- b. Section 1.1.4 Creative Development, A, the bidder lacked details on their plan to meet the creative development requirement.
- c. Section 1.1.4 Creative Development, B, the bidder did not provide any details on their plan to meet this requirement.
- d. Section 1.1.4 Creative Development, C, the level of complexity of samples did not match market expectations and some links were not able to be accessed properly.
- e. Section 1.1.5 Media Selection, A, the bidder lacked details on their plan to meet the media selection requirement.
- f. Section 1.1.5 Media Selection, B, the bidder lacked detail on their plan to provide an in-depth evaluation of all media vehicles.
- g. Section 1.1.5 Media Selection, C-E, the bidder did not provide any details on their plan to meet this requirement.
- h. Section 1.1.5 Media Selection, F, the bidder did not provide any details on their plan to meet this requirement.
- i. Section 1.3 Specific Standards, Mobile Responsiveness, the bidder did not address responsive designs.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-3 15/15

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4-8 12/20

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 4.1 Project Plan, A-C, the bidder did not provide a project plan representative of the steps requested.
- b. Section 4.1 Project Plan, D, the bidder did not address how they will balance existing programs with new projects/campaigns.
- c. Section 4.1 Project Plan, D.4, the bidder did not provide a process for addressing issues.
- d. Section 4.3 Reporting, the bidder lacked detail on providing their reporting capabilities.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience 7/7

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience 25/30

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Experience 1, the dollar value is out of scope for what is required in this contract and the experience is a short time frame.

- b. Experience 2, the dollar value is out of scope for what is required in this contract and the experience is a short time frame.
- c. Experience 3, the experience is a short time frame.

Total Score: 89/120

E. Advance Local Media LLC dba MLive Media Group

The Evaluation Team determined that Advance Local Media LLC dba MLive Media Group, based on a score of 93, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 28/48

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 1.1.1 Strategic Consulting, the bidder did not provide a detailed plan for meeting the strategic consultation requirement.
- b. Section 1.1.3 Message Development, the bidder lacked details on their plan to meet the message development requirement.
- c. Section 1.1.4 Creative Development, A, the bidder lacked details on their plan to meet the creative development requirement.
- d. Section 1.1.4 Creative Development, C, the levels of complexity of samples did not match market expectations, and some links were unable to be accessed properly.
- e. Section 1.1.4 Creative Development, D, the stock images sourced by MLive are done under the firm's license so infinite and unlimited use would not be possible.
- f. Section 1.1.5 Media Selection, C-E, the bidder stated that they charge a 10% pass-through cost for billing.
- g. Section 1.1.5 Media Selection, F, the bidder lacked details on their plan to meet this requirement.
- h. Section 1.1.B Optional Use Professional Services, the bidder did not provide any details on their plan to meet this requirement.
- i. Section 1.3 Specific Standards, IT Policies, Standards, and Procedures, the bidder failed to agree to this requirement.
- j. Section 1.3 Specific Standards, Acceptable Use Policy, the bidder failed to agree to this requirement.
- k. Section 1.3 Specific Standards, SOM Digital Standards, the bidder failed to agree to this requirement.
- l. Section 1.3 Specific Standards, Mobile Responsiveness, the bidder did not address responsive designs.

- m. Section 1.3 Specific Standards, ADA Compliance, the bidder did not commit to follow federal law.
- n. Section 1.4 End-User Operating Environment, the bidder failed to agree to this requirement.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-3 **12/15**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 3.6 Key Personnel, the key personnel provided does not align with the information provided within the project plan.
- b. Section 3.9 Security, the bidder failed to agree to this requirement.

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4-8 **19/20**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 4.3 Reporting, the bidder stated that they are unable to grant access to their media buying platforms, and the bidder's answer for I. was blank.

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience **7/7**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience **27/30**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- c. Experience 1, the dollar value is out of scope for what is required in this contract.
- d. Experience 2, the dollar value is out of scope for what is required in this contract.
- a. Experience 3, the bidder did not disclose the dollar value.

Total Score: 93/120

F. Ovative Group, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Ovative Group, LLC, based on a score of 112, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 **45/48**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Section 1.1.1 Strategic Consultation, the bidder stated that they are not providing media mix model and ROI.
- b. Section 1.1.4 Creative Development, C, the links provided were unable to be accessed.

- c. Section 1.1.5 Media Selection, F, the bidder lacked details on their plan to meet the media selection requirement.
- 2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-3** **15/15**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
- 3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4-8** **20/20**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
- 4. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience** **6/7**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:
 - a. Section 6 Standard Contract Terms, the bidder had exceptions to Schedules D and E.
- 5. Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience** **26/30**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Experience 1, the bidder did not disclose the dollar value and the experience was a short time frame.
 - b. Experience 2, the bidder did not disclose the dollar value and the experience was a short time frame.

Total Score: 112/120

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

Bidder	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-3	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4-8	Vendor Questions Worksheet – Excluding Experience	Vendor Questions Worksheet – Experience	Total
9Rooftops Marketing, LLC	47	15	18	7	30	117
Daniel Brian & Associates, Inc.	34	15	20	7	28	104
Virtual Marketing,	47	15	20	7	30	119

LLC dba Fusion92						
Gray Television Inc.	30	15	12	7	25	89
Advance Local Media LLC dba MLive Media Group	28	12	19	7	27	93
Ovative Group, LLC	45	15	20	6	26	112

V. Oral Presentations/Demonstrations

A. 9Rooftops Marketing, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that 9Rooftops Marketing, LLC, based on a score of 100, did meet the requirement of this RFP. The determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Oral Presentation Evaluation Factors.

1. Company Information/Quality of presentation 10/10

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

2. Project Management Plan 10/10

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

3. Research Plan/Methodology Rationale 25/25

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

4. Media and Message Plan and Value Add 25/25

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

5. Creative and Messaging Concepts/Innovation/Cutting-edge Strategy 30/30

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

Total: 100/100

B. Daniel Brian & Associates, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that 9Rooftops Marketing, LLC, based on a score of 100, did meet the requirement of this RFP. The determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Oral Presentation Evaluation Factors.

1. Company Information/Quality of presentation 10/10

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

2. Project Management Plan 10/10

The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.

- 3. Research Plan/Methodology Rationale 25/25**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
 - 4. Media and Message Plan and Value Add 25/25**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
 - 5. Creative and Messaging Concepts/Innovation/Cutting-edge Strategy 30/30**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
- Total: 100/100**

C. Virtual Marketing, LLC dba Fusion92

The Evaluation Team determined that 9Rooftops Marketing, LLC, based on a score of 89, did meet the requirement of this RFP. The determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Oral Presentation Evaluation Factors.

- 1. Company Information/Quality of presentation 10/10**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
 - 2. Project Management Plan 10/10**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
 - 3. Research Plan/Methodology Rationale 22/25**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:
 - a. The bidder failed to provide research examples and description of qualitative examples.
 - 4. Media and Message Plan and Value Add 25/25**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
 - 5. Creative and Messaging Concepts/Innovation/Cutting-edge Strategy 22/30**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. The visuals presented were not consistently user friendly.
 - b. The creative examples presented were static and lacked complexity.
 - c. The JEC had concerns that the playable ad technology presented could not effectively be explained.
- Total: 89/100**

D. Ovative Group, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that 9Rooftops Marketing, LLC, based on a score of 77, did not meet the requirement of this RFP. The determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Oral Presentation Evaluation Factors.

- 1. Company Information/Quality of presentation 7/10**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. The bidder failed to adequately walk through the organizational chart presented.
 - b. The bidder failed to demonstrate experience outside of being the incumbent.
- 2. Project Management Plan 10/10**
 The Evaluation Team determined that the responses were satisfactory for this section.
- 3. Research Plan/Methodology Rationale 20/25**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. The bidder’s plan to conduct research lacked complexity.
 - b. The bidder did not provide real examples of data research.
- 4. Media and Message Plan and Value Add 18/25**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. The creative examples presented lacked a clear description of the budget.
 - b. The budget referenced in the discussion was not within the parameters.
 - c. The bidder failed to address audience reach goals.
- 5. Creative and Messaging Concepts/Innovation/Cutting-edge Strategy 22/30**
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. The visuals presented were not consistently user friendly.
 - b. The bidder lacked video and animation examples from the creative team.
- Total: 77/100**

Bidder	Company Information/ Quality of presentation	Project Management Plan	Research Plan/ Methodology Rationale	Media and Message Plan and Value Add	Creative and Messaging Concepts/ Innovation/ Cutting-edge Strategy	Total
9Rooftops Marketing, LLC	10	10	25	25	30	100
Daniel Brian & Associates, Inc.	10	10	25	25	30	100
Virtual Marketing, LLC dba Fusion92	10	10	22	25	22	89

Ovative Group, LLC	7	10	20	18	22	77
--------------------	---	----	----	----	----	-----------

VI. Pricing Summary

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

9Rooftops Marketing, LLC		
	1st Round	2nd Round
1. Digital Media Placement Services – Commission Percentage (Yearly Value of Media Placed)		
a. \$0 to \$6,000,000	0%	8%
b. \$6,000,000.01 to \$9,000,000	0%	7.25%
c. \$9,000,000.01 or greater	0%	7%
2. Optional Use Professional Services – Variable Blended Hourly Rate	\$145	\$145
3. Agency Fee	\$1,600,000	\$335,000 (Account Management, Strategy, Insights, Planning, and Project Management) \$305,000 (Digital Media Attribution, Analysis, Research Consulting, and Reporting) \$273,000 (Creative Services, Messaging and Copywriting, Art, Design, Studio Services, and Production Supervision)

9Rooftops Marketing, LLC		
	1 st Round	2 nd Round
4. Additional Fixed Costs (must detail services provided for each fixed cost)	\$0 – Will estimate upon finalization of scope.	\$0 – Will estimate upon finalization of scope.
*In lieu of commission-based structure, 9Rooftops recommends an agency fee structure.		

Daniel Brian & Associates, Inc.		
	1 st Round	2 nd Round
1. Digital Media Placement Services – Commission Percentage (Yearly Value of Media Placed)		
a. \$0 to \$6,000,000	7.5%	6%
b. \$6,000,000.01 to \$9,000,000	7%	5.5%
c. \$9,000,000.01 or greater	7%	5%
2. Optional Use Professional Services – Variable Blended Hourly Rate	\$169	\$169
3. Account Management Fee – Fixed Annual Price	\$400,000	\$240,000 year 1 \$210,000 year 2
4. Digital Media Attribution Reporting and Analysis Tool - Fixed Annual Price	\$345,000	\$0
5. Creative Services (Annual)	\$0	17.5% of estimated annual budget for year 1, 4.76% of estimated annual budget for year 2

Virtual Marketing, LLC dba Fusion92		
	1 st Round	2 nd Round
1. Digital Media Placement Services – Commission Percentage (Yearly Value of Media Placed)		
a. \$0 to \$6,000,000	9.5%	8.75%
b. \$6,000,000.01 to \$9,000,000	9.5%	8.75%

Virtual Marketing, LLC dba Fusion92		
	1 st Round	2 nd Round
c. \$9,000,000.01 or greater	9%	8.25%
2. Optional Use Professional Services – Variable Blended Hourly Rate	\$165	\$165
3. Account Management Fee – Fixed Annual Price	\$290,000	\$290,000
4. Digital Media Attribution Reporting and Analysis Tool - Fixed Annual Price	\$250,000 (\$75,000 Research, \$125,000 Digital Media Platform, \$50,000 Reporting & Analytics Tool Fees)	\$250,000 (\$100,000 Research, \$100,000 Digital Media Platform, \$50,000 Reporting & Analytics Tool Fees)

VII. Negotiations

The bidders who passed both technical and the oral presentations were offered an opportunity to submit second round pricing which is reflected in the above table.

VIII. 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 the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions Evaluation Process* section, and price.

Daniel Brian & Associates, Inc. provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include: Documented knowledge and capability, cutting edge technology offerings, alignment of presentation to Lottery goals, value and stability of key personnel, flexibility of creative spend, lowest commission rate, lowest account management fees, quality and extent of research, and acceptance to the Standard Contract Terms.

As part of the best value determination, overall economic impact to the State of Michigan was considered but is not the determinative factor in making this award.

Award Recommendation is made to Daniel Brian & Associates, Inc. in the amount of \$17,332,000.00.