



**STATE OF MICHIGAN PROCUREMENT**  
Department of Technology, Management & Budget  
525 W. Allegan St., Lansing, MI 48933  
PO Box 30026, Lansing, MI 48913

## Award Recommendation

### NIA1 230000001305

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget's Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP 230000002677 for Enterprise Software License & User Identity Management. Two bids were received however neither Bidder passed the technical evaluation, and the State has determined to not award to any Bidder.

Bidders who submitted a bid 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:

Lauren Stempek, Solicitation Manager  
StempekL@Michigan.gov  
517-243-4008

#### Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a State Hosted solution, including implementation services, to integrate with the States existing FlexNet Manager solution for the Department of Technology, Management & Budget (DTMB).

#### Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on Wednesday July, 12th, 2023 for a period of four weeks. The following Bidders submitted proposals:

| Bidder                          | Address<br>City, State Zip                               | SDVOB* |
|---------------------------------|--|--------|
| CoreView USA, Inc.              | 3343 Peachtree Rd NE Suite 145-1576<br>Atlanta, GA 30326 | N      |
| International Business Machines | 1 New Orchard Road,<br>Armonk, New York 10504-1722       | N      |

\*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.

### RFP Proposal Instructions, Evaluation Process

**EVALUATION PROCESS.** The State will evaluate each proposal based on the following factors:

|    | Technical Evaluation Criteria                           | Weight |
|----|---|--------|
| 1. | Vendor Questions Worksheet                              | 20     |
| 2. | Schedule A - Statement of Work                          | 40     |
| 3. | Schedule A – Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet | 30     |
| 4. | Schedule A – Vendor Proposal                            | 10     |
|    | <b>Total</b>  | 100    |

Proposals receiving 80 or more technical evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and considered for award.

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

## II. Evaluation Method

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

| Voting  |
|---|
| Lauren Stempek, Solicitation Manager<br>DTMB, Central Procurement Services                  |
| Reid Sisson, ITAM Software Manager<br>DTMB, Chief Technology Office                         |
| Whitnie Zuker, IT Contract Portfolio Management<br>DTMB, Chief Technology Office            |
| Phil Adolph, Manager of Enterprise Infrastructure Services<br>DTMB, Chief Technology Office |

## III. Evaluation Results

### A. CoreView USA, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that CoreView USA, Inc., based on a score of 52.5, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

#### 1. Vendor Questions Worksheet (12/20)

- Experience 1 – The Bidder’s experience is lacking relevancy to scope, it refers primarily to Microsoft 365 management. (-2)
- Experience 2 – The Bidder’s experience is lacking relevancy to scope, it refers primarily to Microsoft 365 management. (-2)
- Experience 3 – The Bidder’s experience is lacking relevancy to scope, it refers primarily to Microsoft 365 management. (-2)

- d. Standard Contract Terms – The Bidder confirmed agreed with the Terms but proposed a solution that was not supported by the State Hosted COTS terms agreed to. (-2)

**Total Deductions: 8**

**2. Schedule A – Statement of Work (22.5/40)**

- a. Section 4 - IT Environment Responsibilities – The Bidders confirmation of COTS State Hosted is contradicting to the proposed Vendor Hosted SaaS Solution. (-0.5)
- b. Section 4 - IT Environment Responsibilities – The Bidder provided insufficient response for escalation path. (-0.5)
- c. Section 4 - IT Environment Responsibilities – The Bidder provided own Security Policy and Standards. (-0.5)
- d. Section 4 - IT Environment Responsibilities – Data Security Requirements – The Bidder provided own Security and Policy Standards. (-0.5)
- e. Section 4 – IT Environment Responsibilities - State Hosted Software Solution – The Bidder failed to demonstrate the full scope of the RFP requirements. (-1)
- f. Section 6 – User Type and Capacity – The Bidder did not adequately address ability to support expected number of concurrent users in a State Hosted environment, and bidder did not adequately address its ability to scale up or down in a State Hosted environment. (-1)
- g. Section 6 – User Type and Capacity – The Bidder did not adequately address latency response times in a State Hosted environment. Bidder did not adequately address Network Connectivity or equipment required in a State Hosted environment. (-1)
- h. Section 9 – End User and IT Operating Environment – The State is seeking a State Hosted COTS Solution and not a Vendor Hosted SaaS Solution. (-2)
- i. Section 10 – Software – The SoM is seeking a State Hosted COTS Solution and not a Vendor Hosted SaaS solution. (-2)
- j. Section 11 – Integration – Bidder did not provide adequate detail on how the solution will integrate with the systems required in the RFP (VMWare vCenter, FlexNet Manager, Flexera Data Platform (FDP), Adobe Administrative Console, BMC Software State Hosted, and BMC Atrium CMDB). (-1.5)
- k. Section 18 – Contractor Personnel – Contractor Security Officer – Bidder did not identify any security training, and provided no description of current and past work experience for this Key Personnel. (-1)
- l. Section 19 – Implementation and Operation Resources – Bidder provided resources based on SaaS instead of State Hosted COTS Solution. (-2)
- m. Section 21 – State Resources/Responsibilities – Bidder provided State resources based on a SaaS instead of State Hosted COTS solution. (-2)
- n. Section 22 – Meetings – The Implementation document provided by the Bidder explained implementation and ongoing support for a Vendor Hosted SaaS solution instead of a State Hosted COTS solution. (-2)

**Total Deductions: 17.5**

**3. Schedule A – Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet (18/30)**

- a. Requirement 1 – Not Applicable - Only relevant to M365. (-3)
- b. Requirement 2 – Not Applicable - Only relevant to M365. (-3)
- c. Requirement 3 - Not Applicable - Only relevant to M365. (-3)
- d. Requirement 10 – Bidder indicated yes can comply, however provided same response as requirements identified as “Not Applicable” – contradicting. (-1)
- e. Requirement 11 – Bidder indicated yes can comply, however provided same response as requirements identified as “Not Applicable” – contradicting. (-1)
- f. Requirement 13 – Bidder indicated yes can comply, however provided same response as requirements identified as “Not Applicable” – contradicting. (-1)

**Total Deductions: 12**

**4. Schedule A – Vendor Proposal (0/10)**

- a. Technical Description – Out of scope, Bidder provided a Vendor Hosted SaaS solution instead of a State Hosted COTS solution.

**Total Deductions: 10**

**Total Deductions: 47.5**

**B. International Business Machines**

The Evaluation Team determined that International Business Machines, based on a score of 66.5, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. Vendor Questions Worksheet (15/20)**

- a. Experience 1 – The Bidder did not clearly define what were their roles, percentage of work and operational support. (-2)
- b. Experience 2 - The Bidder's experience refers primarily to their assets, lacking relevancy to scope. (-2)
- c. Experience 3 – The Bidder's experience is lacking details on the scope of the engagement. (-1)

**Total Deductions: 5**

**2. Schedule A – Statement of Work (27.5/40)**

- a. Section 11 – Integration – Bidder did not provide adequate detail on how the solution will integrate with the systems required in the RFP (Flexera Data Platform, Adobe Administrative Console, BMC Atrium CMDB). (-1.5)
- b. Section 16 – Documentation – Bidder did not provide knowledge transfer documentation for systems currently not integrated with Flexera FlexNet Manager. (-2)
- c. Section 18 – Contractor Personnel – Contractor Security Officer – Bidder did not provide a resume for the Contractor Security Officer. (-2)
- d. Section 19 – Implementation and Operation Resources – Bidder did not provide an implementation team for needed interfaces. (-2)
- e. Section 21 – State Resources/Responsibilities - Implementation Team – Bidder did not provide a State implementation team for resources for needed interfaces. (-2)
- f. Section 22 – Meetings – Bidder was non-responsive to a kick-off meeting. (-1)
- g. Section 24 – Project Management – Milestones/Deliverables for Implementation – Bidder did not include integrations into milestone deliverables for operations support services schedule. (-1)
- h. Section 24 – Project Management – Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) – Bidder did not provide a Work Breakdown Structure. (-1)

**Total Deductions: 12.5**

**3. Schedule A – Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet (24/30)**

- a. Requirement 9 – Bidder did not indicate how they would have accomplished this in FlexNet which is what they were proposing. (-3)
- b. Requirement 11 – Bidder did not indicate how they would have accomplished this requirement. (-3)

**Total Deductions: 6**

**4. Schedule A – Vendor Proposal (0/10)**

- a. Technical Description – There was no SoW provided for the services the Bidder will perform.  
(-10)

**Total Deductions: 10**

**Total Deductions: 33.5**

**IV. Technical Evaluation Summary:**

|          | <b>Selection Criteria</b>   | <b>CoreView USA, Inc.</b> | <b>International Business Machines</b> |
|----------|---|---------------------------|--|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Vendor Questions Worksheet (20)</b>                              | 12                        | 15                                     |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Schedule A - Statement of Work (40)</b>                          | 22.5                      | 27.5                                   |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Schedule A – Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet (30)</b> | 18                        | 24                                     |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Schedule A – Vendor Proposal (10)</b>                            | 0                         | 0                                      |
|          | <b>Total (100)</b>  | <b>52.5</b>               | <b>66.5</b>                            |

**V. Pricing Summary**

Pricing was not evaluated as neither Bidder passed the Technical Evaluation.

**VI. Award Recommendation:**

The State has determined to not award any Bidder under this Solicitation, per Proposal Instructions, Section 8. Evaluation Process, and Section 11. Reservations.