

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 240000000937

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP # 230000003077 Distribution Warehouse Inventory System for Michigan State Police, and has recommended an award to RiceFW Tech Inc., in the amount of **\$948,520.00** pending State Administrative Board approval. 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 reached at:

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 Contractor to provide a web-based COTS Software Solution, and applicable Services to allow for accurate inventory tracking of warehouse goods, assist with ordering that is picked up in a timely manner, and ensure proper stock is on hand with no duplicate orders occurring in the system. The term of this contract is 5 years, with up to 5, 1-year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on September 8th, 2023. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of October 20th, 2023.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*
Apptricity	220 Las Colinas E., Tower 1, Suite 400, Irving Texas, 75039	No
Mass Group	6280 S. Valley View Blvd., Suite 230, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89118	No
OnActuate	10900 NE 4 th Street, AUnit 2300, Bellevue, Washington, 98004	No
RiceFW Tech Inc.,	4295 Okemos Road, Suite 102, Okemos, MI, 48864-6201	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: Evaluation Process

1.

Evaluation Criteria Name	Evaluation Weight
Project Scope <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 1-17 and 22-25 Schedule D – Service Level Agreement Schedule E – Data Security Requirements Schedule F – Disaster Recovery Plan Schedule G – Transition In/Out Plan Schedule H – Hardware Schedule I – System Acceptance Testing 	30
Solution Requirements / Specifications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule A, Table 1 – Business Specifications Worksheet 	50
Staffing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 18-21 Attachment 1, Resume Templates 	10
Company Background <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vendor Question Worksheet 	10
Total Weight	100

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

The State may utilize all Bidder information, without regard to a proposal’s technical score, to determine fair market value for goods or services sought. The State is not obligated to accept the lowest price proposal. If applicable, the State’s evaluation will include consideration of a bidder’s qualified disabled veterans/service-disabled veteran owned business(QDV/SDVOB) status under MCL 18.1261(8). Additional information on the SDVOB preference is available at: Michigan.gov/SDVOB.

The State strongly encourages strict adherence to the Contract Terms and Schedules. The State reserves the right to deem a bid non-responsive for failure to accept the

Contract Terms and Schedules. Nevertheless, the Bidder may submit proposed changes to the Contract Terms and Schedules in track changes (i.e., visible edits) with an explanation of the Bidder’s need for each proposed change. Failure to include track changes with an explanation of the Bidder’s need for the proposed change constitutes the Bidder’s acceptance of the Contract Terms and Schedules. General statements, such as that the Bidder reserves the right to negotiate the terms and conditions, may be considered non-responsive.

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
Jason Pierce, MSP	LeAnne Bruce, MSP
Coreen Williams, MSP	Dawn Davis, MSP
Amy Stafford, MSP	Ramesh Devaram, DTMB
Jim Coggin, DTMB	Timothy Imes, MSP
Lauren Stempek, DTMB	Dat Le, MSP
	Matthew Thelen, MSP
	Kelly Tiedgen, MSP

III. Evaluation Results

Evaluation Scoring Breakdown

Statement of Work

RFP Section		Apptricity	Mass	OnActuate	RiceFW
Section 4: IT ENVIRONMENT RESPONSIBILITIES	Bidder did not agree to meet Schedule D – Service Level Agreements	-0.5			
Section 4: IT ENVIRONMENT RESPONSIBILITIES	Bidder did not identify their responsibilities in meeting the requirements in Data Security Schedule			-0.5	
Section 5: ADA COMPLIANCE	Bidder is not fully compliant with ADA		-0.5		
Section 9: END USER AND IT OPERATING ENVIRONMENT	Bidder did not provide hardware as a part of the solution			-1.0	
Section 13: HARDWARE	Bidder did not provide or recommend Hardware as required by the RFP			-1.0	

Section 14: TRAINING SERVICES	Bidder places a lot of the training responsibility on the State to do – does not specify the bidders roll in training				-0.5	
Subtotal Deductions		-0.5	-0.5	-3.0		

Business Requirements

RFP Section		Apptricity	Mass	OnActuate	RiceFW
Schedule A: Table 1 Business Specification Worksheet – Requirement 12	Bidders' solution does not have the ability to automatically calculate the surcharge		-1.136		
Schedule A: Table 1 Business Specification Worksheet – Requirement 23	Bidders' solution does not provide the full functionality		-0.568		
Schedule A: Table 1 Business Specification Worksheet – Requirement 40	Bidders' solution does not have the ability to do price averaging		-1.136		
Schedule A: Table 1 Business Specification Worksheet. – Requirement 42	Bidders' solution is a labor-intensive process as it does not automatically perform		-0.568		
Schedule A: Table 1 Business Specification Worksheet. – Requirement 44	Bidders' solution cannot be configured to automatically print the receipt			-1.136	
Subtotal Deductions		-0.0	-3.408	-1.136	-0.0

Staffing

RFP Section		Apptricity	Mass	OnActuate	RiceFW
CONTRACTOR PROJECT MANAGER	Project Manager resume submitted was for Systems Analyst role	-1.0			
CONTRACTOR PROJECT MANAGER	Bidder did not fill out Key Personnel Resume experience requirements for Project Manager				-1.0
Subtotal Deductions		-1.0	-0.0	-0.0	-1.0

Vendor Question Worksheet					
RFP Section		Apptricity	Mass	OnActuate	RiceFW
Section 6: STANDARD CONTRACT TERMS	Bidder provided exceptions			-0.5	
Section 10: SUPPLIER DIVERSITY	Bidder did not provide because they have less than 100 employees, but in VQWS they stated they have 145 employees			-0.1	
Subtotal Deductions		-0.0	-0.0	-0.6	-0

Deductions Summary

Possible Points	Criteria	Apptricity	Mass	OnActuate	RiceFW
30	Project Scope: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 1-17 and 22-25 Schedule D – Service Level Agreement Schedule E – Data Security Requirements Schedule F – Disaster Recovery Plan Schedule G – Transition In/Out Plan Schedule H – Hardware Schedule I – System Acceptance Testing 	-0.5	-0.5	-3.0	
50	Solution Requirements / Specifications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule A, Table 1 – Business Specifications Worksheet 		-3.408	-1.136	
10	Staffing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule A, Statement of Work: Sections 18-21 Attachment 1, Resume Templates 	-1.0			-1.0
10	Company Background <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vendor Questions Worksheet 			-0.6	
Total Technical Evaluations Deductions		-1.5	-3.908	-4.736	-1.0
100	Technical Evaluation Score	98.5	96.092	95.264	99

IV. Pricing Summary

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

	Apptricity	Mass Group	OnActuate	RiceFW
Subscription	\$1,257,245.00	\$901,500.00	\$255,680.00	\$125,000.00
Hardware	\$7,800.00	\$15,600.00	---	\$4,000.00

Implementation	\$100,500.00	\$45,500.00	\$1,297,100.00	\$504,320.00
Hosting/Service Fees	\$25,000.00	\$388,125.00*	\$112,600.00	\$315,200.00
5 Year Total Costs	\$1,390,545.00	\$1,350,725.00	\$1,665,380.00	\$948,520.00

	Apptricity	Mass Group	OnActuate	RiceFW
Subscription	\$2,514,490.00	\$1,947,584.89	\$430,680.00	\$268,750.00
Hardware	\$7,800.00	\$15,600.00	---	\$8,600.00
Implementation	\$100,500.00	\$45,000.00	\$1,297,100.00	\$504,320.00
Hosting/Service Fees	\$50,000.00*	\$796,250.00*	\$172,600.00	\$723,910.00
10 Year Total Costs	\$2,672,790.00	\$2,804,934.89	\$1,900,380.00	\$1,505,580.00

**Indicates estimates based on States figures*

V. Negotiations

The State conducted demos with all four passing vendors and requested second round pricing. After negotiations, RiceFW was able to reduce their proposal by \$547,490.00. The new proposed price is \$948,520.00.

VI. 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.

RiceFW provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include:

- 1) Bidder's solution offers automatic printing of receipts.
- 2) Bidder's solution offers the capability for a single order to have multiple accounting templates.
- 3) Most user friendly (cut down on training/learning).
- 4) The reporting capabilities and presentation of data; allowing for the ease of access and interpretation of data, cutting down on mistakes/problems in inventory.
- 5) Includes a Price Averaging tool.
- 6) Michigan based.
- 7) RiceFW provided the overall lowest cost to the State.