

# AWARD RECOMMENDATION

## Notice of Intent to Award Number: 24000000499

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget office has completed the evaluation of **RFS # 24000000439 for a fraud analytics and ID proofing system** and has recommended an award to Socure, Inc. in the amount of \$4,097,472, 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:

Kristine Mills, Solicitation Manager.  
 millsk11@michigan.gov  
 517-242-6402

### Background Information:

This Request for Solution (RFS) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide a fraud analytics and ID proofing system. The term of this contract is 3 Base Years, with up to 5, 1-Year renewal options.

### Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on November 17, 2023. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of December 8<sup>th</sup>, 2023.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
<b>International Business Machines</b>	1 New Orchard Road Armonk, New York 10504-1722	No	No
<b>LexisNexis Risk Solutions FL Inc.</b>	1000 Alderman Dr. Alpharetta, GA 30005	No	No
<b>Lumen Technologies, Inc.</b>	100 CenturyLink Drive Monroe, LA 71203	No	No
<b>Ping Identity Corporation</b>	1001 17th Street, Suite 100, Denver, CO 80202	No	No
<b>Socure, Inc.</b>	885 Tahoe Blvd Suite 1, Incline Village, NV 89451	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

	Technical Criteria Name	Weight
1.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	10
2.	Schedule A – Statement of Work	20
3.	Schedule A – Attachment 1 – Business Specification Worksheet*	40
4.	Schedule A – Attachment 2 - Bidder’s Proposed Solution*	30
	<b>Total</b>	100

\* Vendors may respond to the Fraud Analytics and/or ID Proofing portion of the RFS. If a vendor is only responding to one of these sections, that section’s points will be doubled.

Proposals receiving 80 or more evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and be considered for award. 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
Kristine Mills, DTMB Dane Spencer, DTMB Stephanie Jeppesen, DTMB	Nathan Ebig, DTMB Karthik Narayanan, DTMB Gayathri Rajaram, DTMB Jennifer Tuttleman, DTMB-Contractor Matt Weiss – DTMB Mike Bartkowiak – DTMB

## III. Evaluation Results

### a. IBM

The Evaluation Team determined that IBM based on a score of 88.50, did meet the requirements of this RFS. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

### 1. Vendor Questions Worksheet – 8/10

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
Bidder does not provide government experience around the purpose of this RFS.	Vendor Questions Worksheet			0.50
Bidder redlined the Terms and Conditions	Vendor Questions Worksheet			1.00
Bidder does not agree to insurance requirements	Vendor Questions Worksheet			0.50

**2. Schedule A – Statement of Work- 14.50/20**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
Bidder does not comply with Schedules D & E.	Schedule A	4. IT ENVIRONMENT		4.00
Security Officer proposed by Bidder does not have security related certification.	Schedule A	18. CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL		0.50
Bidder provided redlines to Background Checks and the small java code snippets written by IBM employees in Tel Aviv, Israel is unacceptable.	Schedule A	20. CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS		1.00

**3. Schedule A. Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet – 38/40**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
----------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------	--------------	---------------------

Bidder did not define the capability of each requirement upon initial proposal receipt.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet			2.00
---	---	--	--	------

**4. Schedule A. Attachment 2 – Bidder’s Proposed Solution – 28/30**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
Bidder provided a very robust fraud and behavior analytics solution, but it is not FedRAMP compliant. Bidder does not provide roadmap timing.	Attachment 2- Bidder’s Proposed Solution			2.00

**b. LexisNexis Risk Solutions**

The Evaluation Team determined that LexisNexis Risk Solutions based on a score of 86.50, did meet the requirements of this RFS. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. Vendor Questions Worksheet – 9/10**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
Bidder provided redlines to Terms and Conditions	Vendor Questions Worksheet			1.00

**2. Schedule A – Statement of Work- 14/20**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
----------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------	--------------	---------------------

Bidder does not commit to NIST compliance and FIPS compliance modules. Bidder also provided redlines to Schedule E and did not provide a Disaster Recovery Plan.	Schedule A	4. IT ENVIRONMENT		5.00
Bidder does not provide the PAT for the proposed solution.	Schedule A	5. ADA COMPLIANCE		0.5
Bidder's latency time is unacceptable.	Schedule A	6. USER TYPE AND CAPACITY		0.5

**3. Schedule A. Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet – 38.50/40**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
Bidder does not support at this time.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		12.0 (d)	0.50
Bidder does not support at this time.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		13. (c)	0.50
Bidder does not support at this time.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		16.0 (c)	0.50

**4. Schedule A. Attachment 2 – Bidder's Proposed Solution – 25/30**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
----------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------	--------------	---------------------

Bidder's FedRamp timing is not satisfactory. Due to the complexity, the solution integration would require more time and funds by the State. State would need to provide a UI as it is not provided by the Solution. Review and approval will be required prior to federation by the State.	Attachment 2- Bidder's Proposed Solution			5.00
---	--	--	--	------

**c. Lumen Technologies**

The Evaluation Team determined that Lumen Technologies, based on a score of 63.00, did not meet the requirements of this RFS. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. Vendor Questions Worksheet – 9/10**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
Bidder provided redlines to Terms and Conditions	Vendor Questions Worksheet			1.00

**2. Schedule A – Statement of Work- 7/20**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
Bidder did not provide a Disaster Recovery Plan	Schedule A	4. IT ENVIRONMENT		1.00
Bidder is not currently WCAG 2.1 compliant	Schedule A	5. ADA COMPLIANCE		0.5

Bidder's response describes more of an intrusion prevention solution than a fraud analytics solution.	Schedule A	10. SOFTWARE SECTION		2.00
Bidder failed to provide a detailed transition in and out plan.	Schedule A	15. TRANSITION RESPONSIBILITIES		1.00
Bidder lacks detail as to what documentation applies to the solution proposed within the link that was provided.	Schedule A	16. DOCUMENTATION		1.00
Bidder does not provide contractor personnel	Schedule A	18. CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL		2.00
Service availability affected by restricting offshore resources.	Schedule A	20. CONTRACTOR PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS		0.50
Bidder does not provide any meeting requirements and timeframes.	Schedule A	22. MEETINGS		2.00
Bidder does not provide details around project controls and reports	Schedule A	23. PROJECT CONTROLS AND REPORTS		1.00

Bidder does not provide details around project management milestone and deliverables.	Schedule A	24. PROJECT MANAGEMENT/MILESTONES & DELIVERABLES FOR IMPLEMENTATION		2.00
---	------------	---	--	------

**3. Schedule A. Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet  
 – 27/40**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
Bidder does not provide details on how the solution will deliver the business specification and does not discuss the client bot score.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		1.0	1.00
Bidder does not provide details on how the solution will deliver each of the business specifications.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		2.0 (a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h)	4.00
Bidder does not provide details on how the solution will deliver each of the business specifications.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		3.0 (a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h)	4.00
Bidder is lacking details around the solution supporting the requirement.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		4.0	1.00
Bidder does not state they can send a risk score to the backstream application.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		6.0	1.00



State would have to extract the data required. The system does not provide this to the State.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		7.0	1.00
Bidder is lacking details around the requirement including values supporting test benchmarks.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		9.0	1.00
Bidder is lacking detail regarding the dashboard and what analytics are provided.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		Optional (1)	N/A
Bidder did not acknowledge this optional requirement.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		Optional (3)	N/A

**4. Schedule A. Attachment 2 – Bidder’s Proposed Solution- 20/30**

<b><u>Evaluation Comments</u></b>	<b><u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u></b>	<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Req #</u></b>	<b><u>Docked Score</u></b>
Bidder’s response describes more of an Intrusion Prevention solution than a fraud analytics solution. Based on the description, the solution does not align with State requirements and may conflict with other IPS solutions already in place at the state.	Attachment 2- Bidder’s Proposed Solution			10.00

**d. Ping Identity**

The Evaluation Team determined that Ping Identity based on a score of 84.00, did meet the requirements of this RFS. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. Vendor Questions Worksheet – 7/10**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
Bidder only provided gross annual sales for a year.	Vendor Questions Worksheet			0.50
Bidder did not provide the 3 relevant experiences requested.	Vendor Questions Worksheet			0.50
Bidder did not review and/or comply with Terms and Conditions	Vendor Questions Worksheet			1.00
Bidder did not review and/or comply with Insurance requirements.	Vendor Questions Worksheet			0.50
Bidder did not provide information around MI economic impact.	Vendor Questions Worksheet			0.50

**2. Schedule A – Statement of Work – 13.50/20**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
RTO and RPO does not support our requirements	Schedule A	4. IT ENVIRONMENT		1.00
Bidder failed to review and/or comply with Schedule E.	Schedule A	4. IT ENVIRONMENT		2.00

Bidder did not provide a working link to their DR Plan.	Schedule A	4. IT ENVIRONMENT		1.00
Bidder is not currently WCAG 2.1 compliant.	Schedule A	5. ADA COMPLIANCE		0.50
Bidder's form of communication is not acceptable.	Schedule A	9. END USER AND OPERATING ENVIRONMENT		0.50
Contractor Security Officer resume lacks details around skills and experience.	Schedule A	19. CONTRACTOR KEY PERSONNEL		0.50
Bidder does not provide a response to the question provided.	Schedule A	23. PROJECT CONTROLS AND REPORTS		1.00

**3. Schedule A. Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet  
 – 36.50/40**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
Bidder does not support at this time.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		2.0 (e & d)	1.00
Bidder does not support at this time.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		3.0 (c & d)	1.00
Bidder does not support at this time.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		14.0 (g)	.50
Bidder does not support at this time.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		16.0 (b & c)	1.00

**4. Schedule A. Attachment 2 – Bidder's Proposed Solution –  
 27/30**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
Bidder doesn't clearly describe product suite and offerings in regards to what is asked in the RFS.	Attachment 2- Bidder's Proposed Solution			3.00

**e. Socure**

The Evaluation Team determined that Socure, based on a score of 94.50, did meet the requirements of this RFS. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. Vendor Questions Worksheet – 8.50/10**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
Bidder provided redlines to Terms and Conditions	Vendor Questions Worksheet			1.00
Bidder provided redlines to Insurance Requirements	Vendor Questions Worksheet			0.50

**2. Schedule A – Statement of Work – 17/20**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
RTO and RPO does not support our requirements	Schedule A	4. IT ENVIRONMENT		1.00
Bidder provided redlines to Schedule E.	Schedule A	4. IT ENVIRONMENT		2.00

**3. Schedule A. Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet – 39/40**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
Bidder does not support at this time.	Attachment 1- Business Specifications Worksheet		3.0 (c & d)	1.00

**4. Schedule A. Attachment 2 – Bidder’s Proposed Solution – 30/30**

<u>Evaluation Comments</u>	<u>Evaluation Criteria Name</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Req #</u>	<u>Docked Score</u>
Bidder provided a detailed plan that meets the State’s requirements.	Attachment 2- Bidder’s Proposed Solution			0.00

**IV. Technical Evaluation Summary**

The JEC determined that four out of five proposals met the minimum 80 technical evaluation point threshold. The JEC derived the technical scores below from the bidders’ written proposals.

DEDUCTIONS SUMMARY

Possible Points	Criteria	IBM Corp.	LexisNexis Risk Solutions	Lumen Technologies	Ping Identity	Socure, Inc.
<b>10</b>	Vendor Questions Worksheet	<b>-2</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>-1.5</b>
<b>20</b>	Schedule A- Statement of Work	<b>-5.5</b>	<b>-6</b>	<b>-10</b>	<b>-6.5</b>	<b>-3</b>
<b>40</b>	Schedule A – Attachment 1 – Business Specification Worksheet*	<b>-2</b>	<b>-1.5</b>	<b>-13</b>	<b>-3.5</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>30</b>	Schedule A – Attachment 2 - Bidder’s Proposed Solution*	<b>-2</b>	<b>-5.0</b>	<b>-13</b>	<b>-3.0</b>	<b>-0</b>
<b>Total Technical Evaluation Deductions</b>		<b>-11.5</b>	<b>-13.5</b>	<b>-37</b>	<b>-16</b>	<b>-5.5</b>
<b>Technical Evaluation Score</b>		<b>88.50</b>	<b>86.50</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>94.50</b>

**V. Pricing Summary**

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

Deliverable		IBM Corp.	LexisNexis Risk Solutions	Ping Identity	Socure
1	Fraud Analytics – Base Contract Term	\$ 3,391,337.95	\$ 288,000	\$ 820,173.45	\$1,702,134
2	ID Proofing – Base Contract Term	Not included	\$ 4,633,200	\$ 3,899,688	\$2,125,188
3	Implementation & Ongoing Services – Base Contract	\$298,720	\$133,771.28	N/A	\$270,150
<b>Base Years Subtotal</b>		<b>\$3,690,057.95</b>	<b>\$5,054,971.28</b>	<b>\$4,719,861.45</b>	<b>\$4,097,472</b>
4	Fraud Analytics – Option Years	\$5,825,182.91	\$480,000	\$2,085,039.82	\$3,074,813.52
5	ID Proofing – Option Years	Not included	\$7,722,000.00	\$9,902,738.69	\$3,820,135.29
6	Implementation & Ongoing Services – Option Years	\$271,200.00	\$9,428.57	N/A	\$561,680.11
<b>Option Years Subtotal</b>		<b>\$6,096,382.91</b>	<b>\$8,211,428.57</b>	<b>\$11,987,778.51</b>	<b>\$7,456,628.92</b>
<b>8 Year Total</b>		<b>\$9,786,440.86</b>	<b>\$13,266,399.85</b>	<b>\$16,707,639.96</b>	<b>\$11,554,100.92</b>

## VI. Negotiations

After entering negotiations, Socure was able to reduce their proposal by \$812,111.84 through negotiations. The new proposed total contract price is \$11,554,100.92 for all base and option years.

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

Socure provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include, but are not limited to, providing both a Fraud Analytics and ID Proofing solution at the lowest cost. Socure also provided a detailed and customized approach for both Transition in and Transition out plans and has offered an additional resource, the Solution Consultant, that comes with previous experience in implementing these types of programs.

