

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 260000000316

Notice of Intent to Award Date: 3/23/2026

The Department of Technology, Management, and Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of Request for Proposal (RFP) 260000000439 Michigan Cyber Summit Event Planning and has recommended an award to Accelerate Holdings, LLC, dba e.Republic, LLC, 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:

Susan Watt-Smith, Solicitation Manager
wattsmiths@michigan.gov
 517-230-0535

Public copies of all bidder proposals can be found here: [DTMB - Bid Proposals \(michigan.gov\)](#)

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide event planning services for the annual Michigan Cyber Summit. The term of this contract is 3 years, with up to 3, 1-year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on Monday, December 22, 2025. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of Monday, January 26, 2026.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
Edge Partnerships, LLC	117 E. Kalamazoo St., Lansing, MI 48933	No	Yes
Accelerate Holdings, LLC dba e.Republic, LLC	100 Blue Ravine Road Suite 100 Folsom, CA 95630	No	No
Direct Marketing Productions, LLC dba eventPower	4304 W. Beach Park Dr. Tampa, FL 33609	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:

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1	35
2.	Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2 - 5	20
3.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6 - 9	15
4.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	30
	Total	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 Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC), which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Susan Watt-Smith, Sr. Category Analyst DTMB CPS-Services	Jamie Bennett, Deputy Chief Security Officer DTMB/Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection
Stephanie Jeppesen, State Asst. Administrator, Business Services DTMB/Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection	Giget Schlyer, Business Relationship Manager DTMB-Agency Services
Michelle McClish, State Asst. Administrator DTMB/Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection	Megan Schrauben, Executive Director LEO/ MiSTEM Network
	Dillon Trombly, Contractor DTMB/Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection
	Laura Wotruba, Director of Communications DTMB/Office of Public Information

III. Evaluation Results

A. Edge Partnerships, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Edge Partnerships, LLC based on a score of 89.25, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1

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

- a. **Section 1.1.1.A**, Bidder’s Sample Plan is the same document as the Project Schedule and Work Breakdown Schedule with different section titles. The planning stages for the main public event, sponsor vendor reception, high school challenge competition and high school student cyber summit events were not shown in the Sample Plan.
- b. **Section 1.1.1.J**, Bidder did not provide a sample Decision Log.
- c. **Section 1.1.2.B**, Bidder’s sample Communication Plan lacked sufficient examples of communication to the target audiences of the summit in that the following was missing: approach and mechanism to communicate event details to: Vendor Sponsors, Advisory Group/Leaders/Stakeholders, Planning & Execution Team, Panel Moderators, Panel Participants, Speakers & Presenters, Breakout Session Hosts, Main Cyber Summit event audience, Sponsor vendor reception audience, HS Challenge Competition audience, HS Student Cyber Summit event audience.
- d. **Section 1.1.4.**, Bidder provided a link to Sample Work Plan Section: MICEC 2025. However, per RFP 26000000439 Proposal Instructions, 1. Proposal Preparation, “References and links to websites or external sources may not be used in lieu of providing the information requested in the RFP within the proposal.”
- e. **Section 1.1.6.**, Bidder provided links to the following documents: Draft Agenda, Draft Speaker Agenda, Sample Call for Presenters Form, Sample Committee Feedback Form, Script Sample, Run of Show Sample – MMA, and Run of Show Sample – MICEC. However, per RFP 26000000439 Proposal Instructions, 1. Proposal Preparation, “References and links to websites or external sources may not be used in lieu of providing the information requested in the RFP within the proposal.”
- f. **Section 1.1.7.**, Bidder provided links to the following documents: Committee meeting kickoff agenda, Committee notes including roles, and Panel question samples. However, per RFP 26000000439 Proposal Instructions, 1. Proposal Preparation, “References and links to websites or external sources may not be used in lieu of providing the information requested in the RFP within the proposal.”

- g. **Section 1.1.8.**, Bidder provided links to the following documents: General Attendee Survey Example, and Exhibitor Survey. However, per RFP 260000000439 Proposal Instructions, 1. Proposal Preparation, “References and links to websites or external sources may not be used in lieu of providing the information requested in the RFP within the proposal.”
- h. **Section 1.6.**, Bidder did not provide a Disaster Recovery Plan.

Score: 26.75/30

2. Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2 - 5

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

- a. **Section 2.2.**, Bidder did not provide a response to the bidder box.
- b. **Section 3.1.**, Bidder did not provide a response to the bidder box.
- c. **Section 4.5.B.**, Bidder’s proposal stated “Detailed, chronological resumes included as Attachment D Resumes” but Attachment D was not included in their bid response.
- d. **Section 5.1.**, Bidder’s proposal stated “See Attachment B Project Plan” but Attachment B is their Communication Plan.

Score: 17.50/20

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6 - 9

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, and no deficiencies were noted.

Score: 15/15

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, and no deficiencies were noted.

Score: 30/30

Total Score: 89.25/100

B. Accelerate Holdings, LLC, dba e.Republic, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Accelerate Holdings, LLC, dba e.Republic, LLC based on a score of 90.50, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1

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

- a. **Section 1.1.7.**, Bidder stated the following reason for not agreeing to the requirement: “We do not proactively name back up speakers for all speakers, however, we have a process to ensure if a speaker backs out that

we are able to find a replacement, so the session is protected. If it is a sponsor speaker, the sponsor company is responsible for sending a replacement.

- b. Section 1.5., 2nd Bidder Box**, Bidder did not sufficiently describe if it can comply with the current environment and how it intends to comply with any future changes to the user environment. And if not, describe what end user operating environment its Software supports.

Score: 33/35

2. Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2 - 5

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory and no deficiencies were noted.

Score: 20/20

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6 - 9

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory and no deficiencies were noted.

Score: 15/15

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet

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

- a.** All three (3) experiences listed described indicated they are no cost to the State and did not provide dollar values for the projects.

Score: 22.50/30

Total Score: 83/100

C. Direct Marketing Productions, LLC, dba eventPower

The Evaluation Team determined that Direct Marketing Productions, LLC, dba eventPower, based on a score of 91.25, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1

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

- a. Section 1.1.4.**, Bidder did not provide a response to the bidder box.
- b. Section 1.1.6.**, Bidder’s attachment titled “1.1.6 – Agenda Buildout” contained 2 broken document links. However, per RFP 260000000439 Proposal Instructions, 1. Proposal Preparation, “References and links to websites or external sources may not be used in lieu of providing the information requested in the RFP within the proposal.”
- c. Section 1.5, 2nd Bidder Box**, Bidder did not sufficiently describe if it can comply with the current environment and how it intends to comply with any

future changes to the user environment. And if not, describe what end user operating environment its Software supports.

Score: 33.75/35

2. Service Capabilities – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2 - 5

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory and no deficiencies were noted.

Score: 20/20

3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 6 - 9

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory and no deficiencies were noted.

Score: 15/15

4. Vendor Questions Worksheet

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

- a. **Experience 1:** Bidder states “Profit Share with SCFS” in the field provided for Dollar Value.
- b. **Experiences 2 and 3:** Bidder states “No Cost Contract” in the field provided for Dollar Value.

Score: 22.50/30

Total Score: 91.25/100

Technical Evaluation Summary

Selection Criteria		Edge	e.Republic	eventPower
1	Product Quality – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 1 (35 points)	26.75	33.00	33.75
2	Service Capabilities – Schedule A – Statement of Work, Sections 2 – 5 (20 points)	17.50	20.00	20.00
3	Schedule A – Statement of Work, Sections 6 – 9 (15 points)	15.00	15.00	15.00
4	Vendor Questions Worksheet (30 Points)	30.00	22.50	22.50
Total		89.25	90.50	91.25

IV. Pricing Summary

The State evaluated pricing and realized that the Schedule B – Pricing page provided was not applicable to the services being requested. The State is not paying the Contractor directly and the Contractor will be compensated from the vendor sponsorships and registration fees. The sponsorship level prices and registration fees will be established and agreed to between the Contractor and the State's Program Manager once the event details are further determined. Therefore, the State did not evaluate the pricing that has been submitted with bidders' proposals.

V. 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.

Accelerate Holdings, LLC, dba e.Republic, LLC, provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include the presence of an established turnkey process including fully developed Project Schedule and Sample Plans that deliver immediate value to the State and extensive experience securing private-sector and cybersecurity sponsorships.

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

Award Recommendation is made to Accelerate Holdings, LLC, dba e.Republic, LLC.