

# AWARD RECOMMENDATION

## Notice of Intent to Award Number: 220000000650

The Department of Technology, Management, and Budget’s Central Procurement office has completed the evaluation of Request for Proposal (RFP) 210000002475 Secure Case Management and has recommended an award to Monster Government Solutions, LLC. in the amount of \$ \$8,647,142.00, 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:

Christopher Martin, Solicitation Manager.  
 martinc20@michigan.gov  
 517-643-2833

### Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide Secure Case Management and related Workforce Development Software. The term of this contract is five (5) years, with up to five (5) one-year renewal options.

### Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on 8/6/2021 and posted for 39 days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of 9/14/2021.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*
<b>Accelare, Inc.</b>	15 Pacella Park Dr., Randolph, MA 02368	No
<b>Deloitte Consulting, LLP</b>	30 Rockefeller Plaza New York, NY 10112	No
<b>Geographic Solutions, Inc.</b>	1001 Omaha Circle Palm Harbor, FL 34683	No
<b>Microsoft Corporation</b>	One Microsoft Way Redmond, Washington 98052-6399	No
<b>Monster Government Solutions LLC.</b>	133 Boston Post Road Weston, MA 02493	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: Mandatory Minimum Requirements

The system must offer the ability to produce the Participant Information Record Layout (PIRL) File in CSV format on a quarterly, annual and as-needed basis.
--

The system must be fully web-based.
-------------------------------------

### Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

For proposals where all mandatory minimum requirements were met, the State evaluated each proposal based on the following factors:

Evaluation Criteria Name	Evaluation Weight
Vendor Question Worksheet	10
Key Personnel / Experience	5
Schedule A, Statement of Work	20
Schedule A, Attachment A (Business Requirements)	50
Implementation Plan (Including Integration, Migration, and Training)	15
Total Weight	100

Proposals that received 80 or more evaluation points, had their pricing evaluated and were considered for award. The State is not obligated to accept the lowest price proposal.

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

## II. Evaluation Method

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

Voting	Advisory
Paula Eklund, Departmental Specialist, Data and Performance Reporting (DPR) LEO - Employment and Training	Jacqueline Brodzik, IT Project Specialist, DPR LEO - Employment and Training

Voting	Advisory
Sharon Wiegand, Departmental Manager, DPR LEO - Employment and Training	Shannon Coombs, Project Manager DTMB-Enterprise Project Management Office (EPMO)
Matthew Shields, State Administrative Manager, DPR LEO – Employment and Training	Joseph Billig, Division Administrator, Targeted Services LEO - Workforce Development
Kalyan Murali, State Administrative Manager DTMB – Agency Services supporting LEO - Employment and Training	Tammy Flynn, Departmental Specialist, DPR LEO - Employment and Training
Christopher Martin, IT Category Analyst DTMB-Central Procurement, IT Division	Tiziana Galeazzi, General Manager DTMB-Agency Services supporting LEO
	Kelly Jackson, Departmental Specialist, Workforce Innovation LEO - Workforce Development
	Sue Johnson, Departmental Specialist, DPR LEO - Employment and Training
	Erica Luce, State Administrative Manager, Adult Education LEO – Workforce Development
	Chelsea Mates, State Administrative Manager, Workforce Innovation LEO – Workforce Development
	Krisanne McConnell, Project Management Office Manager DTMB-EPMO
	Andrew Pabst, Department Analyst, DPR LEO – Employment and Training
	Scott Powell, Director DTMB-Labor Market Information and Strategic Initiatives
	Nancy Pulter, Business Relationship Manager DTMB-Agency Services supporting LEO
	Steve Roodvoets, Departmental Specialist, DPR LEO - Employment and Training
	Elyse Walter, State Administrative Manager, Communications and Outreach LEO - Employment and Training
	Vern Westendorf, State Administrative Manager, Post Secondary and State Approving LEO - Workforce Development

Voting	Advisory
	Mike Bartkowiak, Security Architecture Specialist DTMB-Michigan Cyber Security

### III. Evaluation Results

#### A. Bidder # 1

The Evaluation Team determined that Accelare, Inc. based on a score of 71.59, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. Vendor Question Worksheet**

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

- a. Case Management experience but not Workforce Development experience. 3 pt. deduction.

**2. Key Personnel/Experience**

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

- a. The Project Manager’s experience was not size or scope relevant. – 1 pt. deduction.
- b. The Security Officer only had two years of relevant experience and lacked certifications. 1 pt. deduction.

**3. Schedule A – Statement of Work**

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

- a. The Bidder did not adequately provide a detailed description of how the proposed solution would meet Federal reporting requirements for multiple programs. 2 pt. deduction.
- b. Bidder’s proposal to build a solution on the ServiceNow platform – solution does not exist, not Workforce Development subject matter experts. 1 pt. deduction.
- c. Bidder’s responses raised concerns over long-term maintenance/on-going support of Federal and State mandated policy changes. 2 pt. deduction.

**4. Schedule A, Table 1 - Business Requirements**

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

- a. The bidder failed to meet or only partially met a significant number of requirements – Requirements that were highly valued by the State. Workforce Case Management has tightly controlled regulations and the lack of experience and lack of subject matter experts was evident in the bidder’s responses. 13.41 pts. deduction.

5. Implementation Plan – Integration/Migration/Training  
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

- a. Vague responses and lack of detail made evaluation difficult and hard to determine if vendor could provide a functioning solution. 5 pt. deduction.

**Total Score: 71.59/100**

## **B. Bidder # 2**

The Evaluation Team determined that Deloitte Consulting, LLP based on a score of 86.51, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

### **1. Vendor Question Worksheet**

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

- a. The bidder's prior experience with the State's MIBridges program may be Salesforce experience, but it is not the same as the Launchpad solution proposed for this project. 1 pt. deduction.

### **2. Key Personnel/Experience**

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

### **3. Schedule A – Statement of Work**

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

- a. Concern over data storage and related costs, amount of storage per license would not have been enough. 0.5 pt deduction.

### **4. Schedule A, Table 1 - Business Requirements**

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

- a. The bidder only partially met a significant number of requirements – Requirements that were highly valued by the State. Upon review, about one quarter of the responses were rescored as requires configuration not current capability. 10.92 pts deduction.
- b. Requirement 35, bidder's response of "Customization is not applicable after go-live" would make the system non-compliant to the requirement – 0.57 pt. deduction.

### **5. Implementation Plan – Integration/Migration/Training**

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

- a. Unrealistic schedule based upon available resources. Substantially shorter than other ready-made solutions. 0.5 pt. deduction.

**Total Score: 86.51/100**

**C. Bidder # 3**

The Evaluation Team determined that Geographic Solutions, Inc. based on a score of 98.08, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Vendor Question Worksheet  
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.
2. Key Personnel/Experience  
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.
3. Schedule A – Statement of Work  
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.
4. Schedule A, Table 1 - Business Requirements  
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. A few minor deductions for items that were reclassified as requires configuration, not current capabilities. 1.92 pts. deduction.
5. Implementation Plan – Integration/Migration/Training  
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

**Total Score: 98.08/100**

**D. Bidder # 4**

The Evaluation Team determined that Microsoft Corporation based on a score of 77.98, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Vendor Question Worksheet  
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. Bidder demonstrated good case management experience, but not Workforce Development case management experience. 1.5 pts. deduction.
2. Key Personnel/Experience

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted:

**3. Schedule A – Statement of Work**

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

- a. The Bidder did not adequately provide a detailed description of how the proposed solution would meet Federal reporting requirements for multiple programs. 2 pt. deduction.
- b. Bidder's proposal to build a solution on the Microsoft Dynamics platform – solution does not exist, not Workforce Development subject matter experts. 1 pt. deduction.
- c. Bidder's responses raised concerns over long-term maintenance/on-going support of Federal and State mandated policy changes. 2 pt. deduction.

**4. Schedule A, Table 1 - Business Requirements**

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

- a. The bidder only partially met a significant number of requirements – Requirements that were highly valued by the State. Upon review, about one quarter of the responses were rescored as requires configuration not current capability. 15.52 pts. deduction

**5. Implementation Plan – Integration/Migration/Training**

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

**Total Score: 77.98/100**

**E. Bidder # 5**

The Evaluation Team determined that Monster Government Solutions, LLC. based on a score of 89.13, did meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

**1. Vendor Question Worksheet**

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

- a. For one of the references provided, the reference was for a third-party solution – not being offered to the State. 1 pt. deduction.

**2. Key Personnel/Experience**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted:

**3. Schedule A – Statement of Work**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted:

**4. Schedule A, Table 1 - Business Requirements**

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

- a. The bidder only partially met a number of requirements. Upon review, about one quarter of the responses were rescored as requires configuration not current capability. 9.87 pts deduction.
- b. Requirement 85, bidder's response of did not align with the requirement – 0.57 pt. deduction.

**5. Implementation Plan – Integration/Migration/Training**

The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted:

**Total Score: 89.13/100**

**IV. Technical Evaluation Summary**

	<b>Selection Criteria</b>	<b>Bidder #1 Accelare</b>	<b>Bidder #2 Deloitte</b>	<b>Bidder #3 Geographic Solutions</b>	<b>Bidder #4 Microsoft</b>	<b>Bidder #5 Monster</b>
<b>1</b>	Vendor Question Worksheet	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2</b>	Key Personnel / Experience	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	Schedule A, Statement of Work	<b>15</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>4</b>	Schedule A, Attachment A (Business Requirements)	<b>36.59</b>	<b>38.51</b>	<b>48.08</b>	<b>34.48</b>	<b>40.13</b>
<b>5</b>	Implementation Plan (Including Integration, Migration, and Training)	<b>10</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>71.59</b>	<b>86.51</b>	<b>98.08</b>	<b>77.98</b>	<b>89.13</b>

**V. Pricing Summary**

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



Deliverable		Bidder #2 Deloitte	Bidder #3 Geographic Solutions	Bidder #5 Monster
1	Implementation	\$8,473,000.00	\$976,500.00	\$4,021,012.00
2	Licensing Costs	\$5,493,855.00	\$6,975,000.00	\$4,123,439.00
3	Maintenance Costs	\$4,900,000.00	Included	Included
4	Other Costs	\$374,489.00	None	None
5	Optional Items	None	\$219,100.00	\$502,691.00
<b>Total Price for Base Contract</b>		<b>\$19,241,344.00</b>	<b>\$8,170,600.00</b>	<b>\$8,647,142.00</b>

### 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.

Monster Government Solutions, LLC provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include: Ability for Michigan to get on the ground floor of a new platform and have significant influence over the design and direction, meeting the State’s stringent Data Security Requirements, and minimal redlines to the State’s terms and conditions greatly reducing overall risk.

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 Monster Government Solutions, LLC in the amount of \$8,647,142.00.