



STATE OF MICHIGAN
ENTERPRISE PROCUREMENT
Department of Technology Management & Budget
525 W. Allegan Street, PO Box 30026, Lansing, MI 48909

Recommendation of Award

RFP 171-22000001798

The Department of Technology, Management & Budget's Procurement office has completed the evaluation of **RFP # 171-22000001798 for a custom-built software system consolidating several existing HIV and STI-related data systems** and has recommended an award to Optum Government Solutions, Inc., in the amount not to exceed \$19,608,542.00 pending State Administrative Board approval. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#). The term of this contract is five base years with five additional optional renewal years.

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:

Jarrod Barron, Solicitation Manager
Barronj1@michigan.gov
517-284-7045

Respondents/Bidders

The RFP was posted on SIGMA on 4/27/2022. The following companies submitted a response by the published due date of 6/1/2022:

Respondent/Bidder	Address City, State Zip	SDVOB*	Responsive Proposal
Deloitte Consulting LLP	30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, NY 10112	No	Yes
Kunz, Leigh & Associates	28081 Southfield Road, Lathrup Village, MI 48076-2816	No	Yes
Optum Government Solutions, Inc.	11000 Optum Circle, Eden Prairie, MN 55344	No	Yes
Presidio Networked Solutions Group, LLC	6355 East Paris SE, Caledonia, MI 49316	No	Yes
Tallan Inc	100 Pearl St, Hartford, CT 06103	No	Yes

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

Evaluation Synopsis

I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it can 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.

The State evaluated each proposal based on the following factors:

Evaluation Criteria Name	Evaluation Weight
Project Scope <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 1-16 and 21-26 Schedule D – Service Level Agreement Schedule E – Data Security Requirements Schedule F – Transition In/Out Plan 	25
Solution Requirements / Specifications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule A, Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet 	25
Staffing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 17-20 Attachment 1, Resume Templates 	35
Company Background <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vendor Questions Worksheet 	15
Total Weight	100

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
Jarrod Barron, DTMB Kathryn E. Macomber, DHHS Tom McIntire, DTMB Sudhakar Ramaswamy, DHHS Mary Roach, DHHS	Amy Allen, DHHS Jeff Ballard, DTMB Mike Bartkowiak, DTMB Erin Black, DHHS Nathan Buckwalter, DTMB Brant Cole, DHHS Kavita Drolet, DHHS Erin Emerson, DHHS Kevin Gaddy, DTMB Farah Hanley, DHHS Fatima Joseph, DTMB Brian Keisling, DHHS Danielle Lefere, DHHS Vinod Narmat, DTMB Becca Nguyen, DHHS-Contractor Bradley Olsen, DHHS-Contractor Sunil Polavarapu, DTMB Leonard Robinson, DTMB-Contractor Cassandra Secrest, DHHS-Contractor Alexis Travis, DHHS Laura Visser, DHHS

III. Evaluation Results

The JEC determined that three of the five proposals met the minimum 80 technical evaluation point threshold. The JEC derived the technical scores below from the bidders' written proposals:

DEDUCTIONS SUMMARY

Criteria	Deloitte	KL&A	Optum	Presidio	Tallan
Project Scope • Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 1-16 and 21-26 • Schedule D – Service Level Agreement • Schedule E – Data Security Requirements • Schedule F – Transition In/Out Plan	-3	-1	-3	-10	-8
Solution Requirements / Specifications • Schedule A, Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet	-2	-4	-6.25	-6.25	-10.25
Staffing • Schedule A – Statement of Work: Sections 17-20 • Attachment 1, Resume Templates	-3	-1	-1	-29.5	-27
Company Background • Vendor Questions Worksheet	-2	-5	-8	-11	-6
Total Technical Evaluation Deductions	-10	-11	-18.25	-56.75	-51.25
Technical Evaluation Score	90	89	81.75	43.25	48.75

EVALUATION SCORING BREAKDOWN

Project Scope						
PROPOSAL SECTION	Description	Deloitte	KL&A	Optum	Presidio	Tallan
SOW Sec 5. ADA Compliance	Failed to agree to comply with ADA requirements.					-1
SOW Sec 6. User Type and Capacity	Failed to provide details regarding latency response time: Did not provide latency times for Generate Page Load, standardized reporting, ad hoc reporting; indicated only that testing would occur and/or reports would be provided.	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
SOW Sec 12. Migration	Failed to explain in detail how and what services are required to migrate the data from the current Content Manager technology.					-1
SOW Sec 13. Training	Failed to provide details on, and examples of, clearly written instructions and documentation to enable State administrators and end-users to successfully operate the Solution without needing to bring in additional Bidder support.					-1
SOW Sec 13. Training	Proposed train-the-trainer approach in contravention to State request.				-1	
SOW Sec 15. Documentation	Failed to provide details on, and examples of, documentation to meet the requirements set forth in this section.					-1
SOW Sec 23. OCM Control & Reports	Failed to describe specific OCM reports the Contractor will provide after contract execution and during the lifecycle of the contract, including all required scheduled reporting and details around the how and when metrics are captured/validated.					-1
SOW	Many response sections lack detail related to proposed approach.				-4	
Schedule D - SLA	Failed to accept the SLA provisions as presented.	-1		-1	-1	
Schedule E - Data Security Requirements	Failed to accept the Data Security Requirements provisions as presented.	-1		-1	-1	
Schedule F – Transition In and Out Plan	Failed to provide a transition in plan				-1	-1
Schedule F – Transition In and Out Plan	Failed to provide a transition out plan				-1	-1
	Deductions Subtotal	-3	-1	-3	-10	-8
Solution Requirements / Specifications						
SPECIFICATIONS SECTION	Description	Deloitte	KL&A	Optum	Presidio	Tallan
Req 13.5	Nonresponsive		-1			
Reqs 6.6, 6.7, 6.10, 10.7	Will not deliver these requirements.					-4
General	Failed to provide detailed explanations or requested information for 8 business Specifications.	-2				
General	Failed to provide detailed explanations or requested information for 12 business Specifications.		-3			
General	Failed to provide detailed explanations or requested information for 25 or more business Specifications.			-6.25	-6.25	-6.25
	Deductions Subtotal	-2	-4	-6.25	-6.25	-10.25

Staffing						
PROPOSAL SECTION	Description	Deloitte	KL&A	Optum	Presidio	Tallan
SOW Sec 17. Contractor Personnel	Staffing Plan failed to provide allocation time of each resource for each phase.	-1				
SOW Sec 17. Contractor Personnel	Staffing Plan failed to name all key personnel roles or at least indicate how to map the listed roles to the key personnel roles.					-1
Project Manager Resume	Proposed resource does not have PMP or Agile certification.	-1				-1
Project Manager Resume	Failed to provide requested info for 7 years of experience as a project manager for Agile projects.		-1			
Project Manager Resume	Proposed resource does not have 7 years of experience as a project manager for Agile projects.				-1	
Project Manager Resume	Failed to list client references.					-1
Project Manager Resume	Failed to indicate percentage of time resource will be allocated to project.				-1	
HIV/STI Functional Lead Resume	Failed to provide resume.				-2.5	
HIV/STI Functional Lead Resume	Unclear response regarding projects and years for which 5 years' experience coordinating the work related to system design, development and implementation and troubleshooting was obtained.					-1
HIV/STI Functional Lead Resume	Failed to list client references.					-1
Agile Team Lead(s) (Scrum Master(s) or equivalent) Resume	Proposed resource does not have Agile Coach Level certification.	-1		-1		
Agile Team Lead(s) (Scrum Master(s) or equivalent) Resume	Failed to complete required resume. Completed PM resume, which has a different required skillset than this role.				-2.5	
Agile Team Lead(s) (Scrum Master(s) or equivalent) Resume	Failed to list client references.					-1
Technical Lead / Solution Architect Resume	Failed to list client references.					-1
Technical Lead / Solution Architect Resume	Failed to provide years of experience on multiple skillsets.					-1.5
Technical Lead / Solution Architect Resume	Failed to provide resume.				-2.5	
Test Lead Resume	Failed to provide resume.				-2.5	
Test Lead Resume	Failed to list client references.					-1
Test Lead Resume	Failed to provide years for which any required experiences were obtained.					-1
Training and Business Readiness Lead Resume	Failed to demonstrate multiple requested skillsets.					-1.5
Training and Business Readiness Lead Resume	Failed to list client references.					-1
Training and Business Readiness Lead Resume	Failed to provide resume.				-2.5	
Production Support Engineer Resume	Failed to provide years for which any required experiences were obtained.					-1
Production Support Engineer Resume	Failed to provide 5 years' experience in production support and proven experience with using dev ops and agile methodologies				-1	
Production Support Engineer Resume	Proposed resource does not have Bachelor's degree.				-1	
Production Support Engineer Resume	Failed to list client references.					-1
HCD / User Experience (UX) Design Lead Resume	Failed to provide years for which any required experiences were obtained.					-1
HCD / User Experience (UX) Design Lead Resume	Failed to list client references.					-1
HCD / User Experience (UX) Design Lead Resume	Failed to provide name of project(s) and year(s) experience was obtained.				-1	
Organizational Change Management (OCM) Lead Resume	Failed to provide resume.				-2.5	
Organizational Change Management (OCM) Lead Resume	Failed to list any OCM experience.					-1
Organizational Change Management (OCM) Lead Resume	Failed to list client references.					-1
Security Lead Resume	Failed to provide years for which any required experiences were obtained.					-1
Security Lead Resume	Failed to list client references.					-1
Security Lead Resume	Failed to provide name of project(s) and year(s) experience was obtained.				-1	
Security Lead Resume	Proposed resource does not have Bachelor's degree.				-1	
Data Migration / Conversion Lead Resume	Failed to provide resume.				-2.5	
Data Migration / Conversion Lead Resume	Failed to provide years for which any required experiences were obtained.					-1
Data Migration / Conversion Lead Resume	Failed to list client references.					-1
Integration/Interface Lead Resume	Failed to provide years for which any required experiences were obtained.					-1
Integration/Interface Lead Resume	Failed to list client references.					-1

Integration/Interface Lead Resume	Failed to provide resume.				-2.5	
Business Analyst Lead Resume	Failed to provide resume.				-2.5	
Business Analyst Lead Resume	Failed to provide years for which any required experiences were obtained.					-1
Business Analyst Lead Resume	Failed to list client references.					-1
	Deductions Subtotal	-3	-1	-1	-29.5	-27
Background and Experience						
VENDOR QUESTIONS WORKSHEET SECTION	Description	Deloitte	KL&A	Optum	Presidio	Tallan
Prior Experience 1	Not relevant experience				-3	
Prior Experience 1	Not similar size or no size info provided					-1
Prior Experience 1	Not similar scope or different use case		-2	-2		
Prior Experience 2	Not relevant experience				-3	
Prior Experience 2	Not similar size or no size info provided		-1			-1
Prior Experience 2	Not similar scope or different use case			-2		-1
Prior Experience 3	Not relevant experience				-3	
Prior Experience 3	Not similar size or no size info provided					-1
Prior Experience 3	Not similar scope or different use case		-2	-2		-1
Contract Terms	Failed to agree to State's Contract Terms as presented.	-2		-2	-2	
Gross Annual Sales	Failed to provide gross annual sales each of for the last 5 years.					-1
	Deductions Subtotal	-2	-5	-8	-11	-6

VI. Oral Presentations & Pricing

Oral presentations were conducted, and pricing was evaluated. The following is a 10-year cost summary of the proposals that passed technical evaluation:

ITEM	Deloitte	KL&A	Optum
Base Years 1-5			
Development & Implementation	22,056,622.83	14,805,808.00	10,865,152.00
Training & Documentation	577,742.17	Included in Dev/Impl	936,246.00
Maintenance & Support	3,396,708.00	1,632,999.45	2,514,612.00
Transition			164,865.00
BASE YEARS SUBTOTAL	26,031,073.00	16,438,807.45	14,480,875.00
Option Years 6-10			
Maintenance & Support	6,740,958.00	3,744,000.00	5,127,667.00
OPTION YEARS SUBTOTAL	6,740,958.00	3,744,000.00	5,127,667.00
Base Years Total	26,031,073.00	16,438,807.45	14,480,875.00
Option Years Total	6,740,958.00	3,744,000.00	5,127,667.00
TEN YEAR TOTAL	\$32,772,031.00	\$20,182,807.45	\$19,608,542.00

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 factors stated in Technical Evaluation Criteria of the RFP and price. The JEC has determined that Optum Government Solutions, Inc. will provide the best value to the State and recommends award be made to Optum Government Solutions, Inc. in the amount not to exceed \$19,608,542.00 pending State Administrative Board approval.