

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 230000000983

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP #220000002111 EOC-DC Tools and has recommended an award to JEM Tech Group in the amount of **\$2,991,747.50** 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:

Shannon Romein, Solicitation Manager
RomeinS@michigan.gov
517-898-8102

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide a set of tools that will assist in the support of the State’s hosting centers and supported telecom switch rooms. 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 April 22, 2022. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of June 10, 2022.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*
JEM Computers, Inc. d/b/a JEM Tech Group	23537 Lakepointe Drive, Clinton Twp., MI 48036	No
Presidio Networked Solutions Group, LLC	6355 East Paris SE, Caledonia, MI 49316	No
SecurAlarm, LLC	921 47th St. SW, Ste 2, Grand Rapids, MI 49509	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

Minimum Requirements
<p>All servers must be compatible with a State Virtual Environment via a Microsoft platform with the following exception(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Digital Visual Monitoring (DVM) components must be in their own physical environment. Bidder must use Vsphere as the source OS for the Virtual Machine instances. <p>All software proposed by Bidder must be able to integrate with Nlyte</p>

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

1.

Evaluation Criteria Name	Evaluation Weight
Statement of Work	30
Business Requirements	45
Vendor Question Worksheet	10
Resumes	15
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
Jennifer Poirier, DTMB	Melissa, Hoodhood, DTMB
Matt Caterino, DTMB	John Kinkema, DTMB
Shannon Romein, DTMB	Melanie Wightman, DTMB
	David Oliver, DTMB
	Jaime Bennett, DTMB
	Matthew Tribflner, DTMB
	Gene White, DTMB
	Mike Bartkowiak, DTMB

III. Evaluation Results

Deductions Summary

Possible Points	Criteria	JEM	Presidio	SecurAlarm
30	Statement of Work	-1.5	-6.5	-2.5
45	Business Requirements	-3.4	-8.18	-3.32
10	Vendor Question Worksheet	-.5	-3	-3
15	Resumes	0	-2	0
	Total Technical Evaluations Deductions	5.4	19.68	8.82
100	Technical Evaluation Score	94.6	80.32	91.18

Evaluation Scoring Breakdown

Statement of Work

RFP Section		JEM	Presidio	SecurAlarm
Section 2: IT ENVIROMENT RESPONSIBILITES	Bidder did not respond if they could meet the PSPs	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5
Section 4: USER TYPE AND CAPACITY	Bidder did not explain whether the solution can scale up or down without affecting performance		-1	
Section 5: ACCESS CONTROL AND AUTHENTICATION	Bidder did not indicate if they can comply with CJIS		-2	-2
Section 8: SOFTWARE	Bidder's response lacked detail in software being used and licensing model		-0.5	
Section 10: TRAINING SERVICES	Bidder's response lacked detail in providing a proposed training plan		-1.5	
Section 20: PROJECT MANAGEMENT	Bidder did not provide required detail for this section	-1	-1	
	Subtotal Deductions	-1.5	-6.5	-2.5

Business Requirements

RFP Section				
Schedule A: Table 1 Business Specification Worksheet	9 items are listed as Not Available Functions	-0.4		
Schedule A: Table 1 Business Specification Worksheet	4 items are listed as Not Available Functions		-1.8	
Schedule A: Table 1 Business Specification Worksheet	7 items are listed as Not Available Functions			-0.32
Schedule A: Table 1 Business Specification Worksheet.	Bidder did not provide detail on all sections that required customization	-3	-3	-3
Schedule A: Table 1 Business Specification Worksheet.	Bidder did not provide responses for Nlyte Energy Optimizer NEO Monitoring Section		-5	
	Subtotal Deductions	-3.4	-8.18	-3.32

Vendor Question Worksheet

RFP Section		JEM	Presidio	SecurAlarm
Section 5: SOM EXPERIENCE AND PRIOR EXPERIENCE	Bidder provided projects smaller in scope than the RFP		-0.5	
Section 5: SOM EXPERIENCE AND PRIOR EXPERIENCE	Bidder did not provide a value for Experience 3			-0.5
Section 6: CONTRACT TERMS	Bidder redlined the T& C's		-2	-2

Section 8: LABOR AND ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS COMPLIANCE	Bidder stated not applicable rather than answer the question	-5	-5	-5
	Subtotal Deductions	-5	-3	-3

Resumes

RFP Section				
CONTRACTOR PROJECT MANAGER	Bidder did not answer percentage of time resource allocated to the project		-5	
CONTRACTOR PROJECT MANAGER	Bidder only listed 1 year of experience in the section requiring 5 years of experience managing projects of similar size and scope of this solicitation.		-1	
CONTRACTOR SECURITY OFFICER	Bidder did not answer percentage of time resource allocated to the project		-5	
	Subtotal Deductions	0	-2	0

IV. Pricing Summary

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

	SecurAlarm	JEM	Presidio
Total Proposed Costs	\$2,110,318.00	\$2,400,317.50	\$4,071,401.48
Software licensing, support and maintenance for the full 5 year base Contract	\$335,314.00	\$591,430.00	Included
	\$2,445,632.00	\$2,991,747.50	\$4,071,401.48

V. Negotiations

The State entered negotiations with JEM. JEM was able to reduce their proposal by \$871,073.50 through negotiations. The new proposed price is \$2,991,747.50.

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.

JEM Tech Group provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include:

- 1) Bidder included an active asset tracking system that is at the cabinet level and can detect each individual asset as it moves while remaining within the cabinet. Because it is at the cabinet level and active, the Data Center staff can "ping" the tags to tell if they have moved at the cabinet level. This frees up the physical audit requirement to once a year for validation purposes and may be accomplished with current staffing levels and would save a full-time employee/equivalent at an estimated cost saving of \$713,439.75 over 5 years.
- 2) RFCode RFID tags use a lower power infra-red signal when within the cabinet, only using a higher power when moving in the room, which allows a battery life of 5-7 years which will save the State in an estimated future replacement cost of \$265,000. Additionally as a recognized partner of Nlyte there is a higher integration level already built in.

JEM's overall long-term cost to the State when taking these factors into consideration would be less while offering a higher level of integration.