

# AWARD RECOMMENDATION

**Notice of Intent to Award Number:** 230000000546

The Department of Technology, Management and Budget office has completed the evaluation of RFP 220000002493 for the MiCSES Oracle Forms Refactoring and has recommended an award to Accenture, LLP in the amount of \$6,125,741, 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:

Katelyn LaHaye, Solicitation Manager.

lahayek@michigan.gov

517-388-7422

**Background Information:**

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide a MiCSES Oracle Forms Refactoring solution and services. The term of this contract is 2 years and 6 months, with no renewal options.

**Bidders:**

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on 6/7/2022, for 56 days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of 8/1/2022.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*
<b>Accenture, LLP</b>	1001 Woodward Avenue, 4th Floor, Detroit, Michigan, 48226	No
<b>Systems Technology Group, INC</b>	3001 W. Big Beaver Road, Suite 500 Troy, Michigan 48084	No
<b>HTC Global Services</b>	3270 West Big Beaver Road Troy, Michigan 48084	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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bidder must, within the last 5 years, possess experience in successfully completing a project of refactoring legacy User Interface (UI) code (Oracle Forms preferred) to a modern coding language.</li> <li>Bidder must possess experience and knowledge with building multi-tier applications and Container deployment.</li> </ul>

### Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

Evaluation Criteria Name	Evaluation Weight
Schedule A – Statement of Work (Table 1 scored separately)	30.00
Schedule A - Table 1 - Business Specification Worksheet	40.00
Attachment 1 - Resume Templates	20.00
Vendor Questions Worksheet	10.00
Total Weight	100.00

For the proposals receiving 80 or more evaluation points, pricing was 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 Solicitation Manager in collaboration with Subject Matter Experts and Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Dave Fox (DTMB)	Brad Olsen (DHHS)
Katelyn LaHaye (DTMB)	Danielle LeFere (DHHS)
Laura Cleland (DHHS)	Kirsten Thompson (DHHS)
Pratin Trivedi (DHHS)	Sudhakar Ramaswamy (DHHS)

Voting	Advisory
	Brian Putman (DTMB)
	Gurpreet Sandhu (DTMB)
	Jamie Walker (DTMB)
	Jason Rodgers (DTMB)
	Jayadeep Das (DTMB)
	Jennifer Bronz (DTMB)
	Niveditha Mahendiran (DTMB)

### III. Evaluation Results

Description & Point Value	Bidder A Accenture, LLP	Bidder B HTC Global Services	Bidder C Systems Technology Group, INC
Schedule A - Statement of Work 30 Points	30.00	26.31	25.69
Schedule A – Table 1, Business Specification Worksheet 40 Points	40.00	34.00	28.00
Bidder Resumes (Attachment 1) 20 Points	20.00	15.00	15.00
Vendor Questions Worksheet 10 Points	5.00	10.00	10.00
<b>Total: 100</b>	<b>95.00</b>	<b>85.31</b>	<b>78.69</b>

**IV. Technical Evaluation Summary**

**Evaluation Scores:**

**Bidder A**

**Vendor Name: Accenture, LLP Score: 95.00 points**

<b>Accenture, LLP</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Technical Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Schedule A - Statement of Work	30.00	30.00	No Deductions
Schedule A – Table 1, Business Specification Worksheet	40.00	40.00	No Deductions
Vendor Questions Worksheet	10.00	5.00	Vendor Questions Worksheet - Deduction: The vendor listed an experience with an identified cost when the cost was not specifically paid by the State.
Bidder Resumes (Attachment 1)	20.00	20.00	No Deductions
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>95.00</b>	

**Bidder B**

**Vendor Name: HTC Global Services Score: 85.31 points**

<b>HTC Global Services</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Technical Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Schedule A - Statement of Work	30.00	26.31	Schedule A - Statement of Work - 3. IT Environment Responsibilities, Bidder Box #3. Deduction: Description lacked

		<p>sufficient level of detail to evaluate impact on solution implementation.</p> <p>Schedule A - Statement of Work - 5. System Background Information, Bidder Box #1. Deduction: Bidder's architecture approach identified goes beyond the required scope.</p> <p>Schedule A - Statement of Work - 7. End User Operating Environment, Bidder Box #1. Deduction: Response did not confirm browser requirements as identified in RFP. The following reference does not represent the RFP requirements. Micro services-based deployment to the containerized environment was not clearly described.</p> <p>Schedule A - Statement of Work - 8. Requirements, Bidder Box #2. Deduction: Bidder did not identify all open-source components that they plan to use for their solution.</p> <p>Schedule A - Statement of Work - 8. Requirements, Bidder Box #3. Deduction: Bidder did not identify all open-source components that they plan to use for their solution.</p> <p>Schedule A - Statement of Work - 9. Training, Change Management and Knowledge Transfer Services, Bidder Box #1. Deduction: Bidder's response did not sufficiently describe the training approach for MiCSES Refactoring.</p> <p>Schedule A - Statement of Work - 10. Documentation. Bidder Box #3. Deduction: Bidder did not acknowledge QASP as described in 18F Requirements.</p>
--	--	---

Schedule A – Table 1, Business Specification Worksheet	40.00	34.00	<p>Schedule A - Table 1 – Business Specifications Worksheet - Required Functionality. Bidder Box #4. Deduction: Bidder indicated use of MiLogin when we specifically asked for AD as the ICAM solution. The bidder reference to Oracle Impersonation feature lacked explanation for appropriate evaluation.</p> <p>Schedule A - Table 1 – Business Specifications Worksheet - Required Functionality. Bidder Box #9. Deduction: Bidder's architecture approach identified goes beyond the required scope.</p> <p>Schedule A - Table 1 – Business Specifications Worksheet - Required Functionality. Bidder Box #11. Deduction: Bidder did not address how their solution will maintain seamless user experience in incremental roll out.</p>
Vendor Questions Worksheet	10.00	10.00	
Bidder Resumes (Attachment 1)	20.00	15.00	Attachment 1 - Resume Templates – Deduction: The Resume Template does not demonstrate comprehensive change management and training skills. The template for key personnel does not demonstrate experience with HTC's automated code conversion tool.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>85.31</b>	

**Bidder C**

**Vendor Name: Systems Technology Group, INC    Score: 78.69 points**

<b>Systems Technology Group, INC</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Technical Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
--------------------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	-----------------

<p>Schedule A - Statement of Work</p>	<p>30.00</p>	<p>25.69</p>	<p>Schedule A - Statement of Work - 3. IT Environment Responsibilities. Bidder Box #3. Deduction: The response to the clarifying question which requested clarification on whether the bidder would require access to, or copies of State data was still not sufficient to evaluate.</p> <p>Schedule A - Statement of Work - 7. End User Operating Environment. Bidder Box #2. Deduction: Information has been provided but the response formatting has not been followed.</p> <p>Schedule A - Statement of Work - 8. Requirements. Bidder Box #2. Deduction: Multiple softwares/frameworks were mentioned in bidder's response, but they were not specific enough.</p> <p>Schedule A - Statement of Work - 8. Requirements. Bidder Box #3. Deduction: Bidder did not clearly address the question related to maintenance, support and enhancements.</p> <p>Schedule A - Statement of Work - 9. Training, Change Management and Knowledge Transfer Services. Bidder Box #1. Deduction: Bidder did not address requirement.</p> <p>Schedule A - Statement of Work - 9. Training, Change Management and Knowledge Transfer Services. Bidder Box #2. Deduction: Bidder only provided role details and no other clear indication of their training plan.</p> <p>Schedule A - Statement of Work - 10. Documentation. Bidder Box #1. Deduction: Bidder did not sufficiently demonstrate knowledge and approach to 18F requirements.</p>
---------------------------------------	--------------	--------------	---

			<p>Schedule A - Statement of Work - 16. Project Controls and Reports. Bidder Box #1. Deduction: Bidders reference to reports did not provide list of comprehensive reports requested. The reports were available in another Appendix.</p>
Schedule A – Table 1, Business Specification Worksheet	40.00	28.00	<p>Schedule A - Table 1 – Business Specifications Worksheet - Required Functionality. Bidder Box #1. Deduction: Bidder did not specifically address the question on preserving business workflow and functionality in appendix G.</p> <p>Schedule A - Table 1 – Business Specifications Worksheet - Required Functionality. Bidder Box #4. Deduction: Using the user's Oracle account to directly connect to the database could cause performance issues.</p> <p>Schedule A - Table 1 – Business Specifications Worksheet - Required Functionality. Bidder Box #5. Deduction: The bidder's reference to Appendix G did not address the requirement.</p> <p>Schedule A - Table 1 – Business Specifications Worksheet - Required Functionality. Bidder Box #6. Deduction: Some parts of the requirement are addressed in appendix G, however, look and feel standards and security practices were not addressed.</p> <p>Schedule A - Table 1 – Business Specifications Worksheet - Required Functionality. Bidder Box #7. Deduction: Bidder acknowledged requirement in the table, however, did not elaborate in the referenced Appendix.</p> <p>Schedule A - Table 1 – Business Specifications Worksheet - Required</p>



			<p>Functionality. Bidder Box #9. Deduction: Bidder acknowledged requirement in the table, however, no elaboration that allows effective evaluation. The Response time was partially addressed. Intra-screen navigation not addressed.</p> <p>Schedule A - Table 1 – Business Specifications Worksheet - Required Functionality. Bidder Box #11. Deduction: Bidder did not address how to maintain seamless user experience (inter-screen navigation, dependencies etc) while both refactored MiCSES and legacy MiCSES are live. There was a discrepancy between schedule figure on page 9 of proposal and the approach in response box.</p>
Vendor Questions Worksheet	10.00	10.00	
Bidder Resumes (Attachment 1)	20.00	15.00	<p>Attachment 1 - Resume Templates – Deduction: RFP states under Required Skills, PMP is required. Proposed Project Manager has presented a Google certification. The Training organization Change Management limited experience in requested skills.</p> <p>The proposed Security Coordinator's resume did not demonstrate a sufficient active security certification expected.</p>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>78.69</b>	

### V. Pricing Summary

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

Deliverable		Accenture	HTC Global
1	Code conversion, testing services & release	\$4,642,000.00	\$3,829,016

Deliverable		Accenture	HTC Global
	management etc. (effort cost)		
2	Tools, licenses, & other (equipment & environment costs)	\$1,363,741.00	N/A
3	ICAM integration services	\$61,500.00	\$48,000.00
4	Training, Change Management, Knowledge Transfer Services	\$58,500.00	\$144,000.00
5	Project Management	N/A	\$420,000.00
<b>Total Price</b>		<b>\$6,125,741.00</b>	<b>\$ 4,441,016.00</b>

## VI. Negotiations

After evaluating all RFP Bidders, Accenture, LLP, is the chosen bidder for the award of the RFP. The JEC team conducted several rounds of negotiations with the bidder and was able to conduct a cost savings of \$451,259.00 from Code conversion, Testing Services & Release management deliverable.

## VII. Award Recommendation

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offered 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. Best value factors for Award Recommendation included the bidder scoring the highest on Statement of Work elements, security, and answers to vendor questions worksheet.

Best value factors for Award Recommendation also include:

- Demonstrating comprehensive awareness and acknowledgement to work with applicable teams within the State per the ADA Compliance requirements.
- Providing a robust solution while staying within the parameters of the scope of requirements per the System Background Information requirements.
- Providing comprehensive coverage of QASP (Quality Assessment Surveillance Plan) and various stages of testing per the Documentation requirements.
- Providing a wide variety and thorough explanation on each category per the Project Controls and Reports requirements.
- Providing a detailed and thorough response, specifically identifying how SUITE would be met, specified by deliverable, and including CMMI experience and qualification per the Project Management requirements.
- Providing a comprehensive solution for a complex problem, while keeping the database changes to a minimal per the Required Functionality requirements.

- The recommended plan was thorough and supported with deep analysis of potential implementation approaches per the Required Functionality requirements.

Award Recommendation is made to **Accenture, LLP** in the amount of \$6,125,741.00.