

# AWARD RECOMMENDATION

**Notice of Intent to Award Number: 230000000527**

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget ‘s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of MDOS – OIS Enforcement Division Case management System RFP, 220000002580, for a new solution. The Enforcement Division case management system will provide a means for assigning case numbers for incoming complaints, serve as a repository for core case investigation information, development of narrative reports, provide case routing and assignment and approval routing and allow for statistical information to be generated from the system and has recommended an award to, Kaseware, Inc. in the amount of \$420,000, 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:

Jeremy Lyon, Solicitation Manager.  
 LyonJ5@michigan.gov  
 517-230-2858

**Background Information:**

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide a proposal. The term of this contract is 5 years, with up to 5 one-year renewal options.

**Bidders:**

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on August 9, 2022 for 56 days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of October 4, 2022.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*
<b>Kaseware Inc.</b>	191 University Blvd., Suite 170 Denver, Colorado 80206	No
<b>Kunz Leigh &amp; Associates Inc.</b>	2164 University Park Drove Okemos, MI 48864	No
<b>Microsoft Corporation</b>	1 Microsoft Way, Redmond, WA 98052	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	
1.	The solution must adhere to the Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS) Security Policy (Exhibit 1, CJIS Security Policy) to support activities conducted by OIS, Enforcement Division (a designated Criminal Justice Agency) as part of an enforcement case management system.
2.	The solution must adhere to and comply with NIST SP 800-53 Rev 5.1, FIPS 199/200 Moderate-Impact Security Baseline Compliance determined under the organizational risk assessment. Receiving the State of Michigan, ATO in the end. The solution must adhere to and comply with all State of Michigan Information Technology policies, standards, and procedures.
3.	Contractors must have a minimum of five (5) years of verifiable experience in the design and production of an enforcement case management or law enforcement agency solution, that has been live for more than 1 year.
4.	The solution must integrate with MILogin for public, external users, and internal SOM users. (e.g., password resets using identity proofing, Multi Factor Authentication).

### Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

	Technical Criteria Name	Weight
1.	Schedule A – Statement of Work	40
2.	Schedule A – Table 1 Business Specifications Worksheet	40
3.	Attachment 1 – Resume Templates	5
4.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	5
5.	Vendor Questions Worksheet – (Section 6) Compliance with SOM Terms & Conditions – Redlining results in reduction in points, or possibly deeming the bid non-responsive.	10
	<b>Total</b>	100

Proposals receiving 80 or more evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and be considered for award.

## II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by Jeremy Lyon, Solicitation Manager, in collaboration with Subject Matter Experts and Joint Evaluation Committee, *which* consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Darryl Hill (MDOS)	Chad Bassett (MDOS)
Peggy Hines (MDOS)	Corey Ames (MDOS)
Daniel Klodt (DTMB)	Christopher Jahnke (MDOS)
Autumn Pelkey (MDOS)	Ray Johnson (DTMB)
Tyiea Stephens (MDOS)	Julie Kluytman (MDOS)
Jeremy Lyon (DTMB) – Solicitation Manager	Mike Bartkowiak (DTMB)
N/A	Tracy Jo Devereaux (DTMB)
N/A	Scott Wager (DTMB)

## III. Evaluation Results

### Evaluation Scores:

**Bidder A - MDOS – OIS Division Case Management System RFP**

**Vendor Name: Kaseware, Inc. Score: 98.5 points**

Kaseware, Inc.	Possible Points	Technical Score/100	Comments
Schedule A - Statement of Work	40	40	Section was evaluated, no deductions noted.
Schedule A – Table 1, Business Specification Worksheet	40	38.5	Requirement 132 - Deficiency - Bidder indicated standard vulnerability scans would require customization and negotiation.  Requirement 133 – Deficiency - Bidder was not willing to provide vulnerability scan reports on a monthly basis and indicated a fee may be charged.

Attachment 1 - Resume Templates	5	5	Section was evaluated, no deductions noted.
Vendor Question Worksheet	5	5	Section was evaluated, no deductions noted.
Compliance with SOM Terms and Conditions – redlining results in reduction in points, or possibly deeming the bid non-responsive.	10	10	Section was evaluated, no deductions noted.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>98.5</b>	

**Evaluation Scores:**

**Bidder B - MDOS – OIS Division Case Management System RFP**

Vendor Name: Kunz Leigh & Associates. Score: 99 points

<b>Kaseware, Inc.</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Technical Score/100</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Schedule A - Statement of Work	40	40	Section was evaluated, no deductions noted.
Schedule A – Table 1, Business Specification Worksheet	40	40	Section was evaluated, no deductions noted.
Attachment 1 - Resume Templates	5	4	Deficiency - Contract Security Officer did not meet the required experience or active certifications requirements.
Vendor Question Worksheet	5	5	Section was evaluated, no deductions noted.
Compliance with SOM Terms and Conditions – redlining results in	10	10	Section was evaluated, no deductions noted.

reduction in points, or possibly deeming the bid non-responsive.			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>99</b>	

**Evaluation Scores:**

**Bidder C - MDOS – OIS Division Case Management System RFP**

Vendor Name: Microsoft Corporation. Score: 86.5 points

<b>Kaseware, Inc.</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>	<b>Technical Score/100</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Schedule A - Statement of Work	40	37	Bidder Box 9 – Deficiency - Bidder's declaration of not being responsible for integrating with third-party software that may be needed in order to provide an overall solution to OIS, is unacceptable.
Schedule A – Table 1, Business Specification Worksheet	40	29.5	<p>Requirement 6 - Deficiency - Bidder's "out of scope" note is not acceptable for this business requirement.</p> <p>Requirement 15 – Deficiency - Bidder's "out of scope" note is not acceptable for this business requirement.</p> <p>Requirement 17 - Bidder's "out of scope" note is not acceptable for this business requirement.</p> <p>Requirement 23 – Deficiency - Bidder's "out of scope" note is not acceptable for this business requirement.</p> <p>Requirement 73 – Deficiency - Bidder's "out of scope" note is not acceptable for this business requirement.</p> <p>Requirement 74 – Deficiency - Bidder's response is only partially fulfilling this business requirement</p>

with OOTB functionality. The remaining need in the business requirement cannot be satisfied as stated.

Requirement 79 – Deficiency - Bidder's "out of scope" note is not acceptable for this business requirement.

Requirement 82 – Deficiency - Bidder's response states that this business requirement is not included as part of their proposal.

Requirement 86 – Deficiency - Bidder is unable to meet this business requirement via their answer of "Not Available."

Requirement (89-93) – Deficiency - Bidder failed to select a box in Column C or provide a response in Column D on how they would meet the business requirement.

Requirement 101 – Deficiency - Bidder's response of "after access is granted" is unacceptable as a risk to the SOM.

Requirement 105 – Deficiency - Bidder failed to check a box in Column C.

Requirement 106 – Deficiency - Bidder failed to check a box in Column C.

Requirement 107 – Deficiency - Bidder's response of "rollback from audit results is not available" is unacceptable to the SOM.

Requirement (132-134, 136) – Deficiency - Bidder's response of

			"Not Available" is unacceptable to the SOM for meeting this business requirement.
Attachment 1 - Resume Templates	5	5	Section was evaluated, no deductions noted.
Vendor Question Worksheet	5	5	Section was evaluated, no deductions noted.
Compliance with SOM Terms and Conditions – redlining results in reduction in points, or possibly deeming the bid non-responsive.	10	10	Section was evaluated, no deductions noted.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>86.5</b>	

**IV. Oral Presentations/Demonstrations** - Oral Presentations/Demonstrations allowed the State to confirm and adjust scoring accordingly.

**V. Pricing Summary**

After evaluating all RFP bidders, Kaseware, Inc. is the chosen bidder for the award of the RFP. The JEC team conducted several rounds of negotiations with the bidder. No additional Cost savings were achieved.

Pricing was evaluated for the bidders that passed technical. The following is a summary of the price proposal.

Deliverable	Kaseware, Inc.	Kunz Leigh & Associates	Microsoft
<b>1</b> Implementation Fee	\$351,000	\$4,586,388.00	\$8,850,926.18
<b>2</b> Annual Subscription	\$69,000	\$1,200,000	<b>Total \$8,850,926,.18</b>
<b>3</b> Maintenance & Support		\$3,779.696.22	
<b>Total Price</b>	<b>\$420,000</b>	<b>Total \$9,566.084.22</b>	

## **VI. 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, answers to vendor questions worksheet, and the no-licensing fee pricing model that represents long-term cost.

Award Recommendation is made to Kaseware, Inc. in the amount of \$420,000.