

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 230000000071

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP 220000002701 for Operational Consulting Services and has recommended an award to the Bidders in the table below. Money will be added as tier two SOW projects are awarded, 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:

Katie McFarland, Solicitation Manager.
McFarlandK1@michigan.gov

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses to establish a pre-qualification program of qualified Contractors to provide Operational Consulting Services. The term of this contract is three years, with up to two, one-year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on July 11, 2022, for four weeks. The following Bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of August 8, 2022.

Bidder Name	Address	SDVOB
CSG Government Solutions, Inc.	180 North Stetson Avenue, Suite 3200, Chicago, IL 60601	No
Info-Tech Research Group Inc.	3960 Howard Hughes Pkwy, Suite 500, Las Vegas, NV 89169-5972	No
Public Knowledge, LLC	600 Airport Rd., Lakewood, NJ 08701-5995	No
Dewpoint, Inc.	300 S. Washington Square Suite 200, Lansing, MI 48933	No
Ricoh USA, Inc.	300 Eagleview Blvd, Exton PA 19341	No
Matrix Consulting Group, Ltd.	1650 S Amphlett Blvd, Suite 213, San Mateo, CA 94402-2529	No
Accenture LLP	1001 Woodward Avenue Suite 400, Detroit, MI 48226	No
Merit Network, Inc.	880 Technology Dr., Suite B, Ann Arbor, MI 48108-8963	No
Lean Resources, LLC	6403 Sand Castle Vw, Holland, MI 49423-8527	No

Orion Solutions Group, LLC	2950 W Square Lake Rd., Suite 202, Troy, MI 48098-5725	No
Netlogx LLC	429 E Vermont St, Ste. 208, Indianapolis, IN 46202-3698	No
Nyaa Health Services L.L.C	3003 East Michigan Ave #1015, Lansing, MI 48912	No
Public Sector Consultants, Inc.	230 N. Washington Square, Suite 300, Lansing, MI 48933	No
Protiviti Government Services	1640 King St Suite 400, Alexandria, VA 22314-2746	No
Broadsword Solutions Corporation	3795 Dorothy Ln., Waterford, MI 48239-1110	No
Deloitte Consulting LLP	30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, NY 10112	No
22nd Century Technologies, Inc.	8251 Greensboro Dr, Ste 900, McLean, VA 22102-4938	No
NTT DATA State Health Consulting, LLC	1660 International Drive, McLean, VA 22102	No
TEKsystems, Inc.	300 South Washington Sq., Suite 430, Lansing, MI 48933	No
Procurement Consulting Group, LLC	5531 Hillsboro Ct., Commerce Twp, MI 48382-5135	No
McKinsey & Company, Inc. Washington D.C.	1200 19TH ST NW., Washington, DC 20036-2412	No
Guidehouse Inc.	1676 International Drive, Suite 800, McLean, VA, 22102	No
Slalom, LLC	821 2nd Ave, Suite 1900, Seattle, WA 98104-1526	No
Public Consulting Group LLC	148 State Street, 10th Floor Boston MA 02109	No
Ejoent Business Solutions Inc.	5983 Kensington Ave, Detroit, MI 48224-3806	No
Springboard Consulting, LLC	3753 Clark Rd., Bath, MI 48808-8417	No
The Young Conway Group LLC	7310 Woodward Avenue, Suite 740B, Detroit, MI 48202	No

*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 identified solicitation instructions.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Service Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3	35
2.	Staffing – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4	25
3.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9	20
4.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	20
	Total	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
Katie McFarland, Category Specialist Department of Technology, Management, & Budget, Central Procurement Services
Kelly Manning, Director Department of Technology, Management, & Budget, Office of Performance Management
Lynn Venturino, State Administrative Manager Management, & Budget, Office of Performance Management
Susan Nordyke, Division Director Department of Technology, Management, & Budget, Agency Services

III. Evaluation Results

A. CSG Government Solutions, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that CSG Government Solutions, Inc. on a score of 94, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 35

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 23

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) For 4.5, no toll-free customer service telephone line was provided.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The sample reports provided in the bid response did not identify the information requested in question 5.1.A.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The bid response did not explain how the company grew, either organically or through mergers and acquisitions, or both.

Total Score: 94/100

B. Public Knowledge, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Public Knowledge, LLC on a score of 92, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 29

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

- a) The bid response did not provide the Bidder's overall consulting approach. Samples were provided, but the overall approach was not explained for Section 1.1.A.
- b) The Bidder did not describe their ability to conduct hybrid meetings. In addition, the Bidder did not include their ability to conduct process mapping and utilize additional interactive tools to facilitate process improvements or business analysis/design as requested in Section 1.1.D.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 25

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The sample reports provided in the bid response did not identify the information requested in question 5.1.A.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 20

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 92/100

C. Dewpoint, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Dewpoint, Inc. on a score of 96, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 33

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The examples provided in Section 1.1.A. were thorough on approach but did not cite actual client projects where methodology was used.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 23

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) For 4.5, no toll-free customer service telephone line was provided.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 20

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 20

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 96/100

D. Merit Network, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Merit Network, Inc. on a score of 45, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 6

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a) There were no approach or examples provided on how the Bidder has met similar deliverables for Section 1.1.A.
- b) There was no description provided on the Bidder's operational consulting services practices or procedures from their past experience in Section 1.1.C.
- c) There was no description provided on how the Bidder would meet the requirements of Section 1.1.D.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 19

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a) The Bidder failed to identify their contract representative as requested in Section 4.1.
- b) For 4.5, no toll-free customer service telephone line was provided.
- c) The organizational chart provided did not list the personnel roles.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 10

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiency:

- a) The Bidder did not provide an explanation or samples of their reporting capabilities as requested in 5.1.A.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 10

The Evaluation Team noted following deficiency:

- a) Experience one is an internal project rather than an external consulting project. The remaining examples provided did not explain the results of the services provided. The contact information for the examples provided were incomplete for some of the examples provided.

Total Score: 45/100

E. Lean Resources, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Lean Resources, LLC on a score of 81, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 22

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a) The Bidder provided no narrative to describe their approach to operational consulting projects or draw correlation from the project to deliverables in 1.1.A. However, there were sample documents provided that were produced during some engagements.
- b) The Bidder did not use an example from the vendor questions worksheet and did not mention what stakeholders were included in the example provided in 1.1.C.
- c) The Bidder did not identify their ability to leverage breakout room functionality, conduct hybrid meetings, or conduct process mapping or other interactive tools.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 25

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 16

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A. was not included in the bid response. The Bidder did not describe any project related reporting examples.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The Bidder did not provide information on the Company's history.

Total Score: 81/100

F. Orion Solutions Group, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Orion Solutions Group, LLC on a score of 85, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 24

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

- a) The bid response did not provide a description of the Bidder's operational consulting services practices or procedures from their past experience in Section 1.1.C.
- b) The Bidder did not identify their ability to leverage breakout room functionality or conduct hybrid meetings in 1.1.D.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 25

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A. was not included in the bid response.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The Bidder did not include their company history.

Total Score: 85/100

G. netlogx LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that netlogx LLC on a score of 92, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 31

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

- a) For 1.1.A., the Bidder did not provide their overall consulting approach. Samples were provided, but their overall approach was not explained.

b) The Bidder did not identify other interactive tools, simply mentioned displaying files on screen. They did not expand on what tools would be used in 1.1.D.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 23

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

b) For 4.5, no toll-free customer service telephone line was provided.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

a) The sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A. was not included in the bid response.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 20

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 92/100

H. Nyaa Health Services L.L.C.

The Evaluation Team determined that Nyaa Health Services LLC on a score of 71, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 24

The Evaluation Team noted following deficiencies:

- a) For 1.1.A., examples were thorough on approach but did not cite actual client projects where methodology was used.
- b) There was no description provided on the Bidder's operational consulting services practices or procedures from their past experience for 1.1.C.
- c) For 1.1.D, the Bidder did not identify their ability to conduct hybrid meetings.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 19

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) For 4.8, the Bidder's company has only been in existence for 1 year, however, column 5 indicates time spans much longer. Many resumes did not include a description of work performed in each role. The resumes provided do not translate into the skillsets required to do the work.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 10

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a) Sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A was not included. Samples provided were not status reports, more analysis/finding reports. None of the examples were in the name of the company Nyaa, all appear to be prior work.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The experience provided was that of employees rather than Nyaa's experience.

Total Score: 71/100

I. Public Sector Consultants, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Public Sector Consultants, Inc. on a score of 84, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 33

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) For 1.1.A, the Bidder did not provide their overall consulting approach. Samples were provided, but their overall approach was not explained.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 23

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- c) For 4.5, no toll-free customer service telephone line was provided.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 10

The Evaluation Team determined the following deficiencies were noted:

- a) Minimal explanation of the Bidder's reporting capabilities was provided, and no sample reports were provided for 5.1.A.
- b) The Bidder did not agree with pricing to be firm for the length of the contract for 6.1.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The company history provided was very brief. The response was more limited to explaining their growth rather than company history.

Total Score: 84 /100

J. Broadword Solutions Corporation

The Evaluation Team determined that Broadword Solutions Corporation on a score of 92, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 33

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The Bidder did not provide their overall consulting approach. Samples were provided for 1.1.A., but their overall approach was not explained.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 21

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) For 4.8, the education experience was not listed on the resume for Jeff Dalton and no resume was included for Patricia Dalton.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) Sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A was not included.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 20

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 92/100

K. 22nd Century Technologies, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that 22nd Century Technologies, Inc. on a score of 86, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 31

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

- a) Examples provided for 1.1.A. were thorough on approach but did not cite actual client projects where methodology was used.
- b) For 1.1.C., the Bidder did not describe an example of what or how roadblocks were resolved, only indicated they did not encounter one. The outcomes described did not explain how the issue was resolved or improved, it would have been helpful to have metrics included on how the process was improved.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 25

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) Sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A was not included.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 12

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

- a) The company history was not described. It appeared to indicate the company was organically grown but focused on where the company is now vs how they got there.
- b) For experience 1, results obtained were the same as listed above under #3 how is this experience relevant. For experience 3, start/end date not stated. For experience 2 and 3, used the same results obtained, which were not results but more what they are working on.

Total Score: 86/100

L. NTT DATA State Health Consulting, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that NTT DATA State Health Consulting, LLC on a score of 96 met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 33

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) Examples provided for 1.1.A. were thorough on approach but did not cite actual client projects where methodology was used.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 25

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) Sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A was not included.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 20

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 96/100

M. Procurement Consulting Group, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Procurement Consulting Group, LLC on a score of 79, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 28

The Evaluation Team noted following deficiencies:

- a) Examples provided in 1.1.A. were thorough on approach but did not cite actual client projects where methodology was used.
- b) The Bidder provided information on their consulting approach but did not use an example from the vendor questions worksheet or respond to the five elements requested in 1.1.C.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 19

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a) The Bidder did not identify their Contract Representative as requested in 4.1.
- b) For 4.5, no toll-free customer service telephone line was provided.
- c) Many of the resumes provided for 4.8 did not mention the individual's work experience with the Procurement Consulting Group, LLC.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) Sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A was not included.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 14

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiency:

- a) Experiences for 1-3 are very brief on project descriptions, relevancies, and results obtained. There was nothing for each of the experiences listed which explained how they were relevant to the services requested in this RFP. Contacts listed for all experiences appear to be vendor staff, not customer staff which inhibits the ability for the State to conduct reference checks.

Total Score: 79/100

N. Public Consulting Group LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Public Consulting Group LLC on a score of 87, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 34

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) For 1.1.C., the Bidder did not explain how the process was conducted, either in-person or virtually.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 23

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) For 4.8, resumes did not show employer history, just showed past project experience.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 12

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiency:

- a) The Bidder did not explain their reporting capabilities. Sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A was not included. The report attached was a billing report rather than a status report.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The Bidder did not explain why organization structure changes occurred or how changes affected company.

Total Score: 87/100

O. Ejoent Business Solutions Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Ejoent Business Solutions Inc. on a score of 30, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 6

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a) For 1.1.A, no approach or descriptions for three projects were provided.
- b) There was no description provided in 1.1.C. on the Bidder's operational consulting services practices or procedures from their past experience.
- c) The Bidder did not describe their ability to meet the requirements listed in 1.1.D.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 6

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a) Bidder did not identify their Contract Representative in 4.1.
- b) Phone number provided in 4.5 is a mobile phone number rather than a toll-free number.
- c) No resumes were provided for 4.8, and only one individual was listed for all roles.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 10

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiency:

- a) The Bidder did not explain reporting capabilities and failed to provide any sample reports for 5.1.A.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 8

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a) The Bidder did not provide company history nor explain how they would scale up to meet the demands if awarded.
- b) Prior experience provided is not of similar size or scope to this RFP. Experience#1 has incomplete fields, indicates results are ongoing, and no dollar amount is assigned.

Total Score: 30/100

P. Springboard Consulting, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Springboard Consulting, LLC on a score of 87, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 32

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

- a) The Bidder did not provide their overall consulting approach for 1.1.A. Samples were provided, but their overall approach was not explained.
- b) The Bidder did not describe steps taken to identify how the issue or process would be reviewed as requested in 1.1.C., 2.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 19

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

- a) No toll-free number provided in 4.5, Bidder indicated they would be willing to obtain one within 15 days of award.
- b) The resumes were not included for Emma and Chris for 4.8.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) Sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A was not included.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The company history was not described.

Total Score: 87/100

Q. Info-Tech Research Group Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Info-Tech Research Group Inc. on a score of 90, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 31

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

- a) For 1.1.A., the overall description on approach was thorough, but did not cite three actual examples where methodology was used.
- b) The Bidder further described consultative approach, but just referenced the vendor question worksheet examples versus answering the questions as requested in 1.1.C. Experiences in the vendor question worksheet were detailed but did not describe if they were virtual/in person or describe roadblocks.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 23

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The organizational chart for senior leadership was provided but did not include the organizational chart for individuals who would be assigned to this work.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The sample reports provided did not include the information/format required in 5.1.A.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The Bidder did not provide their company history.

Total Score: 90/100

R. Ricoh USA, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Ricoh USA, Inc. on a score of 67, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 33

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The Bidder did not agree to 1.2.1, 1.2.2 or 1.2.3, just indicated would review at the tier two stage. Bidder did not explain their concerns with these sections.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 2

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a) No toll-free number was provided for 4.5, only noted that one would be provided.
- b) Bidder did not agree to the working requirements identified in 4.6.
- c) Bidder did not provide key personnel in 4.7.
- d) No resumes were provided for 4.8.
- e) Bidder did not agree to 4.12.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) Sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A was not included.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 14

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The prior experience provided was minimal. No specifics were provided.

Total Score: 67/100

S. Matrix Consulting Group, Ltd.

The Evaluation Team determined that Matrix Consulting Group, Ltd. on a score of 85, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 26

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a) Examples were thorough on approach for 1.1.A. but only cited one actual client project (Dallas) where methodology was used.
- b) There was no description provided for the five elements requested in 1.1.C.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 19

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

- a) No toll-free number was provided for 4.5 provided.
- b) For 4.8, the resumes provided did not show any date chronology. Also, no resumes were provided for the senior consultant or consultant positions.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 20

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 20

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 85/100

T. Accenture LLP

The Evaluation Team determined that Accenture LLP on a score of 90, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 35

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 19

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

- a) No toll-free number was provided for 4.5 provided.
- b) For 4.8, no resumes were provided for Handy and Lampi for review.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) Sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A was not included.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The Bidder did not specifically disclose if they have had contracts terminated for cause.

Total Score: 90/100

U. Protiviti Government Services

The Evaluation Team determined that Protiviti Government Services on a score of 76, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 33

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) Examples were thorough on approach for 1.1.A but did not cite actual client projects where methodology was used.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 9

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a) The Bidder did not agree to requirement 4.6 and requested overtime rates for hours extending beyond normal hours of operation.
- b) Only resumes for two senior leadership were provided for 4.8. No direct staff resumes were provided to be able to review qualifications and past experience.
- c) The organizational chart provided for 4.9 only included senior leadership.
- d) The Bidder did not agree to security measures identified in 4.11.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 14

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

- a) Sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A was not included.
- b) The Bidder checked the box they excepted requirement identified in 6.2, but then listed exceptions.
- c) The Bidder did not agree to requirement identified in 7.1.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 20

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 76/100

V. Deloitte Consulting LLP

The Evaluation Team determined that Deloitte Consulting LLP on a score of 100, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 35

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 25

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 20

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 20

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 100/100

W. TEKsystems, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that TEKsystems, Inc. on a score of 89, met the requirements of this RFP This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 28

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

- a) Overall description on approach was provided for 1.1.A but did not cite three actual examples where methodology was used.
- b) Bidder did not identify how they will meet the four requirements listed in 1.1.D.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 23

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The organizational chart provided for 4.9 did not indicate the direct staff who will be assigned to the Contract.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) Sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A was not included.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 20

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 89/100

X. McKinsey & Company, Inc. Washington D.C.

The Evaluation Team determined that McKinsey & Company, Inc. Washington D.C. on a score of 90, met the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 33

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The Bidder addressed their ability to meet the four requirements identified in 1.1.D but failed to check the box that they agreed to the requirement with no exception.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 23

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) No toll-free number was provided for 4.5 provided.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The Bidder did not agree to requirement 6.1.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 16

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The Bidder did not answer growth or sales questions in the company background information section.

Total Score: 90/100

Y. Guidehouse Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Guidehouse Inc. on a score of 75, did not meet the requirements of this RFP This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 27

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a) The Bidder did not agree to requirement 1.1.B.
- b) The Bidder did not describe roadblocks, or whether the process was conducted in-person or virtually.
- c) The Bidder did not agree to requirement 1.2.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 20

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

- a) No toll-free number was provided for 4.5 provided.
- b) Some of the resumes provided for 4.8 did not include dates of employment.
- c) The Bidder did not agree to requirement 4.11.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 10

The Evaluation Team determined the following deficiency was noted:

- a) The Bidder answered yes to this requirement, but then failed to explain reporting capabilities or provide sample reports.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 18

- a) The Bidder described their company growth but did not explain their company history.

Total Score: 75/100

Z. Slalom, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Slalom, LLC on a score of 86, met the requirements of this RFP This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3: 28

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

- a) There was no description provided on how the Bidder would meet the requirements identified in 1.1.D.

2) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Section 4: 20

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

- a) No toll-free number was provided for 4.5 provided.
- b) Some of the resumes provided for 4.8 did not include dates of employment.
- c) The organizational chart provided for 4.9 did not indicate the direct staff who will be assigned to the Contract.

3) Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9: 18

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory, but the following deficiency was noted:

a) Sample report with fields identified in 5.1.A was not included.

4) Vendor Questions Worksheet: 20

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

Total Score: 86/100

AA. The Young Conway Group LLC

The Young Conway Group LLC has not met the requirements of being responsive and responsible due to the bid not being received by the proposal deadline of 1:59pm on August 8, 2022.

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

Selection Criteria		CSG Government Solutions, Inc.	Public Knowledge, LLC	Dewpoint, Inc.	Merit Network, Inc.	Lean Resources, LLC	Orion Solutions Group, LLC	Netlogx LLC	Nyaa Health Services, LLC	Public Sector Consultants, Inc.	Broadword Solutions Corporation	22nd Century Technologies, Inc.	NTT DATA State Health Consulting, LLC	Procurement Consulting Group, LLC	Public Consulting Group, LLC	Ejoent Business Solutions, Inc.	Springboard Consulting, LLC	Info-Tech Research Group, Inc.	Ricoh USA, Inc.	Matrix Consulting Group, Ltd.	Accenture, LLP	Protiviti Government Services	Deloitte Consulting, LLP	TEKsystems, Inc.	McKinsey & Company, Inc. Washington D.C.	Guidehouse, Inc.	Slalom, LLC
1	Service Requirements – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1-3	35	29	33	6	22	24	31	24	33	33	31	33	28	34	6	32	31	33	26	35	33	35	28	33	27	28
2	Staffing – Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4	23	25	23	19	25	25	23	19	23	21	25	25	29	23	6	19	23	2	19	19	9	25	23	23	20	20
3	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 5-9	18	18	20	10	16	18	18	10	10	18	18	18	18	12	10	18	18	18	20	18	14	20	18	18	10	18
4	Vendor Questions Worksheet	18	20	20	10	18	18	20	18	18	20	12	20	14	18	8	18	18	14	20	18	20	20	20	16	18	20
Total		94	92	96	45	81	85	92	71	84	92	86	96	79	87	30	87	90	67	85	90	76	100	89	90	75	86

V. Pricing Summary

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

Deliverable	CSG Government Solutions, Inc.	Public Knowledge, LLC	Dewpoint, Inc.	Lean Resources, LLC	Orion Solutions Group, LLC	Netlogx, LLC	Public Sector Consultants, Inc.	Broadword Solutions Corporation	22nd Century Technologies, Inc.	NTT DATA State Health Consulting, LLC	Public Consulting Group LLC	Springboard Consulting, LLC	Info-Tech Research Group Inc.	Matrix Consulting Group, Ltd.	Accenture LLP	Deloitte Consulting LLP	TEKsystems, Inc.	McKinsey & Company, Inc. Washington D.C.	Slalom, LLC
Administrative Support																			
1	Clerical Support		\$75.00	\$100.00	\$60.00				\$39.00			\$125.00	\$75.00	\$85.00	\$95.00		\$80.00		
2	Document Librarian					\$120.00													
3	Engagement Team Assistant																	\$125.00	
4	Media Designer																	\$190.00	
5	Procurement Specialist					\$170.00													
6	Technical Writer	\$150.00																	
Analytical Positions																			
1	Analyst		\$162.00	\$115.00	\$150.00				\$71.00		\$195.00	\$150.00	\$217.00		\$195.00		\$110.00		
2	Associate Data Science																	\$534.00	
3	Business Analyst	\$175.00				\$150.00				\$175.81								\$368.00	\$165.00

Deliverable		CSG Government Solutions, Inc.	Public Knowledge, LLC	Dewpoint, Inc.	Lean Resources, LLC	Orion Solutions Group, LLC	Netlogx, LLC	Public Sector Consultants, Inc.	Broadword Solutions Corporation	22nd Century Technologies, Inc.	NTT DATA State Health Consulting, LLC	Public Consulting Group LLC	Springboard Consulting, LLC	Info-Tech Research Group Inc.	Matrix Consulting Group, Ltd.	Accenture LLP	Deloitte Consulting LLP	TEKsystems, Inc.	McKinsey & Company, Inc. Washington D.C.	Slalom, LLC
4	Business Process Reengineering Analyst						\$150.00													
5	Capabilities and Insights Analyst																		\$286.00	
6	Junior Business Analyst										\$129.52									
7	Operational Data Analyst																\$184.00			
8	Process Analyst																\$150.00			
9	Requirements Analyst						\$180.00													
10	Senior Business Analyst										\$187.96									
11	Technical Analyst	\$185.00									\$187.96									
Consulting Positions																				
1	Affiliated Consultant							\$175.00												
2	Capabilities and Insights Expert																		\$379.00	

Deliverable		CSG Government Solutions, Inc.	Public Knowledge, LLC	Dewpoint, Inc.	Lean Resources, LLC	Orion Solutions Group, LLC	Netlogx, LLC	Public Sector Consultants, Inc.	Broadword Solutions Corporation	22nd Century Technologies, Inc.	NTT DATA State Health Consulting, LLC	Public Consulting Group LLC	Springboard Consulting, LLC	Info-Tech Research Group Inc.	Matrix Consulting Group, Ltd.	Accenture LLP	Deloitte Consulting LLP	TEKsystems, Inc.	McKinsey & Company, Inc. Washington D.C.	Slalom, LLC
3	Change Consultant																			\$195.00
4	Consultant	\$190.00		\$165.00	\$200.00			\$120.00		\$85.00	\$202.15	\$250.00	\$155.00	\$257.00	\$120.00	\$275.00		\$225.00		
5	Director Level Consultant				\$400.00															
6	Executive Consultant								\$185.00											
7	Manager Consultant				\$250.00															
8	Operations Consultant II																\$236.00			
9	Operations Consultant I																\$184.00			
10	Process Consultant																			\$195.00
11	Senior Consultant							\$175.00			\$216.33			\$275.00	\$135.00					
12	Senior Manager Consultant				\$300.00															
13	Subject Matter Expert/ Advisor		\$192.00														\$400.00			

Deliverable		CSG Government Solutions, Inc.	Public Knowledge, LLC	Dewpoint, Inc.	Lean Resources, LLC	Orion Solutions Group, LLC	Netlogx, LLC	Public Sector Consultants, Inc.	Broadword Solutions Corporation	22nd Century Technologies, Inc.	NTT DATA State Health Consulting, LLC	Public Consulting Group LLC	Springboard Consulting, LLC	Info-Tech Research Group Inc.	Matrix Consulting Group, Ltd.	Accenture LLP	Deloitte Consulting LLP	TEKsystems, Inc.	McKinsey & Company, Inc. Washington D.C.	Slalom, LLC
Project Implementation Positions																				
1	Associate Implementation																			\$534.00
2	Business Presentation Designer																			\$168.00
3	Business Process Reengineering Lead/ Facilitator						\$215.00													
4	Change Lead																			\$215.00
5	Organizational Strategist																			\$235.00
6	Process Lead																			\$235.00
7	Project Controller		\$136.00																	
8	Project Coordinator						\$120.00		\$80.00		\$124.15									
9	Project Lead					\$150.00														
10	Scrum Master						\$190.00													
11	Training Lead						\$170.00													

Deliverable	CSG Government Solutions, Inc.	Public Knowledge, LLC	Dewpoint, Inc.	Lean Resources, LLC	Orion Solutions Group, LLC	Netlogx, LLC	Public Sector Consultants, Inc.	Broadword Solutions Corporation	22nd Century Technologies, Inc.	NTT DATA State Health Consulting, LLC	Public Consulting Group LLC	Springboard Consulting, LLC	Info-Tech Research Group Inc.	Matrix Consulting Group, Ltd.	Accenture LLP	Deloitte Consulting LLP	TEKsystems, Inc.	McKinsey & Company, Inc. Washington D.C.	Slalom, LLC	
Leadership Lead																				
1	Engagement Manager					\$250.00													\$887.00	
2	Graphics Project Manager																		\$178.00	
3	Manager				\$175.00	\$120.00							\$344.00	\$165.00						
4	Operational Data Manager															\$279.00				
5	Program Manager				\$275.00	\$215.00														\$260.00
6	Project Manager	\$195.00	\$222.00	\$155.00		\$190.00		\$150.00	\$120.00	\$221.29	\$295.00	\$160.00	\$344.00	\$275.00	\$295.00	\$279.00	\$175.00		\$195.00	
7	Project Executive															\$400.00				
8	Schedule Manager					\$170.00														
9	Senior Manager	\$225.00		\$185.00	\$225.00				\$100.00	\$226.46	\$330.00	\$165.00	\$385.00	\$195.00	\$325.00		\$250.00			
10	Senior Project Manager															\$343.00				\$235.00

Deliverable		CSG Government Solutions, Inc.	Public Knowledge, LLC	Dewpoint, Inc.	Lean Resources, LLC	Orion Solutions Group, LLC	Netlogx, LLC	Public Sector Consultants, Inc.	Broadword Solutions Corporation	22nd Century Technologies, Inc.	NTT DATA State Health Consulting, LLC	Public Consulting Group LLC	Springboard Consulting, LLC	Info-Tech Research Group Inc.	Matrix Consulting Group, Ltd.	Accenture LLP	Deloitte Consulting LLP	TEKsystems, Inc.	McKinsey & Company, Inc. Washington D.C.	Slalom, LLC
11	Associate Executive/ Strategy																		\$534.00	
12	Associate Partner																		\$989.00	
13	Director					\$275.00								\$433.00						
14	Managing Director			\$260.00						\$115.00	\$256.84	\$350.00	\$170.00	\$484.00		\$375.00		\$275.00		
15	Partner																		\$1,128.00	
16	Senior Partner																		\$1,384.00	
17	Vice President		\$288.00					\$280.00						\$484.00	\$230.00					

VI. Negotiations

The most critical contract term redlines were requested from Bidders who passed the technical evaluation but did not agree to the Standard Contract Terms. Of the list below, Accenture LLP, Deloitte Consulting LLP, and Orion Solutions Group, LLC agreed to remove their requested redlines and accept the Standard Contract Terms as identified in this RFP.

- Accenture LLP
- Deloitte Consulting LLP
- Info-Tech Research Group, Inc.
- Matrix Consulting Group, Ltd.
- McKinsey & Company, Inc. Washington DC
- Orion Solutions Group, LLC

- Slalom, LLC
- TEKsystems, Inc.

VII. Award Recommendation

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidders 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.

Best value factors for Award Recommendation include technical score, price, and acceptance of the State’s Standard Contract Terms as identified in the RFP. The following Bidders are awarded:

Bidder Name
22nd Century Technologies, Inc
Accenture LLP
Broadsword Solutions Corporation
CSG Government Solutions, Inc.
Deloitte Consulting LLP
Dewpoint, Inc.
Lean Resources, LLC
Matrix Consulting Group, Ltd.
netlogx LLC
NTT DATA State Health Consulting, LLC
Orion Solutions Group, LLC
Public Consulting Group LLC
Public Knowledge, LLC
Public Sector Consultants, Inc.
Slalom, LLC
Springboard Consulting, LLC

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.