

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 230000000261

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of RFP 220000002790 for Electronic Visit Verification and has recommended an award to HHAeXchange in the amount of \$11,337,581.00, 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 for selection of a Contractor to provide Electronic Visit Verification system for the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS). The term of this contract is five years, with up to five, one-year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on July 21, 2022, for eight weeks. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of September 16, 2022.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*
Homecare Software Solutions LLC DBA: HHAeXchange	130 West 42 nd Street, 2 nd Floor New York, NY 10036	N/A
Therap Services LLC	333 Kennedy Drive, Suite R101, Torrington, CT 06790-3060, USA	N/A

First Data Government Solutions LP	6855 Pacific Street Omaha, NE 68106	N/A
Sandata Technologies	270 Duffy Avenue, Unit 266A Hicksville, NY 11081	N/A
Solid Design Software Solution LLC SolidCircle	513 E Eighth St #28 Holland MI, 49423	N/A
Netsmart Technologies, Inc.	11100 Nall Avenue Overland Park, KS 66211	N/A

*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

- A.1 The system must incorporate all HIPAA-compliant confidentiality requirements:
 1. Privacy Act of 1974, Public Law 93-579.
 2. Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) of 2002, 44 USC 3541 et seq.
 3. Michigan Identity Theft Protection Act, MCL 445.61 through MCL 445.79d.
- A.2 The system must incorporate all CMS and State of Michigan security standards requirements at no additional cost, including development, completion, remediation of risk and on-going maintenance of a system security plan (SSP).
- A.3 The system must meet CMS EVV Certification requirements. The vendor shall lead the effort to achieve CMS certification of the system with involvement of DHHS staff.
- B.1 The system architecture must support multiple program types or services which have different policies and procedures, reimbursement rates, and business rules, all of which are subject to change during the contract period. This configuration should be available to MDHHS via configuration management capabilities.
- E.1 The system must be able to capture and verify the following data elements related to visits and be submitted for verification in real-time or near real-time: provider ID, verification of the identity of the person receiving services/tasks, start-time, start-date, service(s) provided during the visit, end-time, end-date, and location.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

Evaluation Criteria Name	Evaluation Weight
Schedule A – Statement of Work (including Table 1)	80.00
Attachment 1 - Resume Templates	10.00

Vendor Questions Worksheet	10.00
Total Weight	100.00

The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.

II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by a Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Department & Agency	Joint Evaluation Committee	Committee Roll
MDHHS, Behavioral & Physical Health and Aging Services (BPHASA)	Scott Wamsley, State Bureau Administrator	Voting Member
	Michelle Martin, State Division Administrator	Voting Member
	Ryan Koolen, Department Specialist	Voting Member
	Jackie Sproat, State Division Administrator	Voting Member
	Laura Demeuse, Departmental Analyst	Advisory Member
	Brant Cole, State Division Administrator	Advisory Member
	Elizabeth Gallaghere, State Administrative Manager	Advisory Member
	Allison Repp, State Administrative Manager	Advisory Member
MDHHS, Strategic Integration Administration (SIA)	Danielle Lefere, State Division Administrator	Voting Member
	Sudhakar Ramaswamy, Senior Deputy Director	Advisory Member
	Danielle Green, Integration Specialist	Advisory Member
	Ken Young, Contractor	Advisory Member
	Melissa Potter, Business Delivery Liaison	Advisory Member
	Kristi Meyer, Compliance and Data Governance Liaison	Advisory Member
DTMB, Agency Services	Pat Thelen, State Administrative Manager	Voting Member
	Joel Nelson, Information Technology Manager	Advisory Member
	John Moore, Business Relationship Manager	Advisory Member

Department & Agency	Joint Evaluation Committee	Committee Roll
	Jim Coggin, State Administrative Manager	Advisory Member
	Fred Moye, Solutions Architect	Advisory Member
	Chris Mitchell, IT Specialist	Advisory Member
DTMB Cyber Security	Mike Bartkowiak	Advisory Member
DTMB Central Procurement	Katie McFarland, Category Specialist, Commodities	Voting Member
	Alannah Doak, Category Analyst, Commodities	Advisory Member

III. Evaluation Results

A. HHAeXchange

The Evaluation Team determined that HHAeXchange based 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. Vendor Questions Worksheet: 10 points

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

2. Attachment 1 – Resume Templates: 10 points

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

3. Schedule A – Statement of Work: 76 points

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

- a. For #5. User Type and Capacity: The Bidder indicated 95% of the latency responses completed within 4 seconds, which is a concern.
- b. For #6. Access Control and Authentication: The Bidder indicated they supported SSO but did not explain how they will connect with MILogin.
- c. For #8. End User Operating Environment: The Bidder explained how they would handle the current environment but did not address how they would handle future enhancements.
- d. For Worksheet C4: The Bidder indicated they would do a Go-Live Readiness Review but didn't indicate when the review would be completed.
- e. For Worksheet E22: No explanation of how the Bidder would recognize if the caregiver was living with the individuals was provided.
- f. For Worksheet G2: The bidder does not accept 837 EDI transactions.
- g. For Worksheet G6: The Bidder did not indicate how the system supported billing of corrected claims. They only explained their process on validating pre-bill edits to correct issues on the front end.
- h. For Worksheet H2: The Bidder did not indicate the system supports Part B of Title XI.
- i. For Worksheet J6: The Bidder did not indicate their training material was at a 6th grade reading level as required by this RFP.
- j. For Worksheet J11: Response and Resolution Time Service Levels for High Service Errors was modified to reflect a response time from 1 to 2 hours and resolution time from 4 hours to 1 business day.

Total Score: 96/100

B. Therap Services, LLC

The Evaluation Team determined that Therap Services, LLC based on a score of 64, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Vendor Questions Worksheet: 5 points

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiency:

- a. For #5: The Bidder stated other State contracts, but the dollar amounts were smaller. There is a concern there were no other state contracts of similar size and scope to this RFP.

2. Attachment 1 – Resume Templates: 5 points

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a. For the Project Manager #2: Project Manager had no IT experience reflected in their resume.
- b. For the Project Manager #6: Project Manager had no risk management experience reflected on their resume.
- c. For the Project Manager #7: There were no certifications provided for the proposed project manager.
- d. For the Security Officer #4: There were no certification provided for the proposed security officer.

3. Schedule A – Statement of Work: 54 points

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a. For #4. ADA Compliance: The PAT provided indicates some areas are only partially supported (language of the page, captions, audio, and visual captions.) There is a concern this does not meet ADA compliance.
- b. For #6. Access Control and Authentication: The Bidder is currently developing single sign-on, but it is not currently supported. They indicated they are developing it per industry standards but did not explain what specific standards are being used. There is a concern the development may not be as far along as it should be to be ready for go-live.
- c. For #7. Data Retention and Removal: The Bidder indicates they retain data indefinitely rather than having a retention schedule.
- d. For #8. End User Operating Environment: The Bidder did not specifically respond on what State system access requirements are needed or how it intends to comply with all future changes to the IT environment. The response was limited to explaining the requirements for accessing their system.
- e. For #9. Software: The Bidder did not fully explain their end-user solution.

- f. For #10. Integration: The Bidder referenced the aggregator as a solution, but MiAIMS is an authorization and case management system. It appears the system interfaces with its own warehouse but there was no reference to experiences with outside databases.
- g. For #12. Training Services: The training plan lacked detail in explaining the training approach and resources. The training approach talked about the initial training and then indicated the train-the-trainer approach would be the pathway forward for any additional trainings needed.
- h. For #14. Documentation: The Bidder did not provide examples of documentation to meet the requirement.
- i. For #20. Meetings: The bid response was limited to say they would meet the requirement rather than explaining how they will meet it and did not note frequency of meetings.
- j. For #21. Project Control and Reports: The bid response does not mention weekly reports with hours worked and funds expended.
- k. For #22. Project Management: The bid response indicated they could roll-out this program sooner than the timeline identified in the RFP. There is a concern the bidder doesn't understand the full complexity of the systems involved and what it will take to get Michigan up and running.
- l. For Worksheet B12: The Bidder did not agree to immediate resolution of critical defects.
- m. For Worksheet B13: The 1,500 system enhancement hours was specifically for customization for Michigan. It should not be included in whatever enhancements they do to their system overall.
- n. For Worksheet C1: The bid response indicated EVV is already developed but does not mention how it meets State of Michigan requirements.
- o. For Worksheet D4: The solution offers 4 languages, but Arabic is not one of the 4 listed.
- p. For Worksheet D5: The helpdesk does not include Arabic as one of the languages included and translation/interpreter services are only available upon request.
- q. For Worksheet D6: The bid response did not explain how their system is ADA compliant.
- r. For Worksheet E10: There is an additional charge for this requirement.
- s. For Worksheet E11: There is an additional charge for this requirement.
- t. For Worksheet E12: There is an additional charge for this requirement.

- u. For Worksheet E13: There is an additional charge for this requirement.
- v. For Worksheet E22: No explanation of how the Bidder would recognize if the caregiver was living with the individuals was provided.
- w. For Worksheet E25: The provider can clock in and out but cannot note services completed until the authorization is complete.
- x. For Worksheet E28: The Bidder referenced E24 as their response which did not address the requirements of E28.
- y. For Worksheet F10: The bid response indicated a report would be provided to track aggregate hours across payers, programs, providers, and individuals receiving services, but it implied the SOM would have to manipulate the data in the Excel file to be able to review the results.
- z. For Worksheet F11: The Bidder did not specify how many reports they had other than indicating they had a report library.
- aa. For Worksheet G2: The system does not have the capability to accept and process 837 EDI transactions from an alternative EVV system.
- bb. For Worksheet G7: The Bidder did not identify how they would address soft errors.
- cc. For Worksheet H3: The Bidder agreed to meet the requirements but did not explain how they would meet them.
- dd. For Worksheet H4: The Bidder agreed to meet the requirements but did not explain how they would meet them.
- ee. For Worksheet I2: The bid response did not reference flagging incorrect transmissions/error messages.
- ff. For Worksheet J1: The bid response indicated training will be ADA, which makes it sound like it is not currently compliant.
- gg. For Worksheet J6: The Bidder did not indicate their training material was at a 6th grade reading level as required by this RFP.
- hh. For Worksheet J9: The Bidder indicated they meet this requirement but failed to explain how they meet it.
- ii. For Worksheet J10: The Bidder indicated they meet this requirement but failed to explain how they meet it.

jj. For Worksheet J11: The Bidder indicated they meet this requirement but failed to explain how they meet it.

Total Score: 64/100

C. First Data Government Solutions, LP

The Evaluation Team determined that First Data Government Solutions, LP based 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. Vendor Questions Worksheet: 10 points

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

2. Attachment 1 – Resume Templates: 9 points

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

- a. The proposed Security Officer does not have the required Bachelor's degree.

3. Schedule A – Statement of Work: 73 points

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

- a. For #3. IT Environment Responsibilities: The Bidder did not agree to this requirement. They indicated they wanted to use terms in another State of Michigan contract.
- b. For #4. ADA Compliance: The Bidder indicated they completed third-party ADA Section 508 review for mobile app and web. The provided PAT notes that supportive services for accessibility and compatibility features and accommodation of communication needs was applicable but not tested.
- c. For Worksheet C4: The Bidder indicated they would do a Go-Live Readiness Review but didn't indicate when the review would be completed.
- d. For Worksheet B3: The Bidder did not confirm they were committed to following DTMB standards. They just indicated they would follow industry standards.
- e. For Worksheet B9: The bid response indicated access and activity reports would only be available upon request rather than the ability for an authorized user to access the information as needed.

- f. For Worksheet B12: The bid response did not specify that they would address critical issues within 3 business days and high issues within 7 business days.
- g. For Worksheet E4: The bid response indicated AuthentiCare supports the delivery of multiple services by one attendant to the same beneficiary. The length of the visit will be divided evenly across the services captured. The hours do not generally break down evenly through these programs.
- h. For Worksheet E12: The Bidder does not provide EVV tokens. They indicated they offer a visit verification card but did not explain what or how that card worked.
- i. For Worksheet E22: The bid response did not explain how they capture the provider's primary residence.
- j. For Worksheet G2: Bid response currently doesn't meet this requirement and indicated customization is required at an additional cost.
- k. For Worksheet J11: The bid response indicated 90% of all issues would be resolved rather than the required 95%. In addition, some medium service errors may not be resolved until 60 days rather than the required 30 days.

Total Score: 92/100

D. Sandata Technologies

The Evaluation Team determined that Sandata Technologies based 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. Vendor Questions Worksheet: 10 points

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

2. Attachment 1 – Resume Templates: 10 points

The Evaluation Team determined the responses were satisfactory.

3. Schedule A – Statement of Work: 72 points

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

- a. For #3. IT Environment Responsibilities: The Bidder indicated they were not willing to complete the State of Michigan SSP. The bid response in exhibit 10 indicated there is a cap for user passwords, but did not explain how they were planning to fix the cap.
- b. For #4. ADA Compliance: Three PATs were provided, but none were in conformance and none of the N/As indicated had any explanation as to why they were N/As.
- c. For Worksheet B12: The bid response did not specify that they would address critical issues within 3 business days and high issues within 7 business days.
- d. For Worksheet D6: The PAT documents provided either did not support or only partially support this requirement.
- e. For Worksheet E22: The bid response did not explain how they capture the provider's primary residence. In addition, this requirement requires a customization for EVV/Aggregator System at an additional cost.
- f. For Worksheet F12: The Bidder did not indicate if reports can be generated in Microsoft Word, it appears it only includes PDF, XLM, and CSV.
- g. For Worksheet G4: Bid response currently doesn't meet this requirement and indicated customization is required at an additional cost.
- h. For Worksheet G5: Bid response currently doesn't meet this requirement and indicated customization is required at an additional cost.
- i. For Worksheet G7: The bid response does not specify if it allows soft errors.
- j. For Worksheet J11: The Bidder did not agree to this requirement. The ticket resolution indicates 24 hours or less resolution time for Urgent issues an average of 5 business days for High issues, and average of 15 days for Normal issues.

Total Score: 92/100

E. SolidCircle

The Evaluation Team determined that SolidCircle based on a score of 20, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Vendor Questions Worksheet: 5

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a. The Bidder does not have prior projects of similar scope to this RFP.

2. Attachment 1 – Resume Templates: 2

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a. The Project Manager does not have 5 years experience with managing projects of similar size and scope, of experience scheduling and facilitating meetings with clients and stakeholders, or of risk management experience. None of the required certifications were provided.
- b. The Security Officer does not have 5 years experience with managing the security of similar size and scope, of experience facilitating compliance for clients and stakeholders, or of risk management experience. The resume did not identify all required knowledge other than NIST and secure coding. No active certifications were provided.

3. Schedule A – Statement of Work: 13

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a. For #3. IT Environment Responsibilities: The Bidder indicated they would complete with the requirement. However, the response provided no detail as to how this requirement would be met aside from saying their software is hosted and data security is managed by Azure.
- b. For #4. ADA Compliance: There was no PAT provided for review. The bid response only indicated they would get their software tested for conformance by a third party if awarded.
- c. For #5. User Type and Capacity: No latency times were provided in the bid response. They only indicated the minimum connectivity required to operate their solution.
- d. For #6. Access Control and Authentication: The Bidder did not discuss how MILogin would be used to meet this requirement.
- e. For #7. Data Retention and Removal: The bid response does not explain how long data will be maintained and did not mention how they will interface with the State of Michigan database to share information.

- f. For #8. End User Operating Environment: The bid response does not mention whether they can support the current and future State environment at no additional cost. Minimal detail was provided on how they communicate changes other than they are communicated through e-mail. There was no mention of release notes or notifying the State ahead of time of planned changes. From the bid response this does not appear to be a pre-built SaaS system which is a requirement of this RFP.
- g. For #9. Software: No visual aids for functionality were provided with the bid response. Bid response did not give specifics about versions of mobile devices that are compatible or provide a list of features that can be performed via a mobile device.
- h. For #10. And Integration & Worksheet I: The Bidder did not provide an explanation of how their system would integrate with the State's systems, but rather indicated it would be something which would have to be customized.
- i. For #14. Documentation: The Bidder indicated they would comply with the requirement but failed to provide any details on, and examples of, the documentation to meet the requirements of this section.
- j. For #s 16. Contractor Personnel: There is a concern the number of people assigned to this contract is insufficient given the size and scope outlined in this RFP.
- k. For #20. Meetings: The Bidder only agreed to virtual online meetings and not to in-person as needed.
- l. For #21. Project Control and Reports: The Bidder listed reports but provided no detail as to when or how they would be used.
- m. For #22. Project Management: The Bidder indicated they could do the work or comply with requirements, but they would have to be customized and no detail as to how that would be achieved was provided. The Bidder did not agree with the State's schedule and failed to propose an alternative for review.
- n. For Worksheet A4: Requirement needs to be configured, but no explanation of what configurations are needed to meet the business requirement.
- o. For Worksheet A5: System does not meet business requirement, uses a 3rd party but no explanation of how they may meet this requirement was provided.
- p. For Worksheet A6 and A7: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- q. For Worksheet A8: Requires configuration but limited their response to say they are evaluating vendors to that may meet this requirement.
- r. For Worksheet A9: Does not meet business requirement and has no plans in the future to meet it.
- s. For Worksheet B2: Bidder has not implemented an EVV solution in another State.

- t. For Worksheet B3 and B4: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- u. For Worksheet B5: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided limited explanation as to how it meets it.
- v. For Worksheet B6 and B7: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- w. For Worksheet B8: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided limited explanation as to how it meets it.
- x. For Worksheet B9, B10, B11, B12, B13, and B14: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- y. For Worksheet D1: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- z. For Worksheet D2: Indicated the system requires customization to meet this requirement but provided no explanation of what would be needed to meet it.
- aa. For Worksheet D3: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- bb. For Worksheet D4: Indicated the system requires customization to meet this requirement but provided no explanation of what would be needed to meet it as it is currently only available in English.
- cc. For Worksheet D5: Does not meet requirement and no plans to meet it.
- dd. For Worksheet D6: Indicated the system requires customization to meet this requirement but provided no explanation of what would be needed to meet it.
- ee. For Worksheet D7: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it aside from indicating the system has a pre-defined number of user roles which could be scaled up if the project required it.
- ff. For Worksheet D8, D9, D10, D11, and D12: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- gg. For Worksheet E2: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- hh. For Worksheet E3: Indicated the system requires customization to meet this requirement but provided response was limited to say integration would be needed to validate the Medicaid ID.
- ii. For Worksheet E4, E5, E6, E7, E8, E9: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.

- jj. For Worksheet E10: Indicated the system requires customization to meet this requirement but provided no explanation of what would be needed to meet it.
- kk. For Worksheet E11: Indicated this feature is not available and no explanation was if they had plans to make it available.
- ll. For Worksheet E12: Indicated this feature is not available and no plans to offer any hardware or devices for this project.
- mm. For Worksheet E13: Indicated the system requires customization to meet this requirement but provided no explanation of what would be needed to meet it.
- nn. For Worksheet E14 and E15: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- oo. For Worksheet E16: Indicated the system would require configuration to meet this requirement, but the response was limited to saying GPS location could be configured. No additional detail was provided.
- pp. For Worksheet E17, E18, E19, and E20: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- qq. For Worksheet E21: Indicated the system requires customization to meet this requirement but provided no explanation of what would be needed to meet it.
- rr. For Worksheet E22, E23, E24, E25, E26, E27, and E28: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- ss. For Worksheet F1: Indicated the system would require configuration to meet this requirement but provided no explanation of what configuration maybe needed to meet this requirement.
- tt. For Worksheet F2 and F3: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- uu. For Worksheet F4 and F5: Indicated the system requires customization to meet this requirement but provided no explanation of what would be needed to meet it.
- vv. For Worksheet F6, F7, F8, F9, F10, and F11: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- ww. For Worksheet F12: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it. It also indicated PDF, Word, and XML would need to be added which suggests they do not currently meet this requirement.
- xx. For Worksheet F13: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.

- yy. For Worksheet F14: Indicated the system requires customization to meet this requirement but provided no explanation of what would be needed to meet it.
- zz. For Worksheet G1: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- aaa. For Worksheet G2: Indicated the system requires customization to meet this requirement but provided no explanation of what would be needed to meet it.
- bbb. For Worksheet G3: Indicated the system requires customization to meet this requirement but provided limited explanation of what would be needed to meet it. Response was limited to indicating an API could be created.
- ccc. For Worksheet G4, G5, and G6: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- ddd. For Worksheet G7: Indicated the system requires customization to meet this requirement but provided no explanation of what would be needed to meet it.
- eee. For Worksheet G8: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- fff. For Worksheet G9: Indicated the system requires customization to meet this requirement but provided no explanation of what would be needed to meet it.
- ggg. For Worksheet H1, H2, H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, and H8: Indicated the system meets this requirement but provided no explanation as to how it meets it.
- hhh. For Worksheet H9: Indicated the system requires customization to meet this requirement but provided no explanation of what would be needed to meet it.
- iii. For Worksheet J1: Training and communication are not currently ADA compliant and require customization.
- jjj. For Worksheet J8: The bid response indicated that there is no user support for all stakeholders by phone and email during non-business hours.
- kkk. For Worksheet J9: The bid response indicated their helpdesk does not answer calls within 2 minutes or less of entering the queue and the call abandonment rates is not less than 5% monthly.
- lll. For Worksheet J10: The Bidder acknowledges they would meet the requirement and then indicated they do not use fax. No additional detail was provided as to how they would meet this specification.
- mmm. For Worksheet J13: The Bidder indicated this requirement can be configured, but the proposed solution does not currently have the functionality.

Total Score: 20/100

F. Netsmart Technologies, Inc.

The Evaluation Team determined that Netsmart Technologies, Inc. based on a score of 56, did not meet the requirements of this RFP. This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Vendor Questions Worksheet: 2 points

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a. The Bidder indicated they have rolled this out in 4 states but listed Georgia twice. It was unclear if experience in other states was limited to an aggregator. Implementations were also personal care only.
- b. The Bidder failed to answer the remaining questions on the Vendor Questions Worksheet.

2. Attachment 1 – Resume Templates: 5 points

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a. The bid response did not provide specifics on how the security officer met the requirements for the 5 years experience of managing security for similar size and scope to the solicitation, facilitating compliance for clients and stakeholders, and of risk management. Unable to provide references from prior employers.
- b. The bid response did not indicate if they have a Bachelor's degree and failed to provide certificates actively held.

3. Schedule A – Statement of Work: 49 points

The Evaluation Team noted the following deficiencies:

- a. For #3. IT Environment Responsibilities: The Bidder did not specifically mention that they would agree to meet SOM data security requirements.
- b. For #4. ADA Compliance: There was no PAT provided, which made it impossible to verify compliance.
- c. For #5. User Type and Capacity: There were no details for latency times provided.
- d. For #6. Access Control and Authentication: The Bidder is proposing a different single sign on other than MiLogin which is required for this RFP.
- e. For #7. Data Retention and Removal: The Bidder failed to answer this question. The response talked about how they store data but failed to explain how they would meet the State's requirement.

- f. For #12. Training Services: Training is only available on-line, but the RFP requires in-person training. A training plan was not provided.
- g. For #14. Documentation: Bidder failed to provide any documentation examples.
- h. For #21. Project Controls and Reports: The Bidder indicates a library of reports and indicated they offer optional dashboard/data analytics, but it was unclear if it was at an additional cost to the State.
- i. For #22. Project Management: The bid response did not provide any details on the Work Breakdown Structure. The Bidder indicated no customization was needed because there is no QASP needed.
- j. For Worksheet A6: There was no commitment there would be no additional cost to the State for any modifications or configurations of the proposed solution needed to comply with CMS and Federal EVV policies.
- k. For Worksheet A7: The Bidder indicates they comply, but any configurations required need to go through an approval process. There is a concern they would not be able to adapt to our policies.
- l. For Worksheet A8: Bidder indicated this is not applicable because there is no direct connection to Health Information Exchange (HIE), but in I7, they indicated this is one of their core strategies.
- m. For Worksheet B12: The Bidder did not commit to the timeframe identified for resolution.
- n. For Worksheet B14: The Bidder did not commit to a specific percentage, or the requirement identified in the RFP.
- o. For Worksheet C4: The Bidder committed to doing the go-live readiness review but did not indicate when that would occur.
- p. For Worksheet D4: System is not available in Arabic.
- q. For Worksheet D5: It appears the system has the ability but does not currently include translation/interpreter services.
- r. For Worksheet D6: The Bidder did not provide a PAT or explain how their system complies with this requirement.
- s. For Worksheet D9: Does not allow agencies to deactivate staff in the system.
- t. For Worksheet D11: The bid response did not answer this question specifically.
- u. For Worksheet D12: The bid response indicated they use email and phone number as unique identifiers. There is a concern with this as those change frequently and does not prevent duplicate entities for users who may have more than one phone number or email address.
- v. For Worksheet E4: Requires customization which would be at an additional expense.
- w. For Worksheet E5: The bid response did not specifically explain how they would meet this requirement.
- x. For Worksheet E12: No EVV tokens are available.

- y. For Worksheet E18, E19, and E22: The Bidder did not provide any details on how they will meet this requirement.
- z. For Worksheet E24: The answer provided did not address the question asked.
- aa. For Worksheet E27: The bid response indicated they could provide this but did not indicate if the system currently had the functionality.
- bb. For Worksheet F6: The system verifies total time, but nothing in the system for users to view how many hours have been used.
- cc. For Worksheet F8, F9, F10: The bid response indicated they could provide this but did not indicate if the system currently had the functionality.
- dd. For Worksheet F11: The Bidder did not define how many or the types of available reports.
- ee. For Worksheet F12: The Bidder did not include Microsoft Word as an available document type.
- ff. For Worksheet G1: The Bidder response was limited in saying they support 837 EDI transactions but did not explain how they support them.
- gg. For Worksheet G2: The Bidder did not explain how they would meet this requirement.
- hh. For Worksheet G8, G9, H2, H4, H6: The Bidder indicated they meet this requirement but did not provide explanation on how they will meet it.
- ii. For Worksheet H8: The Bidder did not agree to this requirement.
- jj. For Worksheet I8: The Bidder did not commit to this requirement, only indicated they would agree to what is commercially reasonable.
- kk. For Worksheet J1: The Bidder indicated they agree but did not explain how they will comply with the requirement.
- ll. For Worksheet J6: The Bidder indicate they would meet this requirement but did not specify it would be at a 6th grade reading level.
- mm. For Worksheet J10: Bidder indicated they would agree to the requirement but did not explain how they would meet this requirement.
- nn. For Worksheet J11: The bid response to this question did not indicate how they would meet this requirement. Bidder will not include clients with 3rd party issues in the resolution metrics.
- oo. For Worksheet J13: Customization is needed, and it would be at an additional cost to the State.

Total Score: 56/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

	Selection Criteria	HHAeXchange	Therp Services, LLC	First Data Government Solutions, LP	Sandata Technologies	SolidCircle	Netsmart Technologies, Inc.
1	Vendor Questions Worksheet (10 points)	10	5	10	10	5	2
2	Attachment 1- Resume Templates (10 points)	10	5	9	10	2	5
3	Schedule A, Statement of Work (Including Table 1) (80 points)	76	54	73	72	13	49
	Total	96	64	92	92	20	56

V. Pricing Summary

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

	Deliverable	HHAeXchange	First Data Government Solutions, LP	Sandata Technologies																																																	
1	Software Licensing Fees	*Cloud Based SaaS <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">Base Contract & Option Year Pricing (Price/Member)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Number of Members</th> <th>Year 1</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 5</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1-50,000</td> <td>\$1.96</td> <td>\$1.96</td> <td>\$1.96</td> <td>\$1.96</td> <td>\$1.96</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>50,001 – 75,000</td> <td>\$1.35</td> <td>\$1.35</td> <td>\$1.35</td> <td>\$1.35</td> <td>\$1.35</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>75,001 – 100,000</td> <td>\$1.23</td> <td>\$1.23</td> <td>\$1.23</td> <td>\$1.23</td> <td>\$1.23</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>100,001 – 125,000</td> <td>\$1.20</td> <td>\$1.20</td> <td>\$1.20</td> <td>\$1.20</td> <td>\$1.20</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>125,001+</td> <td>\$1.15</td> <td>\$1.15</td> <td>\$1.15</td> <td>\$1.15</td> <td>\$1.15</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Base Contract & Option Year Pricing (Price/Member)							Number of Members	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5		1-50,000	\$1.96	\$1.96	\$1.96	\$1.96	\$1.96		50,001 – 75,000	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35		75,001 – 100,000	\$1.23	\$1.23	\$1.23	\$1.23	\$1.23		100,001 – 125,000	\$1.20	\$1.20	\$1.20	\$1.20	\$1.20		125,001+	\$1.15	\$1.15	\$1.15	\$1.15	\$1.15		*Cloud Based SaaS, unlimited users 3,000 hours annually for the first two contract years with no additional cost to the State for enhancement pool hours. First year pro-rated = \$560,000.00 Annual fee thereafter = \$1,680,000.00	Included in End User Support and Operations Fees
Base Contract & Option Year Pricing (Price/Member)																																																					
Number of Members	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5																																																
1-50,000	\$1.96	\$1.96	\$1.96	\$1.96	\$1.96																																																
50,001 – 75,000	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35	\$1.35																																																
75,001 – 100,000	\$1.23	\$1.23	\$1.23	\$1.23	\$1.23																																																
100,001 – 125,000	\$1.20	\$1.20	\$1.20	\$1.20	\$1.20																																																
125,001+	\$1.15	\$1.15	\$1.15	\$1.15	\$1.15																																																

	Deliverable	HHAeXchange		First Data Government Solutions, LP	Sandata Technologies												
2	Support Service Fees	No additional support service fees, included in the Software Licensing Per Member Per Month Pricing		No additional cost, all fees are included in the SaaS delivery model and software licensing fees.	No additional cost, included in End User Support and Operations Fees.												
3	Hosting Fees	Number of Members	Hosting Price/Month	No additional cost, hosting, support, maintenance, and update fees are included in our annual subscription price.	No additional cost, included in End User Support and Operations Fees.												
		1-100,000	\$10,000.00														
		100,001 +	\$8,000.00														
4	Implementation Fees	Activity, Deliverable, or Milestone	Price	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Project Initiation and Planning</td> <td>\$508,000.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Design and Configuration</td> <td>\$508,000.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>User Acceptance</td> <td>\$508,000.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pilot Start/ ORR Complete</td> <td>\$508,000.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pilot Complete Rollout Begins</td> <td>\$508,000.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total</td> <td>\$2,540,000.00</td> </tr> </table>	Project Initiation and Planning	\$508,000.00	Design and Configuration	\$508,000.00	User Acceptance	\$508,000.00	Pilot Start/ ORR Complete	\$508,000.00	Pilot Complete Rollout Begins	\$508,000.00	Grand Total	\$2,540,000.00	<p>Implementation fees include a total of 8.5-month implementation per our proposed Implementation Strategy, including Business Rules and system configuration, system ready for use in 6 months, 2.5 month phased rollout project support, minor configuration updates during the phase/pilot period (if needed), all SME project staff, UAT/SIT testing, training, and CMS Certification support as described in our response. Sandata has assumed a remote implementation and no implementation travel fees are included in this cost submission. We have assumed that the State will provide facilities, including computers, for any onsite classroom training, or additional fees will apply.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">\$655,000.00</p>
Project Initiation and Planning	\$508,000.00																
Design and Configuration	\$508,000.00																
User Acceptance	\$508,000.00																
Pilot Start/ ORR Complete	\$508,000.00																
Pilot Complete Rollout Begins	\$508,000.00																
Grand Total	\$2,540,000.00																
		Conduct Project Kickoff Planning and Meeting (non-software)	\$6,000.00														
		Project Charter and Project Plan (Timeline) (Written)	\$2,625.00														
		Project Status Reports (Written)	\$2,625.00														
		Communications and Change Management Plan (Written)	\$1,500.00														
		Software Configuration Plan (Written)	\$3,000.00														
		Systems Interface Plan and Design/Capability (Written)	\$3,000.00														
		Testing Plan (Written)	\$3,000.00														
		Deployment Plan (Written)	\$3,000.00														
		Disaster Recovery Plan (Written)	\$2,250.00														
		Comprehensive Training Plan and Curriculum (Written)	\$1,875.00														
		End User Support Plan (Written)	\$750.00														
		Business Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) (Written)	\$2,250.00														
		Solutions Requirements Traceability Matrix (Written)	\$1,500.00														
		Operations Support and Management Plan (Written)	\$750.00														

	Deliverable	HHAeXchange		First Data Government Solutions, LP	Sandata Technologies
		Total	\$34,125.00		
		Requirements & Design Validation - Execution + 90 calendar days			
		Business Rules Document-Sign off (Written)	\$3,750.00		
		Workflow Sign Document-Sign Off (Software)	\$3,750.00		
		Provide Software Installation, Configuration, and Operational Plan to Satisfy State Requirements (Software)	\$9,375.00		
		Total	\$16,875.00		
		Configuration of Software - Execution + 260 calendar days			
		Final Solution Document (Written)	\$9,375.00		
		Provider Portal Script (Written)	\$16,875.00		
		Survey (Written)	\$ 9,375.00		
		Configuration Decisions Document- Sign off (Written)	\$11,250.00		
		Total	\$46,875.00		
		Testing, Acceptance, and Deployment (Initial End User Training) Execution + 260 calendar days			
		Conduct Integration Testing (Non-Software)	\$11,250.00		
		Conduct User Acceptance Testing (Non-Software)	\$16,875.00		
		Perform Production Tests (Non-Software)	\$12,000.00		
		Test In-Bound and Out-Bound Interfaces (Software)	\$12,000.00		
		Conduct System Performance (Load/Stress) Testing (Non-Software)	\$12,000.00		
		3rd Party Testing (Non-Software)	\$11,250.00		

Deliverable		HHAeXchange		First Data Government Solutions, LP	Sandata Technologies
		Security Risk Assessment Report (Written)	\$3,750.00		
		Security Authorization Package (Written)	\$2,625.00		
		Interfaced Data Loaded into Production Environment (Software)	\$4,500.00		
		Provide Tools for Backup and Recovery of all Applications and Data (Software)	\$6,375.00		
		Operational Readiness Review (Non-Software)	\$2,625.00		
		Conduct Phase 1 Provider User Training (Non-Software)	\$20,625.00		
		First Productive Use (Non-Software)	\$2,625.00		
		Conduct Training (Non-Software)	\$60,000.00		
		Provide Documentation (Written)	\$3,750.00		
		Execute System Security Plan (Non-software)	\$2,250.00		
		Total	\$184,500.00		
		Operations – Product Support, Ongoing Training - Ongoing			
		Ongoing Hosting Support Plan	\$2,000.00		
		Ongoing Support & Maintenance Plan	\$3,750.00		
		Lead CMS Outcomes Based Certification Planning and Meeting	\$11,250.00		
		Total	\$17,000.00		
5	Transaction Fees	No additional transaction fees, included in the enterprise pricing.		No additional transaction fees, included in the enterprise pricing.	Transaction fee will apply when transactions exceed 1,859,250. A transaction is defined as a per visit fee which includes a check in and check out. Transaction fee = \$0.08

Deliverable		HHAeXchange		First Data Government Solutions, LP		Sandata Technologies	
6	Hardware Pricing	Device	Price	Device	Price	Fee begins date device requested and ends on the date it is returned. Replacement fee = \$24/unit (devices with no data for 30 days will be charged a replacement fee)	
		Fixed Object (FOB) Device	\$12.00 per FOB + \$0.50 per device monthly maintenance	Pre-loaded mobile device Cost is per device per month	\$60.00		
				Visit Verification Card (VVC) with 36 month operation One-time cost per card (excluding shipping)	\$ 165.00		
7	End-User Support and Operations	No additional cost, include end-user support and operations in per member per month pricing.		Number of Hours	Price	Month fixed fee includes base transactions, staff, support services, and all required operational support. Includes the annual 1,500 system enhancement pool hours. Monthly fee = \$123,950.00	
				Year 1 and 2 - 3,000 hours	Included (\$0.00)		
				Year 3, 4, and 5 - 1,500 hours	Included (\$0.00)		
				Year 1 and 2 - Exceeding 3,000 hours Year 3, 4, and 5 - Exceeding 1,500 hours	On-site = \$150.00/hr. On-shore = \$120.00/hr.		
8	Billing Module	No additional cost, billing module included in the above enterprise pricing. As a standard component it does not impact the proposed pricing if the State does not deploy it.		No additional cost, billing module included in the above enterprise pricing. As a standard component it does not impact the proposed pricing if the State does not deploy it.		Monthly Fee = \$24,790.00	
9	Customization Line Items	No customizations required.		AuthentiCare must be modified to accept 837 EDI transactions from alternate EVV systems.		E22. The EVV system must validate that the claim data matches the EVV visit data in	

	Deliverable	HHAeXchange	First Data Government Solutions, LP	Sandata Technologies
			<p>Claims information can be accepted into AuthentiCare today through our Aggregator module. Standard formats are in place for State-approved third party EVV systems to submit via API or batch instead of an 837 record.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Cost = \$54,000.00</p> <p>No implementation impact.</p> <p>Specific development, testing and UAT is required. Related SDLC activities for this requirement are included in the draft WBS and project schedule.</p>	<p>accordance with MDHHS business rules, which may vary by program. This validation may include, but is not limited to, matches between the authorization, EVV visit, and claim on member, provider, service, and units. These edits must be configurable as hard edits (preventing the billing of a claim) and soft edits (flagged on the claim)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Cost \$24,000.00</p> <p>G4.</p> <p>The EVV system must validate that the claim data matches the EVV visit data in accordance with MDHHS business rules, which may vary by program. This validation may include, but is not limited to, matches between the authorization, EVV visit, and claim on member, provider, service, and units. These edits must be configurable as hard edits (preventing the billing of a claim) and soft edits (flagged on the claim).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Cost \$24,000.00</p> <p>G5.</p> <p>The result of the EVV match to the claim data must be added to an 837 file and billed in accordance with program business rules to the applicable managed care entity or MDHHS system. The system must be able to dynamically identify the correct routing for this claim.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Cost \$24,000.00</p> <p>One-time fees for all customizations during the implementation process to customize the edits for EVV claims data.</p>

	Deliverable	HHAeXchange	First Data Government Solutions, LP	Sandata Technologies
10	Optional Components	No optional components needed	No optional components needed	Pricing is smart device pricing only, final price varies on number of devices needed. Smart Device = \$189.97/device Smart Device Operation/support = \$14.25/month
11	Other Costs	Care Insights is an optional add on that empowers caregivers to play a key role in member risk detection and quality improvement. Care Insights Module = \$475,000.00/Year	No other costs	Sandata will apply an annual 3.5% COLA annually, beginning year two (defined as one year post contract execution) to all recurring fees.
12	Postproduction Warranty	90 calendar day postproduction warranty included at no additional cost.	90 calendar day postproduction warranty included at no additional cost.	\$35,000.00
13	Rate Card for Ancillary Professional Services	Project Manager = \$132/hr. (onsite) \$132/hr. (onshore) Quality Assurance Manager = \$120/hr. (onsite) \$120/hr. (onshore) Developer = \$120/hr. (onsite) \$120/hr. (onshore) Senior Product Manager = \$150/hr. (onsite) \$150/hr. (onshore)	Authenticare Support Services \$150/hr. (onsite) \$120/hr. (onshore)	Same hourly rate for all roles \$150/hr. (onsite) \$100/hr. (onshore)
14	Open Source of Third-party Products	Not applicable	Not applicable	Business intelligence by DOMO End user support fees include 26 BI licenses (15 for State Administrators, 1 each for 11 MCOs) Additional BI licenses can be purchased via the Change request process
Estimated Total Based on RFP User Estimates		\$11,337,581.00	\$10,445,075.00	\$16,627,373.00

VI. Demo Observations

All proposals which passed the technical evaluation were asked to provide a demonstration of their proposed solutions. HHAeXchange, First Data Government Solutions, LP, and Sandata Technologies were all asked to demonstrate their solution.

Bidder demonstrations were not scored but were considered as part of the best value determination.

HHAeXchange: demonstration successfully addressed the questions and scenarios requested.

First Data Government Solutions, LP: demonstration successfully addressed the questions and scenarios requested. There was concern of how the Visit Verification Card process and functionality worked with their proposed solution. The process of recording clock in and out times were labor intensive. There was also a concern of how to confirm the card was at the correct location.

Sandata Technologies: demonstration successfully addressed the questions and scenarios requested. There were some concerns on the labor intensity of the clock-in clock-out requirements when a worker is performing multiple services within a single visit.

VII. Clarifications

Clarifications were requested as follows:

HHAeXchange:

- 1) Bidder was asked to confirm their solution is WCAG level 2.0 A & AA compliant, which was confirmed.
- 2) Bidder was asked to agree to #18 Contractor Personnel Requirements due to a missing bidder response box, which the Bidder confirmed.
- 3) Bidder was asked to provide a more detailed explanation for how the Security Officer's time would be allocated to this contract, to which a response was received.
- 4) Bidder was asked to provide additional detail for the Security Officers past employment history, which was provided.
- 5) Bidder was asked to confirm if they could keep all data for 3 years on the active system rather than archiving the 3rd year, which was confirmed it could be done.

- 6) Bidder was asked to provide explanation of how duplication of providers in the system is prevented beyond using the date of birth or social security number, to which further explanation was provided.
- 7) Bidder was asked to confirm the system supports Part B Title XI of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, for which they did confirm support.

First Data Government Solutions, LP

- 1) Bidder was asked to confirm their solution is WCAG level 2.0 A & AA compliant, which was confirmed.
- 2) Bidder was asked to provide explanation for action to resolve issues submitted with their PAT documents. An updated PAT was provided which showed compliance.
- 3) Bidder was asked to provide a more detailed explanation for how the Security Officer's time would be allocated to this contract, to which a response was received.
- 4) Bidder was asked to clarify if there is the ability to perform services that are not previously authorized, to which it was confirmed the system does have the capability to accommodate not previously authorized services.
- 5) Bidder was asked to confirm State employees could run reports in their system, to which confirmation was received.
- 6) Bidder was asked to confirm if their system supported Arabic, to which confirmation was received.
- 7) Bidder was asked if there was any other preventative in place to prevent multiple accounts aside from using NPI or Medicaid ID. Confirmation was received that alternatives are available.
- 8) Bidder was asked to confirm the dashboard reports could be run on demand, to which it was confirmed they could.

Sandata Technologies:

- 1) Bidder was asked to confirm their solution is WCAG level 2.0 A & AA compliant, which was confirmed.
- 2) Bidder was asked to provide explanation for action to resolve issues submitted with their PAT documents. More recent VPATs were provided but also failed to meet compliance in areas.
- 3) Bidder was asked to provide a more detailed explanation for how the Security Officer's time would be allocated to this contract, to which a response was received.
- 4) Bidder was asked to provide additional detail as to how they meet Table 1 Business Specification Worksheet, requirement #J9, to which clarification was received.

- 5) Bidder was asked for Table 1 Business Specification Worksheet, requirement #F6 to confirm if their solution can display in real time, the total time for the services or tasks provided to the same individual by program type against the authorized units, to which confirmation was received.
- 6) Bidder was asked to provide additional details on the exceptions requested, to which most of the details were provided.
- 7) Demo question: Bidder was asked what functionality is available to alert a provider when they are running low of authorized hours, to which a response was received.
- 8) Bidder was asked how they calculated the number of transactions included prior to the per transaction fee being triggered.

VIII. 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.

HHaEXchange provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include: minimal redlines requested to the Contract Terms, agreement to Schedule E – Data Security Requirements as identified in the RFP, ease of use with the ability to provide both offline and a FOB device for locations without access to cellular or landlines, and price.

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. Award Recommendation is made to HHaEXchange in the amount of \$11,337,581.00.