

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 230000000514

The Department of Technology, Management & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of LARA - CSCL Business Fillings System RFP 220000002899, and has recommended an award to Tecuity, Inc, in the amount of \$4,950,000, pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#).

Bidders who were not recommended for the award are encouraged to schedule a debriefing session with the Solicitation Manager. The debriefing session will provide the bidder with the State’s rationale on why the bidder was not recommended for the award. The Solicitation Manager may be contacted as follows:

Jeremy Lyon, Solicitation Manager.

LyonJ5@michigan.gov

517-230-2858

Background Information:

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

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on 8/10/2022 for 56 days The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of 10/5/2022.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*
Carahsoft Technology Corp	11493 Sunset Hills RD. Suite 100 Reston, VA 20190	NO
Deloitte Consulting LLP	30 Rockefeller Plaza New York, NY 10112	NO
GRM Information Management Services, Inc	2050 E. ASU Circle, Suite 103 Tempe, AZ 85284	NO
Tecuity, Inc	40 West 3800 North Hyde Park, UT 84318	NO

*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

EVALUATION SYNOPSIS

I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

Proposal Instructions: Mandatory Minimum Requirements

Minimum Requirements	
1.0	Bidder must agree to actively participate in the State of Michigan Security Accreditation Process.
2.0	Bidder must provide evidence of SOC 2 Type II report for their company.
3.0	Bidder must agree to actively participate in the State of Michigan Web Standards and Accessibility Review process.
4.0	Bidder must maintain hosting in FedRamp authorized space if third party hosted.
5.0	Bidder must have developed a business registry system solution that has been implemented or is in the process of being implemented in a state within the United States or office equivalent to the Michigan Corporations Division in a foreign country.

Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

Evaluation Criteria Name	Evaluation Weight
• Schedule A – Statement of Work	100
• Schedule A, Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet	200
• Attachment 1, Resume Templates	100
• Vendor Questions Worksheet – Less Experience	60
• Vendor Question Worksheet - Experience (Section 5)	70
• Vendor Questions Worksheet – (Section 6) Agreement to the State’s Contract – Redlining may result in reduction in points, or possibly deeming the bid non-responsive.	70
• Schedule A - Statement of Work – Project Management & Implementation Approach	100
Total Weight	700

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

II. Evaluation Method

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

Voting	Advisory
Linda Clegg (LARA)	Jodi Cornell (LARA)
Alexis Lupo (LARA)	Brenda Glinke (LARA)
Lindsey Pung (LARA)	Lindsay Goolsby (LARA)
Giget Schlyer (LARA)	Tracy Goss (LARA)
Stuart Willard (DTMB)	William Metz (DTMB)
Jeremy Lyon (DTMB) – Solicitation Manager	Stephanie Middlebrooks (LARA)
	Jon Rogozinski (DTMB)
	Mike Bartkowiak (DTMB)

The evaluators have disqualified the following proposals, per the Potential Supplier Instructions.

III. Evaluation Results

Description & Point Value	Bidder A Carahsoft Technology Corp	Bidder B Deloitte Consulting LLP	Bidder C GRM Information Management Services, Inc	Bidder D Tecuity, Inc
Schedule A – Statement of Work 100 Points	00.00	98.25	00.00	100

Schedule A - Table 1 Business Specifications Worksheet 200 Points	00.00	187.30	00.00	198.95
Attachment 1 – Key Personal and Resumes 100 Points	00.00	95	00.00	95
Vendor Question Worksheet – Less Experience 60 Points	00.00	60	00.00	60
Vendor Question Worksheet – Experience (Section 5) 70 Points	00.00	70	00.00	70
Vendor Questions Worksheet – (Section 6) Agreement to the State’s Contract – Redlining may result in reduction in points, or possibly deeming the bid non- responsive. 70 Points	00.00	70	00.00	70
Schedule A - Statement of Work – Project Management & Implementation Approach 100 Points	00.00	100	00.00	100
Total: 100	00.00	680.55	00.00	693.95

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

Evaluation Scores:

Bidder A

Vendor Name: Carahsoft Technology Corp

Score: 00.00 points

Carahsoft Technology Corp	Possible Points	Score	Comments
Mandatory Minimum 1 - Bidder must agree to actively participate in the State of Michigan Security Accreditation Process.	Pass or Fail	Fail	Bidder Did not pass Mandatory Minimums. See failure - Failed to answer question.
Mandatory Minimum 3 - Bidder must agree to actively participate in the State of Michigan Web Standards and Accessibility Review process.	Pass or Fail	Fail	Bidder Did not pass Mandatory Minimums. See failure - Contract sited does not reference the State of Michigan Web Standards and or Accessibility review process.
Mandatory Minimum 5 - Bidder must have developed a business registry system	Pass or Fail	Fail	Bidder did not pass Mandatory Minimum. See failure - A business tax system is not considered to be similar to a business registry system and are governed by different statutes.

<p>solution that has been implemented or is in the process of being implemented in a state within the United States or office equivalent to the Michigan Corporations Division in a foreign country.</p>			
--	--	--	--

Bidder B

Vendor Name: Deloitte Consulting LLP Score: 680.55 points

Deloitte Consulting LLP	Possible Points	Technical Score	Comments
<p>Schedule A - Statement Of Work</p>	<p>100</p>	<p>98.25</p>	<p>4. IT ENVIRONMENT RESPOSIBILITIES Bidder Box 2 – Deficiency, Bidder did not clearly identify compliance with both public and non-public PSP's as required in the RFP.</p> <p>13. TRAINING SERVICES Bidder Box 1 – Deficiency, Bidder's response does not meet standard training protocol without additional capacity.</p> <p>16. ADDITIONAL PRODUCTS AND SERVICES Bidder Box 1 – Deficiency, Bidders clarification of training puts significant constraints on sessions needed for the team to be successful at go-live and beyond. Does not meet</p>

			SOM expectations of training per the outlined suggested timeline in SOW.
Schedule A - Table 1 Business Specifications Worksheet -	200	187.30	<p>Business requirement – General 90, deficiency - Bidder did not confirm the system has this current functionality through the demo provided. Bidder's response to the requirement failed to address paper or mailed submissions.</p> <p>Business requirement - General 170, deficiency - Bidder response does not meet requirement of preventing individual submissions that must be part of a package submission.</p> <p>Business requirement - General 230, deficiency - Bidder did not address all elements of the requirement. Bidder did not demonstrate this functionality during the demo.</p> <p>Business requirement - General 290, deficiency - Bidder's response to the requirement failed to address all elements of the requirement.</p> <p>Business requirement – ACC 120, deficiency - Bidder did not address all elements of the requirement. Bidder did not demonstrate this functionality during the demo.</p> <p>Business requirement – ADMIN 50, deficiency – Bidder failed to mee the requirement.</p> <p>Business requirement – ARAS 10 – 70 & 90, 120, deficiency – Bidder failed to meet the requirement.</p> <p>Business requirement – ORD 100, deficiency – Bidder did not meet all elements of the requirement.</p>

		<p>Business requirement - ORD 200, deficiency – Bidder failed to meet requirement.</p> <p>Business requirement - ORD 230, deficiency - Vendor failed to provide a adequate response, State asked for different examples.</p> <p>Business requirement - CUST 90, deficiency - The bidder response states that the browser does not provide spellcheck. The requirement is that the solution provides spellcheck.</p> <p>Business requirement - CUST 110, deficiency - Bidder response does not demonstrate the requirement for the system to have a mechanism for external customers to validate that the name entered is the name that they intended to enter.</p> <p>Business requirement – CUST 170, deficiency - Bidder's response failed to meet expectations of this requirement.</p> <p>Business requirement – CUST 190, deficiency - The solution should only allow for ASCII printable characters as stated in the requirement. The response says that this is a current capability, but the comment states that certain characters are filtered and if other filtering is needed, customization is required.</p> <p>Business requirement - CUST 230, deficiency - SOM asked the vendor the relative question multiple times, vendor failed to provide an adequate response.</p> <p>Business requirement – DATA 10-100, deficiency - Vendor missed key collaboration point on data mapping</p>
--	--	--

		<p>early in the process that would ensure data quality.</p> <p>Business requirement – DOC 50, deficiency - Bidder's response failed to meet expectations of this requirement.</p> <p>Business requirement – DOC 120, deficiency – Bidder's response failed to meet expectations of this requirement.</p> <p>Business requirement – DOC 140, deficiency - Bidder indicates that the required functionality is not available.</p> <p>Business requirement - MAIL 10, deficiency - Initial Requirements response indicated customization required for ability to mail reports/statements to customers. This response only notes a configuration. Paper documents will not have account set ups. We are required to mail reports/statements unless customer opts into email.</p> <p>Business requirement - PAP 30, deficiency - The bidder response states that the browser provides spellcheck. The requirement is that the solution provides spellcheck.</p> <p>Business requirement - REJ 130, deficiency - Bidder did not address all elements of the requirement. Bidder did not demonstrate this functionality during the demo.</p> <p>Business requirement - REJ 150, deficiency - Bidder's response failed to meet expectations of this requirement.</p> <p>Business requirement – SHOP 10, deficiency - Demo did not support that shopping cart is a current capability</p>
--	--	--

			<p>despite answering this was a current capability in the bid response.</p> <p>Business requirement - SUBR 60, deficiency - The system must provide the ability to redact, a manual redaction solution, bidder does not meet the requirement.</p>
Attachment 1 – Key Personal and Resumes	100	95	Deficiency - Active certification does not support the level of responsibility for the assigned role.
Vendor Question Worksheet – Less Experience	60	60	Evaluated, no deficiencies noted
Vendor Question Worksheet – Experience (Section 5)	70	70	Evaluated, no deficiencies noted
Vendor Questions Worksheet – (Section 6) Agreement to the State’s Contract – Redlining may result in reduction in points, or possibly deeming the bid non-responsive.	70	70	Evaluated, no deficiencies noted
Schedule A - Statement of Work – Project Management & Implementation Approach	100	100	Evaluated, no deficiencies noted

TOTAL	700	680.55	
--------------	------------	---------------	--

Bidder C

Vendor Name: GRM Information Management Services Score: 0

GRM Information Management Services	Possible Points	Technical Score	Comments
Mandatory Minimum 5 - Bidder must have developed a business registry system solution that has been implemented or is in the process of being implemented in a state within the United States or office equivalent to the Michigan Corporations Division in a foreign country.	Pass or Fail.	Fail	Bidder Did not pass Mandatory Minimums 5 – bidder, marijuana registry system is not considered to be similar to a business registry system and are governed by different statutes.

Bidder D

Vendor Name: Tecuity, Inc Score: 693.95

Tecuity, Inc	Possible Points	Technical Score	Comments
Schedule A – Statement of Work	100	100	No deductions noted.

Schedule A - Table 1 Business Specifications Worksheet	200	198.95	<p>Business requirement – GEN 160, deficiency -Requirement is not current capability with no definitive date for the feature to be added.</p> <p>Business requirement - GEN 230, deficiency - Bidder's response failed to meet expectations of this requirement.</p> <p>Business requirement - ACC 120, deficiency - Requirement is not current capability with no definitive information that the cost and time to build this functionality was included in the proposal.</p> <p>Business requirement - SCAN 10, deficiency - Bidder's response failed to meet expectations of this requirement.</p> <p>Business requirement – IA -02(8), deficiency - encryption is not a replay resistant authentication solution.</p> <p>Business requirement – AC-02(3), deficiency – This feature is not available.</p>
Attachment 1 – Key Personal and Resumes	100	95	Contractor Security Officer – Deficiency, The Contractor Security Officer's specific experience in security as well as role in this project is not well described nor matches the requirement.
Vendor Question Worksheet – Less Experience	60	60	Evaluated and no deficiencies noted.
Vendor Question Worksheet – Experience (Section 5)	70	70	Evaluated and no deficiencies noted.

Vendor Questions Worksheet – (Section 6) Agreement to the State’s Contract – Redlining may result in reduction in points, or possibly deeming the bid non-responsive.	70	70	Evaluated and no deficiencies noted.
Schedule A - Statement of Work – Project Management & Implementation Approach	100	100	Evaluated and no deficiencies noted.
Total	700	693.95	

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

VI. Pricing Summary

After evaluating all RFP Bidders, Tecuity Inc, is the chosen bidder for the award of the RFP. The JEC team conducted several rounds of negotiations with the bidder and was able to come up with a savings of \$27,500, along with the elimination of the \$250,000 annual licensing fee. Saving all together \$277,500 for the initial term if the agreement.

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

Deliverable		Deloitte	Tecuity, Inc
1	Implementation	\$0	\$3,795,000
2	Licensing	\$5,795,000	\$700,000
3	Hosting	\$0	\$455,000
Total Price		\$5,795,000	\$4,950,000

After evaluating

VII. Award Recommendation

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offered the best value to the State of Michigan. Best value is based on the proposal meeting the minimum point threshold and offering the best combination of the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions Evaluation Process* section, and price. Best value factors for Award Recommendation included the bidder scoring the highest on Statement of Work elements, security, answers to vendor questions worksheet, and the no-licensing fee pricing model that represents long-term cost.

Award Recommendation is made to Tecuity Inc, in the amount of \$4,950,000.