

# AWARD RECOMMENDATION

**Notice of Intent to Award Number:** 23000000668

The Environment, Great Lakes, and Environment office has completed the evaluation of RFP # 220000003114 and has recommended an award to Agate Software Inc. in the amount of \$739,270.00, 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:

Sarah Platte, Solicitation Manager.  
 PlatteS3@Michigan.Gov  
 517-219-2406

### Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide a Grant Management System. 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 9/13/2023 The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of 11/3/2023.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*
<b>Agate Software Inc.</b>	2214 University Park Dr., Okemos, MI 48864	
<b>Costal Cloud Holdings, LLC</b>	1 Hammock Beach Parkway, Suite 200, Palm Coast, FL 32137	
<b>eCivis Inc</b>	777 South Figueroa Street, Suite 4600, Los Angeles, CA	
<b>HTC Global</b>	HTC Global Services, Inc., 3270 West Big Beaver Road, Troy, MI 48084	
<b>Smartsimple Software LTD</b>	38 W. Fulton Street, Suite 301, Grand Rapids, MI 49503	
<b>Information Strategies Inc</b>	5101 Wisconsin Ave., NW, Suite 420, Washington, DC 20016	
<b>Submittable Holdings</b>	101 E Front St, Suite 500, Missoula, MT 59802	

\*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

1. The system must be in production and currently used by a state or federal government for grants management.
2. System must have a current implementation where at least 10 different grant programs are being managed.
3. If the system is bid by an implementor or service provider, vendor must demonstrate experience implementing the system in a similar size and scope environment as EGLE.

### Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

	Technical Criteria Name	Weight
1.	Schedule A - Statement of Work	20
2.	Schedule A - Business Specification Worksheet	40
3.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	20
4.	Attachment 1, Bidder Resumes	20
	<b>Total</b>	100%

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

## II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by Solicitation Manager in collaboration with a Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Sarah Platte, Category Analyst, IT DTMB/Central Procurement Services	Paul McDonald, Finance Division Director EGLE
Brad Pagratis, Information Management Division EGLE	Sarah Howes, Special Projects Administrator EGLE
Laura Brancheau, Business Relationship Manager	Mallory Fox, Grants Analyst EGLE

Voting	Advisory
DTMB/Agency Services	
Lisa VanOstran, Procurement Manager EGLE	Jennifer Bronz, Category Manager, IT DTMB/Central Procurement Services
Lisa Hoeh, Finance Unit Supervisor EGLE	Craig Weaver, Enterprise Architect DTMB
Robert Sweet, EQA EGLE	Michael Bartkowiak, Cyber Security Expert DTMB/Michigan Cyber Security

**III. Evaluation Results - Please see attached evaluation document to see detailed deficiencies.**

**A. Agate Software Inc.**

The Evaluation Team determined that Agate Software Inc based on a score of 99.16, did 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 – 19.43/20  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. Bidder needs to maintain State requirements.
2. Schedule A – Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet – 39.73/40  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a) Requirements not currently available
  - b) Requirements not available
  - c) Requirements listed as needing configurations.
  - d) Solution not fully capturing the geometry needs.
3. Vendor Questions Worksheet – 20/20  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
4. Attachment 1, Resumes – 20/20
  - a) The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

**Total Score: 99.16/100**

**B. Costal Cloud Holdings, LLC**

The Evaluation Team determined that Coastal Cloud Holdings, LLC based on a score of 93.61, did 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 – 17.91/20

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

- a) Lack of detail in responses.
  - b) The solution not having a perpetual licenses.
  - c) Offshore resources are no longer allowed.
  - d) Did not address adherence to SUITE.
  - e) No WBS
  - f) Response did not include information about reports the State requested.
2. Schedule A – Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet – 39.73/40  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a) Requirements listed as needing customization.
  - g) Requirements not available.
  - h) File sizes need to be larger.
  - i) Solution not fully capturing the geometry needs.
3. Vendor Questions Worksheet – 16/20  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
- a. The State’s Terms and Conditions were not accepted as-is, reflecting minor modifications.
4. Attachment 1, Resumes – 20/20  
 a) The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

**Total Score:93.61/100**

**C. eCivis Inc**

The Evaluation Team determined that eCivis Inc based on a score of 90.74, did 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 – 18.01/20  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

  - a) Lack of detail in responses.
  - b) Did not respond to the requirement.
  - c) No WBS

- 2. Schedule A – Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet – 36.73/40  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:

  - b) Requirements listed as needing configuration.
  - c) Requirements listed as needing customization.
  - d) Requirements not available.
  - e) Did not classify bidder’s availability to meet a requirement.
  - f) Solution not fully capturing the geometry needs.

- 3. Vendor Questions Worksheet – 16/20

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

- a) The State's Terms and Conditions were not accepted as-is, reflecting minor modifications.
4. Attachment 1, Resumes – 20/20
  - a) The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

**Total Score: 90.74/100**

#### **D. HTC Global**

**The Evaluation Team determined that HTC Global based on a score of 97.66, did 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 – 19.38/20  
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a) Lack of detail in responses.
2. Schedule A – Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet – 38.28/40  
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a) Requirements listed as needing customization.
  - b) Requirements not currently available.
  - c) File sizes need to be larger.
  - d) Requirements not available.
  - e) Did not classify bidder's availability to meet a requirement.
  - f) Requirements listed as needing configurations.
  - g) Solution not fully capturing the geometry needs.
3. Vendor Questions Worksheet – 20/20  
The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - b. The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
4. Attachment 1, Resumes – 20/20
  - b) The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.

**Total Score: 97.66/100**

#### **E. Smartsimple Software LTD**

**The Evaluation Team determined that Smartsimple Software LTD. based on a score of 69.76, 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 – 14.29/20

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

- a) Please review spreadsheet.
- 2. Schedule A – Table 1 – Business Specification Worksheet – 39.47/40  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a) Requirements not currently available.
  - b) Requirements listed as needing configurations.
- 3. Vendor Questions Worksheet – 8/20  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. The State’s Terms and Conditions were not accepted as-is, reflecting minor modifications.
- 4. Attachment 1, Resumes – 8/20
  - a) There were several questions that were not filled out

**Total Score: 69.76/100**

**F. Information Strategies Inc**

**Bidder #3 has not met the requirements of being responsive and responsible due to:**

- a) References not included in resumes.
- b) There were a considerable number of questions not completed in Vendor questions and resumes.
- c) Multiple positions were not filled out.

**Total Score:0/100**

**G. Submittable Holdings**

**Bidder #3 has not met the requirements of being responsive and responsible due to:**

- a) References not included in resumes.
- b) There were a considerable number of questions not completed in Vendor questions and resumes.
- c) Multiple positions were not filled out.

**Total Score:0/100**

**IV. Technical Evaluation Summary**

<b>Selection Criteria</b>	<b>Agate Software Inc.</b>	<b>Coastal Cloud Holdings LLC</b>	<b>eCivis Inc.</b>	<b>HTC Global Services Inc</b>	<b>Smartsimple Software LTD</b>
---------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------

1	<b>Schedule A – Statement of Work</b>	<b>19.43</b>	<b>17.91</b>	<b>18.01</b>	<b>19.38</b>	<b>14.29</b>
2	<b>Business Specification Worksheet</b>	<b>39.73</b>	<b>39.71</b>	<b>36.73</b>	<b>38.28</b>	<b>39.47</b>
3	<b>Vendor Questions Worksheet</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8</b>
4	<b>Attachment 1, Resumes</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>99.16</b>	<b>93.61</b>	<b>90.74</b>	<b>97.66</b>	<b>69.76</b>

**V. Oral Presentations/Demonstrations**

The State held one round of demos to confirm details provided within the formal written responses.

**VI. Pricing Summary**

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

	<b>Agate Software Inc.</b>	<b>Coastal Cloud Holdings LLC</b>	<b>eCivis Inc.</b>	<b>HTC Global Services Inc</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$739,270.00</b>	<b>\$2,750,877.50</b>	<b>\$1,379,100 + \$750/user/year for licenses</b>	<b>\$1,288,000.00</b>

**VII. Negotiations**

Negotiations were held for pricing and terms. The final pricing is stated above.

**VIII. Award Recommendation**

The 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.

Agate Software Inc. provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include: favorable Terms and Conditions, scalability, reports and dashboards, and user-friendliness, Favorable pricing was also a factor that was included in making the award decision.

Award Recommendation is made to Agate Software Inc. in the amount of \$739,270.00 for a 5-year contract with 5, 1-year options.