

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Notice of Intent to Award Number: 230000000225

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 220000003223, Informal Dispute Resolution (IDR) and Independent Informal Dispute Resolution (IIDR) Services and has recommended an award to iMPROve Health in the amount of \$556,875.00, 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:

Lauren Stempek, Solicitation Manager.
 stempekl@michigan.gov
 1-855-MI PURCH 1-855-647-8724

Background Information:

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide IDR and IIDR Services. The term of this contract is three (3) years, with up to three (3) additional one (1) year renewal options.

Bidders:

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on October 6th, 2022. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of October 21st, 2022 by 1:55 PM EST. until 10/21/2022 at 1:55

| Bidder | Address, City, State, Zip Code | SDVOB* |
|---|---|--------|
| CertiSurv, LLC | 112 W 7 th St. STE C, Columbia, TN 38401 | No |
| Michigan Peer Review Organization dba iMPROve Health | 625 Kenmoor Ave SE, Suite 350, PMB 47995, Grand Rapids, MI 49546-2395 | 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.

The State evaluated each proposal based on the following factors:

Solicitation Instructions, Section 7, Evaluation Process.

| Technical Evaluation Criteria | | Weight |
|-------------------------------|---|--------|
| 1. | Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1 | 50 |
| 2. | Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4 and 5 | 20 |
| 3. | Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-3 and 6-9 | 10 |
| 4. | Vendor Questions Worksheet | 20 |
| Total | | 100 |

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

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 (JEC), which consisted of the following individuals:

| Voting | Advisory |
|--|---|
| Steve Gobbo, Deputy Director LARA, Dept of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Survey and Certification | Joy Nakfoor, Category Manager, Services, DTMB - CPS |
| Lauren Stempek, Category Analyst, DTMB - CPS | Brenda Davis, Department Specialist, LARA, Finance and Administrative Services |

III. Evaluation Results

A. CertiSurv

The Evaluation Team determined that CertiSurv based on a score of 96, 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, Sections 1. Requirements (50/50)
 The Evaluation Committee determined that the overall responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.

2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4 and 5. Staffing, Project Management (20/20)
The Evaluation Committee determined that the overall responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.
3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-3 and 6-9. (10/10)
The Evaluation Committee determined that the overall responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.
4. Vendor Questions Worksheet. (16/20)
The Evaluation Committee determined that the overall responses were mostly satisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Section 5, State of Michigan Experience and Prior Experience, Experience 2 is mainly out of scope.
 - b. Section 5, State of Michigan Experience and Prior Experience, Experience 3 is mainly out of scope.

Total Score: 96/100

B. iMPROve Health

The Evaluation Team determined that iMPROve Health based on a score of 98, 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, Sections 1. Requirements (50/50)
The Evaluation Committee determined that the overall responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.
2. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4 and 5. Staffing, Project Management (20/20)
The Evaluation Committee determined that the overall responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.
3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-3 and 6-9. (10/10)
The Evaluation Committee determined that the overall responses were satisfactory, no deficiencies were noted.
4. Vendor Questions Worksheet. (18/20)
The Evaluation Committee determined that the overall responses were mostly satisfactory, the following deficiencies were noted:
 - a. Section 5, State of Michigan Experience and Prior Experience, Experience 2 is out of scope.

Total Score: 98/100

IV. Technical Evaluation Summary

| Selection Criteria | | CertiSurv, LLC | iMPROve Health |
|--------------------|---|----------------|----------------|
| 1 | Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1 | 50 | 50 |
| 2 | Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 4 & 5 | 20 | 20 |
| 3 | Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2-3 & 6-9 | 10 | 10 |
| 4 | Vendor Questions Worksheet | 16 | 18 |
| Total | | 96 | 98 |

V. Pricing Summary

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

CertiSurv:

| | Flat Fee Per Citation | Qualified Reviewer's Hourly Rate | Estimated Hours Per Review | Total Estimated Cost Per Review | Total Estimated Max # of Reviews Per Year | Total Max Estimated Review Cost Per Year | Total Contract Length in Years | Total |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|--------------|
| First 200 Reviews | \$125 | \$100 | 5 | \$625 | 200 | \$125,000 | 3 | \$375,000.00 |
| Any Reviews Over 200 | \$125 | \$100 | 5 | \$625 | No Limit | | 3 | |

*Quick Payment Terms: 2%NET15

iMPROve Health Round 1 Pricing:

| | Flat Fee Per Citation | Qualified Reviewer's Hourly Rate | Estimated Hours Per Review | Total Estimated Cost Per Review | Total Estimated Max # of Reviews Per Year | Total Max Estimated Review Cost Per Year | Total Contract Length in Years | Total |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|--------------|
| First 200 Reviews | \$130 | \$130 | 3.5 | \$585.00 | 200 | \$117,000 | 3 | \$351,000.00 |
| Any Reviews Over 200 | \$125 | \$125 | 3.5 | \$562.50 | 130 | \$73,125 | 3 | |

*Quick Payment Terms: 1%NET15

iMPROve Health Round 2 Pricing:

| | Flat Fee Per Citation | Qualified Reviewer's Hourly Rate | Estimated Hours Per Review | Total Estimated Cost Per Review | Total Estimated Max # of Reviews Per Year | Total Max Estimated Review Cost Per Year | Total Contract Length in Years | Total |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|--------------|
| First 200 Reviews | \$125 | \$125 | 3.5 | \$562.50 | 200 | \$112,500 | 3 | \$337,500.00 |
| Any Reviews Over 200 | \$125 | \$125 | 3.5 | \$562.50 | 130 | \$73,125 | 3 | |

*Quick Payment Terms: 1%NET15

VI. Negotiations

Cost avoidance achieved from pricing negotiations. Original proposed pricing at \$570,375.00 with revised pricing at \$556,875.00 avoiding \$13,500.00 in costs over base years.

VII. 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 Section 7, Evaluation Process* section, and price. Award Recommendation is made to iMPROve Health in the amount of \$556,875.00.

iMPROve Health provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include: Knowledge with Michigan process, staff have SMQT certifications, background checks done on a monthly basis, better overall pricing for life of the contract.

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.