

**AWARD RECOMMENDATION**

**Notice of Intent to Award Number: NIA1 171-260000000488**

**Notice of Intent to Award Date: 5/18/2026**

**Related to**

**Request for Proposal (RFP) 171-250000002999**

**ORS RFP for Atlas Modernization Project**

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of the above-referenced RFP and has recommended an award to **RSM US LLP** in the amount of **\$5,675,674.00**, 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:

Angela Wright, Solicitation Manager.  
 wrighta33@michigan.gov  
 517-899-4646

**Public copies of all bidder proposals can be found here:** [DTMB - Bid Proposals \(michigan.gov\)](#)

**Background Information:** This RFP was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide software development services to modernize ORS IT applications. The term of this contract is 15 months with up to 72 1-month renewal options.

**Bidders:** The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on 8/27/2025. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of 10/16/2025.

<b>Bidder</b>	<b>Address, City, State, Zip Code</b>	<b>SDVOB*</b>	<b>GDBE**</b>
HTC Global Services, Inc.	3270 West Big Beaver Road, Troy, Michigan 48084	No	No
RSM US LLP	30 South Wacker Drive, Suite 3300 Chicago, IL 60606	No	No
Slalom, Inc.	255 S King Street, Suite 1800 Seattle, WA 98104	No	No

\*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

\*\*GDBE: Geographically Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

## 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: Evaluation Process

The State will evaluate each proposal based on the following factors. Proposals receiving 80 or more evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and be considered for award.

	Technical Criteria Name	Weight
1.	Vendor Questions Worksheet	10
2.	Contractor Key Personnel	15
3.	Project Scope Schedule A-Statement of Work Sections 4-9, 11-23	15
4.	Project Scope Schedule A-Section 10	15
5.	Project Scope Schedule A-Section 24	20
6.	Project Scope Schedule A-Statement of Work Section 25	20
7.	Acceptance of Software Development Contract Terms & Conditions and Terms of Schedules C-E	5
	Total	100

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

### II. Evaluation Method

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

Voting	Advisory
Angela Wright DTMB	Travis Peake DTMB-ORS
Andy Kolp DTMB-ORS	Shivkumar Singh DTMB
Douglas Neil DTMB	Toby Pittman DTMB
Meg Skelley DTMB-ORS	Venkateshwaran Ramakrishnan DTMB
	Thasin Sardar DTMB
	Michael Nichols DTMB

	Gurpreet Singh	DTMB
	Anitha Japa	DTMB
	Corey Nunnery	DTMB
	Trevor Sweet	DTMB
	Spencer Mathews	DTMB
	Angela Sanborn	DTMB-ORS
	Mark Peckham	DTMB
	Shweta Aurora	DTMB
	Todd Stevens	DTMB
	Paolo DiLernia	DTMB
	Neelima Paleti	DTMB
	Carl Gonyea	DTMB
	David Szarenski	DTMB
	Kelly Wilson	DTMB
	Joshua Potter	DTMB
	Jameel Farooqui	DTMB
	Hariprasad Vecham	DTMB
	Jimmy Isaac	DTMB
	Suhasini Jegadeesan	DTMB
	Anna Scott	EPMO
	Imaad Thasin	EPMO
	Nicole McCastle	EPMO
	Pavan Kunapareddy	DTMB
	Benjamin Southwell	DTMB-ORS
	Marla Milton	DTMB-ORS
	Paula Webb	DTMB
	Elizabeth Harrison	DTMB-ORS
	Anthony Estell	DTMB-ORS
	Allison Wardlaw	DTMB-ORS
	Timothy McCormick	DTMB-ORS
	Joseph Rauschenberger	DTMB-ORS
	Manny Rosales	DTMB
	Anthony Rodgers	DTMB
	William Pemble	DTMB
	Ryan Dickerson	DTMB
	Gary Rogensues	DTMB
	Sarah Humphreys	DTMB-ORS
	Jennifer Cook	DTMB
	Jyotindra Khatri	DTMB
	Dennis Saylor	DTMB
	Carol Souza	DTMB
	Roberick Barretto	EPMO
	Heather Frick	DTMB

	Lauren Lonsbury	DTMB
	John Donovan	DTMB
	Puja Agrawal	DTMB
	Aishwarya KalyanKumar	DTMB
	Timothy LaRue	DTMB

### III. Evaluation Results

The JEC determined three of the three bidders had submitted Responsive proposals:

Bidder	Responsive
HTC Global Services, Inc.	Yes
RSM US LLP	Yes
Slalom, Inc.	Yes

The JEC then evaluated the three responsive proposals and determined that three of the three met the minimum 80 technical evaluation point threshold. The JEC derived the following technical scores from the bidders' written proposals:

#### EVALUATION SCORING: DEDUCTIONS SUMMARY

Criteria	HTC	RSM	Slalom
Vendor Questions Worksheet	-1.25	-3	-2.25
Contractor Key Personnel/Resumes	-6.25	-6.5	-4.5
Project Scope Schedule A-Statement of Work Sections 4-9, 11-23	-1.5	-0.5	-3
Project Scope Schedule A-Section 10	-4.5	0	-3.75
Project Scope Schedule A-Section 24	-1	0	-3
Project Scope Schedule A-Statement of Work Section 25	-2	0	-1
Acceptance of Software Development Contract Terms & Conditions and Terms of Schedules C-E	-1.5	-1.75	-1

Total Technical Evaluation Deductions	-18	-11.75	-18.5
<b>Overall Technical Evaluation Score</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>88.25</b>	<b>81.5</b>

**EVALUATION SCORING: DEDUCTIONS BREAKDOWN**

	HTC		RSM		Slalom	
	Company Background/Vendor Questions Worksheet		Company Background/Vendor Questions Worksheet		Company Background/Vendor Questions Worksheet	
<b>10 Total Points Available</b>	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>
Prior Experience 1	Failed to provide team structure and sprint cadence	-0.25	Failed to demonstrate Agile Scrum Framework, key objectives, team structure, sprint cadence and outcomes within the experience.	-1	Failed to demonstrate Agile Scrum Framework, key objectives, team structure, sprint cadence within the experience.	-0.75
Prior Experience 2	Failed to provide team structure and sprint cadence   Comparatively smaller SOW (\$2.9)	-0.5	Failed to demonstrate Agile Scrum Framework, key objectives, team structure, sprint cadence and outcomes within the experience.	-1	Failed to demonstrate Agile Scrum Framework, key objectives, team structure, sprint cadence within the experience.	-0.75
Prior Experience 3	Failed to provide team structure and sprint cadence   Comparatively smaller SOW (\$1.4)	-0.5	Failed to demonstrate Agile Scrum Framework, key objectives, team structure, sprint cadence and outcomes within the experience.	-1	Failed to demonstrate Agile Scrum Framework, key objectives, team structure, sprint cadence within the experience.	-0.75
	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-1.25</b>	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-2.25</b>
	Contractor Key Personnel/Resumes		Contractor Key Personnel/Resumes		Contractor Key Personnel/Resumes	
<b>15 Total Points Available</b>	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>
Project Manager	Failed to demonstrate PMP or Scrum Certification   Failed to demonstrate the required skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.5	Failed to provide PMP & Scrum Certification details   Failed to provide complete response for references  Failed to provide current references	-0.5	Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.25
Senior BA	Failed to demonstrate Scrum Certification  Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.5	Failed to provide Scrum Certification details   Failed to provide complete response for references   Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.75	Failed to meet Certification requirement   Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.5
HCD Specialist	Failed to meet the PMP or Scrum requirement   Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.75	Failed to meet the PMP or Scrum requirement   Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.75	Failed to meet Certification   Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.75
Functional Architect	Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.   Failed to provide references that are specific to this role	-0.75	Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.5	Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.5
Solution Architect	Failed to provide references that are specific to this role	-0.5	Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and	-0.75	Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.5

			project   Failed to provide responses to in references			
Azure Cloud Architect	Failed to provide responses to all questions.	-0.5	Failed to provide responses to in references   Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.75	Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.5
D365 CRM Architect Technical Lead	Failed to provide references that are similar is size projects	-0.5	Failed to meet the certification requirements   Failed to provide responses  Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.75		
UI UX Designer	Failed to demonstrate skills and experience for a project of this scope.	-0.5	Failed to provide response to references  Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.75		
Training Lead	Failed to demonstrate skills and experience for a project of this scope.	-0.5	Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.5	Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.5
QA Automation Testing Lead	Failed to provide reference details and responses. Failed to demonstrate skills and experience for a project of this scope.	-0.75	Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.5	Failed to demonstrate skills and experience to meet the requirements of the position and project.	-0.5
Security Officer	Failed to provide details in references   project allocation is not realistic	-0.5			Failed to include Scope of role in phases 2-5	-0.5
	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-6.25</b>	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-6.5</b>	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-4.5</b>
	<b>Project Scope Schedule A-Statement of Work Sections 4-9, 11-23</b>		<b>Project Scope Schedule A-Statement of Work Sections 4-9, 11-23</b>		<b>Project Scope Schedule A-Statement of Work Sections 4-9, 11-23</b>	
<b>15 Total Points Available</b>	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>
SOW Sec 4. IT Environment Responsibilities					Inconsistency in approach throughout the RFP submission.	-1
SOW Sec 5. ADA Compliance						
SOW Sec 6. User Type and Capacity					The response focuses on Dynamics 365 and Dataverse, which only represent a portion of the overall solution. Vendor response omits custom-built application, which is the majority of the solution.	-1
SOW Sec 7. Access Control and Audit						

SOW Sec 8. Data Retention, Disposal, and Retrieval						
SOW Sec 9. End User Operating Environment						
SOW Sec 11. Integration						
SOW Sec 12. Migration						
SOW Sec 13. Hardware						
SOW Sec 14. Training Services					Failed to provide training options to support the ORS Phased approach.	<b>-0.5</b>
SOW Sec 15. Transition Responsibilities						
SOW Sec 16. Documentation	Failed to provide examples	-0.5	Failed to provide examples	-0.5	Failed to provide examples	-0.5
SOW Sec 17. Additional Products and Services						
SOW Sec 18. Contractor Personnel						
SOW Sec 19. Contractor Key Personnel						
SOW Sec 20. Contractor Personnel Requirements						
SOW Sec 22. Meetings						
SOW Sec 23. Project Control & Reports	Failed to demonstrate the bidder's ability to deliver actionable insights and maintain alignment with ORS's Agile practices.	-1				
	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-1.5</b>	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-0.5</b>	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-3</b>
	<b>Project Scope Schedule A-Section 10</b>		<b>Project Scope Schedule A-Section 10</b>		<b>Project Scope Schedule A-Section 10</b>	

PROPOSAL SECTION	Deduction Reason/Description	Deduction Amount Totals	Deduction Reason/Description	Deduction Amount Totals	Deduction Reason/Description	Deduction Amount Totals
	Failed to provide a collaborative approach	-1			Inconsistent descriptions of infrastructure solution, software solution, and Data Modeling amongst the overall proposal and this section.	-3.75
	Failed to provide examples of how similar phased implementations have been successfully executed.	-1				
	Failed to follow ORS DevOps Workspace	-0.5				
	Story Point based pricing not Increment pricing is not consistent with ORS approach	-2				
	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-4.5</b>	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-3.75</b>
	<b>Project Scope Schedule A-Section 24</b>		<b>Project Scope Schedule A-Section 24</b>		<b>Project Scope Schedule A-Section 24</b>	
	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>
	Failed to demonstrate how each PMM/SEM requirement identified in the Milestones/Deliverables will be met.	-1			Failed to demonstrate how each PMM/SEM requirement identified in the Milestones/Deliverables will be met.	-1
					Conflicting response to Agile Delivery Model Approach, ORS vs Slalom Agile methodology	-2
	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-3</b>
	<b>Project Scope Schedule A-Statement of Work Section 25</b>		<b>Project Scope Schedule A-Statement of Work Section 25</b>		<b>Project Scope Schedule A-Statement of Work Section 25</b>	
	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>	<b>Deduction Reason/Description</b>	<b>Deduction Amount Totals</b>
	Failure to demonstrate HCD specialist support for Phase 4 & 5	-1			Failed to demonstrate how process will be sustained over time.	-1
	Inconsistency in response as it relates to the project dynamics between HCD and subcontractors	-1				
	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-1</b>
	<b>Acceptance of Software Development Contract Terms &amp; Conditions and Terms of Schedules C-E</b>		<b>Acceptance of Software Development Contract Terms &amp; Conditions and Terms of Schedules C-E</b>		<b>Acceptance of Software Development Contract Terms &amp; Conditions and Terms of Schedules C-E</b>	

PROPOSAL SECTION	Deduction Reason/Description	Deduction Amount Totals	Deduction Reason/Description	Deduction Amount Totals	Deduction Reason/Description	Deduction Amount Totals
Software Development T&C's	Failed to accept as presented	-1	Failed to accept as presented	-1	Failed to accept as presented	-1
Schedule C Insurance			Failed to accept as presented	-0.25		
Schedule D SLA	Failed to accept as presented	-0.5				
Schedule E Data Security Exhibit			Failed to accept as presented	-0.5		
	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-1.5</b>	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-1.75</b>	<b>Section Deductions Subtotal</b>	<b>-1</b>

**IV. Oral Presentations & Pricing**

Oral presentations were conducted, and pricing was evaluated. The JEC requested and received price concessions from two bidders. The following is a base Contract cost summary of the proposals that passed technical evaluation:

<b>Base Contract</b>	<b>HTC</b>	<b>RSM</b>	<b>Slalom</b>
<b>Total Implementation Fees Phase 1</b>	\$1,175,341.00	\$749,229.00	\$1,433,516.00
<b>Total Implementation Fees Phase 2</b>	9,959,835.00	\$4,926,445.00	\$4,016,480.00
<b>Base Contract Total</b>	<b>\$11,135,176.00</b>	<b>\$5,675,674.00</b>	<b>\$5,449,996.00</b>

**V. 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 factors stated in Technical Evaluation Criteria of the RFP and price. Past performance with the State was also a factor in determining best value. The JEC has determined that RSM US LLP, will provide the best value to the State and recommends award be made to RSM US LLP in the amount not to exceed \$5,675,674.00, pending State Administrative Board approval.