

Interoffice Memo

To: William Pemble, Director
Procurement, IT Division

From: David Hatch
Buyer, IT Division

Date: May 27, 2016

Subject: Award Recommendation RFP number - 007116B0006788
Michigan Department of Technology Management & Budget (DTMB) Michigan Master Computing Program

GENERAL

The State of Michigan (State) issued Request for Proposal (RFP) # 007116B0006788 to solicit responses from qualified vendors to provide products and services for the Michigan Master Computing Program (Bidder) for the State for an initial ten (10) year contract.

The primary components of this request include:

- General Overview of Bidder capabilities including reporting, meeting SLAs, etc.
- Module 1: Computer Hardware (including OEM Software), Hardware Maintenance, & associated Professional Services.
- Module 2: Licensed Software, Software Maintenance, & associated Professional Services.

Bidders could submit proposals on either Module 1, Module 2, or both modules.

JOINT EVALUATION COMMITTEE

A Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC), chaired by the Department of Technology Management and Budget (DTMB) Procurement was established to evaluate proposals. The table below details the JEC membership:

Voting Members	Advisory Members
Hatch, David – DTMB (JEC Chair) Mary Ladd – DTMB Brad Pagratis – DTMB Natalie Spaniolo – DTMB David Roach – DTMB	Chad Hardin – DTMB (Program Manager) Ashley Adrian – DTMB Dave Archer – DTMB Lindsey Barnard – DTMB Jarrod Barron – DTMB Ed Bradley – DTMB Anila Francis – DTMB Scott Hall – DTMB Nick Nelson – DTMB Stacey Nieto – DTMB Reid Sisson – DTMB Rich Reasner – DTMB Lacey Wilke – DTMB

RFP POSTING AND BIDDERS

The State posted the RFP to www.buy4michigan.com on 12/23/2015. A mandatory Pre-Bid Conference was held on 1/14/2016 that provided vendors the opportunity to ask questions related to the RFP. The State provided two initial opportunities for vendors to submit written clarification questions on 12/30/2015, and 1/15/2016. Vendors were provided with a third opportunity to submit clarification questions through 2/29/2016, and the due date for proposals was extended to 3/18/2016.

In total 6 Amendments were issued and are summarized below:

Amendment #	Description of Amendment	Posted Date
<u>1</u>	Mandatory Pre-Bid Meeting Information and Q&A Round 1 State Answers	01/12/2016
<u>2</u>	Pre-Bid Meeting Slides	01/14/2016
<u>3</u>	This amendment has two attachments. The first attachment contains information about the extension, pre-bid meeting attendance, and has the Round 2 Q and A Part 1 answers (there will be a part two as several questions are still being reviewed). The second attachment is a list of the pre-bid meeting attendees including name, company name, sign-in time, and email address for both in-person and web conference attendees.	02/02/2016
<u>4</u>	This amendment has two attachments. The first attachment contains information about Round 3 Q and A, RFP edits, and has the Round 2 Q and A Part 2 answers. The second attachment is an updated spreadsheet for the pricing tables which coincide with answers from the Q and A.	02/23/2016
<u>5</u>	Round 3 Questions with State Answers. The State is still gathering information for a couple of the questions.	03/08/2016
<u>6</u>	Additional Questions and Answers that were left off of the Round 3 Q&A.	03/10/2016

The following table summarizes the Bidders who submitted proposals by the published deadline of 3:00 p.m. EST on 3/18/2016 and the Module(s) they proposed for.

Bidder	Module 1 - Hardware	Module 2 - Software
CDWG	X	X
Dell	X	X
GovConnection	X	X
HPE	X	X
Insight Public Sector	X	X
Office Depot	X	Did Not Propose
SHI International Corp	X	X
Vaske Computer, Inc. (Collier IT)	X	X
Zones, Inc	X	X

AWARD PROCESS

The JEC followed a four step process prior to making an award recommendation:

Step 1 – Mandatory Minimum Requirements (Pass/Fail)

Step 2 – Technical Proposal Evaluation – General (Passing Score of 85+ points)

Step 3 – Separate Technical Proposal Evaluations for Module 1 - Hardware and Module 2 – Software (Passing Score of 85+ points)

Step 4 – Pricing Evaluation

Step 1 - Mandatory Minimum Requirements

Bidders were required to meet and comply with all Mandatory Minimum Requirements identified in the Instructions to Bidder. The JEC determined PASS/FAIL compliance with each of the Mandatory Minimum Requirements. A Provider was required to pass ALL Mandatory Minimum Requirements to have their proposal considered further.

Step 2 - Technical Proposal Evaluation – General Overview

Only those Bidders that met all of the Mandatory Minimum Requirements provided in Step 1 above as determined by the Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) advanced to Step 2.

In Step 2 proposals were evaluated against the scoring criteria weights provided in RFP. In scoring the proposals, the JEC considered documentation within the written proposals, clarification responses and reserved the ability to use the Oral Presentations to adjust scoring under one or more of the Technical Evaluation Criteria categories as appropriate. The following chart details the technical evaluation criteria and scoring weights for Step 2:

Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria – General Overview	Points Possible
1.	General Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products; • Section 1.0.6: Statement of Work Process; • Section 1.0.7: Leasing • Section 1.0.12: Transition Plan at Contract's End; • Section 1.0.13: Contract Performance • Section 1.0.14: Pricing and Invoicing Requirements 	30
2.	Contractor Program Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.9: Contractor Staff, Roles, and Responsibilities; • Section 1.0.10: Roles and Responsibilities of the State; • Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's 	15
3.	Section 1.0.11: Contract Program Implementation Plan	10
4.	Exhibit B: General Proposal Requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2: Company Background Information 4: Experience with the State of Michigan 5: Gross Annual Sales 6: Experience 7: Strategic Relationships 9: Standard Contract 	30
5.	Section 1.0.8: Reporting	15
Total (100 points possible)		100

The points awarded to each Bidder by the JEC with supporting analysis has been provided in the Bidder specific sections of this Synopsis for all Bidders that passed Step 1 (Mandatory Minimum Requirements).

Step 3 – Technical Proposal Evaluation – Module 1 Hardware & Module 2 Software

Only those Bidders that scored 85 points or more during Step 2 above as determined by the Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) advanced to Step 3.

In Step 3 the JEC evaluated proposals for Bidders' Module 1 – Hardware, Module 2 – Software, or both against the technical criteria below which was included in the RFP.

Item	Module 1 – Hardware Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible
1.	General Hardware Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.3: In Scope • Section 1.1.4: Out of Scope • Section 1.1.7: Product Technology Roadmaps • Section 1.1.10: Environmental (Green) Requirements 	10
2.	End-User Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.5.1: End-User Devices; • Section 1.1.5.3: End-User Device Asset-Tagging; • Section 1.1.5.4: State Hard-Drive Image; • Section 1.1.5.5: Evaluation Units 	25
3.	Section 1.1.5.6.1: Core Server Brands	25
4.	Miscellaneous Hardware <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.5.2: Peripherals • Section 1.1.6: Discretionary Hardware 	10
5.	Section 1.1.8: Hardware Installation, Integration, and Implementation Services	20
6.	Exhibit B: Experience with Hardware Services	10
	Total (100 points possible)	100

Item	Module 2 – Software Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible
1.	General Software Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.2.3: In Scope • Section 1.2.4: Out of Scope • Section 1.2.5.1: Software Delivery and Licenses • Section 1.2.5.2: Publisher Software License Agreements 	10
2.	Section 1.2.5.3: Core Software	40
3.	Section 1.2.5.4: Discretionary Software	20
4.	Section 1.2.6: Software Installation, Integration, and Implementation Services	20
5.	Exhibit B: Experience with Software and Services	10
	Total (100 points possible)	100

Step 4 - Pricing Evaluation

Those proposals receiving 85 or more technical evaluation points in Step 3, for either module, had their pricing evaluated in Step 4 and were considered for the awarding of one or both modules depending on which portion of their proposal passed Step 3.

Award Recommendation of Best Value Bidder

The award recommendation was to be made to the responsive and responsible Bidders who offered the best value to the State. Best value was determined by selecting the Bidders that met all Mandatory Minimum Requirements, met the minimum Technical Evaluation point threshold, met the minimum Technical Evaluation point threshold for Module 1- Hardware, Module 2 – Software, or both; and offered the best combination of the Technical Evaluation Criteria, and pricing as demonstrated by its proposal. The State

will post the award (“Notice of Recommendation”) on www.buy4michigan.com.

MANDATORY MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS EVALUATION RESULTS

Step 1 - Mandatory Minimum Requirements

The JEC determined that 8 of the 9 Bidders who submitted proposals met both Mandatory Minimum Requirements and were advanced to Step 2 to have their proposals evaluated. The Bidder whose proposal did not meet both of the Minimum Mandatory Requirements did not advance to Step 2 and was not evaluated further.

Bidder	Mandatory Minimum Requirement (Pass/Fail)	
	1 – ERP Integration	2 – MIDEAL Portal
CDWG	Pass	Pass
Dell	Pass	Pass
GovConnection	Pass	Pass
HPE	Pass	Pass
Insight Public Sector	Pass	Pass
Office Depot	Pass	Pass
SHI International Corp	Pass	Pass
Vaske Computer, Inc. (Collier IT)	Fail	Pass
Zones, Inc	Pass	Pass

TECHNICAL EVALUATION RESULTS SUMMARY

Step 2 – Technical Evaluation Results Summary for – General Overview; **AND**

Step 3 – Technical Evaluation Results Summary for – Module 1 – Hardware, or Module 2 – Software, or both.

Individual breakdowns of the Technical Evaluation by Bidder follows in the table below:

Bidder	Technical Evaluation Score Summary (85+ Required to Advance)*		
	Step 2 – General Overview	Step 3 – Module 1 – Hardware	Step 3 – Module 2 - Software
CDWG	92	99	95
Dell	85	85	85
GovConnection	74	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated
HPE	79	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated
Insight Public Sector	88	58	97
Office Depot	68	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated
SHI International Corp	85	66	92
Vaske Computer, Inc. (Collier IT)	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated
Zones, Inc	67	Not Evaluated	Not Evaluated

***Oral Presentations** – The four bidders that passed the General Overview section were invited to give Oral Presentations after Step 3. No point adjustments were made based on Oral Presentations.

CDWG Technical Evaluation

CDWG – Step 2 Technical Evaluation General Overview			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products; • Section 1.0.6: Statement of Work Process; • Section 1.0.7: Leasing • Section 1.0.12: Transition Plan at Contract's End; • Section 1.0.13: Contract Performance • Section 1.0.14: Pricing and Invoicing Requirements 	30	28
2.	Contractor Program Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.9: Contractor Staff, Roles, and Responsibilities; • Section 1.0.10: Roles and Responsibilities of the State; • Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's 	15	11
3.	Section 1.0.11: Contract Program Implementation Plan	10	10
4.	Exhibit B: General Proposal Requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2: Company Background Information 4: Experience with the State of Michigan 5: Gross Annual Sales 6: Experience 7: Strategic Relationships 9: Standard Contract 	30	28
5.	Section 1.0.8: Reporting	15	15
Total (100 points possible)		100	92

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **CDWG**, based on a score of **92, DID MEET** the RFP's minimum passing point threshold for **General Overview**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider's ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of General Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products)

- A special order restocking fee will be charged.

(Section 1.0.7: Leasing)

- Minimal details provided/specified around the leasing program, mostly financial components.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Contractor Program Support:

(Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's)

- Contractor Transition Manager (CTM) Scope and References were limited.
- Contractor Project Manager (CPM) Scope and References were limited.

The following was considered in the JEC's scoring of General Proposal Requirements:

(4: Experience with the State of Michigan)

CDWG Technical Evaluation

- Limited experience with the State of Michigan.

(9: Standard Contract)

- Did not accept Standard Contract Terms, provided redlines.

CDWG – Step 3 Technical Evaluation Module 1 Hardware			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Hardware Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.3: In Scope • Section 1.1.4: Out of Scope • Section 1.1.7: Product Technology Roadmaps • Section 1.1.10: Environmental (Green) Requirements 	10	10
2.	End-User Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.5.1: End-User Devices; • Section 1.1.5.3: End-User Device Asset-Tagging; • Section 1.1.5.4: State Hard-Drive Image; • Section 1.1.5.5: Evaluation Units 	25	24
3.	Section 1.1.5.6.1: Core Server Brands	25	25
4.	Miscellaneous Hardware <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.5.2: Peripherals • Section 1.1.6: Discretionary Hardware 	10	10
5.	Section 1.1.8: Hardware Installation, Integration, and Implementation Services	20	20
6.	Exhibit B: Experience with Hardware Services	10	10
Total (100 points possible)		100	99

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **CDWG**, based on a score of **99, DID MEET** the RFP's minimum passing point threshold for **Module 1 - Hardware**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider's ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of End-User Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.1.5.5: Evaluation Units)

- Did not provide a 30 day evaluation opportunity in proposal as requested by the State.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Overall Quality of Response:

- No data recovery services proposed.

CDWG – Step 3 Technical Evaluation Module 2 Software			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Software Service Capabilities:	10	10

CDWG Technical Evaluation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.2.3: In Scope • Section 1.2.4: Out of Scope • Section 1.2.5.1: Software Delivery and Licenses • Section 1.2.5.2: Publisher Software License Agreements 		
2.	Section 1.2.5.3: Core Software	40	38
3.	Section 1.2.5.4: Discretionary Software	20	17
4.	Section 1.2.6: Software Installation, Integration, and Implementation Services	20	10
5.	Exhibit B: Experience with Software and Services	10	20
	Total (100 points possible)	100	95

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **CDWG**, based on a score of **95, DID MEET** the RFP's minimum passing point threshold for **Module 2 - Software**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider's ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Section 1.2.5.3: Core Software:

- Failed to adequately address how Bidder would assume State's existing Microsoft Enterprise Agreement.

The following was considered in the JEC's scoring of Section 1.2.6: Software Installation, Integration, and Implementation Services:

- Provided limited detail regarding installation, integration and implementation services approach.

DELL Technical Evaluation – General Overview

DELL – Step 2 Technical Evaluation General Overview			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products; • Section 1.0.6: Statement of Work Process; • Section 1.0.7: Leasing • Section 1.0.12: Transition Plan at Contract's End; • Section 1.0.13: Contract Performance • Section 1.0.14: Pricing and Invoicing Requirements 	30	23
2.	Contractor Program Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.9: Contractor Staff, Roles, and Responsibilities; • Section 1.0.10: Roles and Responsibilities of the State; • Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's 	15	10
3.	Section 1.0.11: Contract Program Implementation Plan	10	10
4.	Exhibit B: General Proposal Requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2: Company Background Information 4: Experience with the State of Michigan 5: Gross Annual Sales 6: Experience 7: Strategic Relationships 9: Standard Contract 	30	27
5.	Section 1.0.8: Reporting	15	15
Total (100 points possible)		100	85

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **DELL**, based on a score of **85, DID MEET** the RFP's minimum passing point threshold for **General Overview**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider's ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of General Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products)

- Will not provide packing slips with requested format.
- Shipping handling and restocking costs and process do not meet requirements.

(Section 1.0.13: Contract Performance)

- All metrics had significant conditions associated with each vendor response or could not meet SLA.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Contractor Program Support:

(Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's)

- Did not associate provided key personnel with State required roles.
- No references provided for key personnel.
- Percent onsite not indicated.

The following was considered in the JEC's scoring of General Proposal Requirements:

DELL Technical Evaluation – General Overview

(6: Experience)

- No size (\$) for all three experiences; but a few additional experiences show size and complexity.

(9: Standard Contract)

- Did not accept Standard Contract Terms, provided redlines.

DELL – Step 3 Technical Evaluation Module 1 Hardware			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Hardware Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.3: In Scope • Section 1.1.4: Out of Scope • Section 1.1.7: Product Technology Roadmaps • Section 1.1.10: Environmental (Green) Requirements 	10	10
2.	End-User Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.5.1: End-User Devices; • Section 1.1.5.3: End-User Device Asset-Tagging; • Section 1.1.5.4: State Hard-Drive Image; • Section 1.1.5.5: Evaluation Units 	25	21
3.	Section 1.1.5.6.1: Core Server Brands	25	21
4.	Miscellaneous Hardware <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.5.2: Peripherals • Section 1.1.6: Discretionary Hardware 	10	10
5.	Section 1.1.8: Hardware Installation, Integration, and Implementation Services	20	18
6.	Exhibit B: Experience with Hardware Services	10	5
	Total (100 points possible)	100	85

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **DELL**, based on a score of **85, DID MEET** the RFP's minimum passing point threshold for **Module 1 - Hardware**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider's ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of End-User Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.1.5.1: End-User Devices)

- Primarily offering Dell products with minimal or no access to other required vendors.

(Section 1.1.5.5: Evaluation Units)

- Did not provide a 30 day evaluation opportunity in proposal as requested by the State.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Section 1.1.5.6.1: Core Server Brands:

DELL Technical Evaluation – General Overview

- Cannot provide Hewlett Packard servers.
- Cannot provide IBM servers.

The following were considered in the JEC’s scoring of Section 1.1.8: Hardware Installation, Integration, and Implementation Services:

- Quality of bid response in this section provided no specific services as requested.

The following were considered in the JEC’s scoring of Exhibit B: Experience with Hardware Services:

- Did not provide size and full information for experience #1.
- Did not provide size for experience #2.
- Did not provide size and full information for experience #3.

DELL – Step 3 Technical Evaluation Module 2 Software			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Software Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Section 1.2.3: In Scope• Section 1.2.4: Out of Scope• Section 1.2.5.1: Software Delivery and Licenses• Section 1.2.5.2: Publisher Software License Agreements	10	8
2.	Section 1.2.5.3: Core Software	40	33
3.	Section 1.2.5.4: Discretionary Software	20	20
4.	Section 1.2.6: Software Installation, Integration, and Implementation Services	20	20
5.	Exhibit B: Experience with Software and Services	10	4
	Total (100 points possible)	100	85

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **DELL**, based on a score of **85, DID MEET** the RFP’s minimum passing point threshold for **Module 2 - Software**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider’s ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC’s scoring of General Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.2.5.1: Software Delivery and Licenses)

- Placed burden on State for establishing Bidder as a reseller for software which the State already purchases.

The following were considered in the JEC’s scoring of Section 1.2.5.3: Core Software:

- Cannot provide HP software.

DELL Technical Evaluation – General Overview

- Did not clearly demonstrate they could provide MS Premier Support.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Exhibit B: Experience with Software and Services:

- Bidder provided limited Software experience details, the State cannot evaluate much with this information.

GovConnection Technical Evaluation – General Overview

GovConnection – Step 2 Technical Evaluation General Overview			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products; • Section 1.0.6: Statement of Work Process; • Section 1.0.7: Leasing • Section 1.0.12: Transition Plan at Contract's End; • Section 1.0.13: Contract Performance • Section 1.0.14: Pricing and Invoicing Requirements 	30	18
2.	Contractor Program Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.9: Contractor Staff, Roles, and Responsibilities; • Section 1.0.10: Roles and Responsibilities of the State; • Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's 	15	10
3.	Section 1.0.11: Contract Program Implementation Plan	10	10
4.	Exhibit B: General Proposal Requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2: Company Background Information 4: Experience with the State of Michigan 5: Gross Annual Sales 6: Experience 7: Strategic Relationships 9: Standard Contract 	30	24
5.	Section 1.0.8: Reporting	15	12
Total (100 points possible)		100	74

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **GovConnection**, based on a score of **74, DID NOT MEET** the RFP's minimum passing point threshold for **General Overview**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider's ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of General Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products)

- Will not honor initial quoted cost on replacement items.
- Heavy weight items shipping costs are not rolled into price; adds huge administrative burden to State PO processing.
- No refund or exchanges on major hardware vendors used by the State, creating a significant limitation on the State's ability to support business as usual.
- DOA process creates a major logistics burden to the State.

(Section 1.0.13: Contract Performance)

- Major changes to SLA's which create difficulty for the State to support effective technology usage.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Contractor Program Support:

(Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's)

- No references provided.

GovConnection Technical Evaluation – General Overview

- Scope and size for second resume were too small, not sufficient experience.

The following was considered in the JEC's scoring of General Proposal Requirements:

(2: Company Background Information)

- Overall size and scope of company is not what we anticipate a vendor should be to handle the State's business.

(4: Experience with the State of Michigan)

- Limited experience with the State.

(6: Experience)

- Only cited hardware experience
- Experience #1 size too small.
- Experience #2 size too small.
- Experience #3 size and scope too small.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Reporting:

- Warranty reporting does not meet State's requirements.
- Asset reporting does not meet State's requirements.

HPES Technical Evaluation – General Overview

HPES – Step 2 Technical Evaluation General Overview			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products; • Section 1.0.6: Statement of Work Process; • Section 1.0.7: Leasing • Section 1.0.12: Transition Plan at Contract's End; • Section 1.0.13: Contract Performance • Section 1.0.14: Pricing and Invoicing Requirements 	30	26
2.	Contractor Program Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.9: Contractor Staff, Roles, and Responsibilities; • Section 1.0.10: Roles and Responsibilities of the State; • Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's 	15	15
3.	Section 1.0.11: Contract Program Implementation Plan	10	10
4.	Exhibit B: General Proposal Requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2: Company Background Information 4: Experience with the State of Michigan 5: Gross Annual Sales 6: Experience 7: Strategic Relationships 9: Standard Contract 	30	17
5.	Section 1.0.8: Reporting	15	11
Total (100 points possible)		100	79

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **HPES**, based on a score of **79, DID NOT MEET** the RFP's minimum passing point threshold for **General Overview**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider's ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of General Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products)

- No shipping notification to State as requested.
- State unable to change order after issued as requested which adds costs and administrative burden to the State.

(Section 1.0.14: Pricing and Invoicing Requirements)

- SLAs have been missed in work with the State.

The following was considered in the JEC's scoring of General Proposal Requirements:

(2: Company Background Information)

- In current litigation with the State.

(4: Experience with the State of Michigan)

HPES Technical Evaluation – General Overview

- Majority of State relationship with HP has been impacted by the litigation.

(9: Standard Contract)

- Did not accept the State's terms and conditions; provided redlines.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Reporting:

- No software license keys to be provided to the State.
- Limited Ad Hoc reporting.

Insight Public Sector Technical Evaluation – General Overview

Insight Public Sector – Step 2 Technical Evaluation General Overview			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products; • Section 1.0.6: Statement of Work Process; • Section 1.0.7: Leasing • Section 1.0.12: Transition Plan at Contract's End; • Section 1.0.13: Contract Performance • Section 1.0.14: Pricing and Invoicing Requirements 	30	22
2.	Contractor Program Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.9: Contractor Staff, Roles, and Responsibilities; • Section 1.0.10: Roles and Responsibilities of the State; • Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's 	15	12
3.	Section 1.0.11: Contract Program Implementation Plan	10	10
4.	Exhibit B: General Proposal Requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2: Company Background Information 4: Experience with the State of Michigan 5: Gross Annual Sales 6: Experience 7: Strategic Relationships 9: Standard Contract 	30	29
5.	Section 1.0.8: Reporting	15	15
Total (100 points possible)		100	88

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **Insight Public Sector**, based on a score of **88, DID MEET** the RFP's minimum passing point threshold for **General Overview**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider's ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of General Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products)

- Five days is too short for damage/discrepancies; does not give the State sufficient processing time.
- Multiple inconsistent return policies; not taking full role of prime as needed by the State.
- Will not meet metrics.

(Section 1.0.13: Contract Performance)

- Rejected PC and Server warranty SLAs.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Contractor Program Support:

(Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's)

- Contractor Transition Manager (CTM) not specified.
- No contact information for references.

Insight Public Sector Technical Evaluation – General Overview

The following was considered in the JEC’s scoring of General Proposal Requirements:

(4: Experience with the State of Michigan)

- Limited experience with the State of Michigan.

The following were considered in the JEC’s scoring of Reporting:

- Ad Hoc Reporting cannot be done by the State.

Insight Public Sector – Step 3 Technical Evaluation Module 1 Hardware			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Hardware Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.3: In Scope • Section 1.1.4: Out of Scope • Section 1.1.7: Product Technology Roadmaps • Section 1.1.10: Environmental (Green) Requirements 	10	7
2.	End-User Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.5.1: End-User Devices; • Section 1.1.5.3: End-User Device Asset-Tagging; • Section 1.1.5.4: State Hard-Drive Image; • Section 1.1.5.5: Evaluation Units 	25	12
3.	Section 1.1.5.6.1: Core Server Brands	25	18
4.	Miscellaneous Hardware <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.5.2: Peripherals • Section 1.1.6: Discretionary Hardware 	10	8
5.	Section 1.1.8: Hardware Installation, Integration, and Implementation Services	20	10
6.	Exhibit B: Experience with Hardware Services	10	3
Total (100 points possible)		100	58

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **Insight Public Sector**, based on a score of **58, DID NOT MEET** the RFP’s minimum passing point threshold for **Module 1 - Hardware**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider’s ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC’s scoring of General Hardware Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.1.3: In Scope)

- Did not accept State’s request for bidder to meet green requirements.

The following were considered in the JEC’s scoring of End-User Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.1.5.3: End-User Device Asset-Tagging)

- Inefficient and unclear asset-tagging method proposed.
- Impacts delivery time and warranty coverage.

Insight Public Sector Technical Evaluation – General Overview

- Didn't indicate how State offices in the Upper Peninsula would be covered.

(Section 1.1.5.4: State Hard-Drive Image)

- Provided response indicates a security risk in the process.

(Section 1.1.5.5: Evaluation Units)

- Evaluation unit process is unclear.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Core Server Brands:

- No plan and support information provided in proposal for Dell server products.
- No plan and support information in proposal for IBM products.
- No plan and support information provided in proposal for APC products

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Miscellaneous Hardware:

(Section 1.1.6: Discretionary Hardware)

- No work product or installation information provided.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Hardware Installation, Integration, and Implementation Services

- No insight provided on what can be done by bidder or who would actually be providing the services.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Experience with Hardware Services:

- Experience #1 scope and size are small.
- Experience #2 scope and size are small.
- Experience #3 not provided.

Insight Public Sector – Step 3 Technical Evaluation Module 2 Software			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Software Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.2.3: In Scope • Section 1.2.4: Out of Scope • Section 1.2.5.1: Software Delivery and Licenses • Section 1.2.5.2: Publisher Software License Agreements 	10	10
2.	Section 1.2.5.3: Core Software	40	40
3.	Section 1.2.5.4: Discretionary Software	20	17
4.	Section 1.2.6: Software Installation, Integration, and Implementation Services	20	20
5.	Exhibit B: Experience with Software and Services	10	10
	Total (100 points possible)	100	97

Insight Public Sector Technical Evaluation – General Overview

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **Insight Public Sector**, based on a score of **97, DID MEET** the RFP's minimum passing point threshold for **Module 2 - Software**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider's ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Section 1.2.5.3: Core Software:

- Failed to adequately address how Bidder would assume State's existing Microsoft Enterprise Agreement.

Office Depot Technical Evaluation – General Overview

Office Depot – Step 2 Technical Evaluation General Overview			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products; • Section 1.0.6: Statement of Work Process; • Section 1.0.7: Leasing • Section 1.0.12: Transition Plan at Contract's End; • Section 1.0.13: Contract Performance • Section 1.0.14: Pricing and Invoicing Requirements 	30	23
2.	Contractor Program Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.9: Contractor Staff, Roles, and Responsibilities; • Section 1.0.10: Roles and Responsibilities of the State; • Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's 	15	9
3.	Section 1.0.11: Contract Program Implementation Plan	10	10
4.	Exhibit B: General Proposal Requirements 2: Company Background Information 4: Experience with the State of Michigan 5: Gross Annual Sales 6: Experience 7: Strategic Relationships 9: Standard Contract	30	14
5.	Section 1.0.8: Reporting	15	12
Total (100 points possible)		100	68

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **Office Depot**, based on a score of **68, DID NOT MEET** the RFP's minimum passing point threshold for **General Overview**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider's ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of General Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products)

- No advance exchange as requested by State.
- Not all items covered in return policy.
- No cancellation of orders after order is placed.
- No change of order before shipping after order is placed.
- Extra work on State for large orders.

(Section 1.0.13: Contract Performance)

- Cannot meet State requested time frames for 2 metric related to the State's primary IT commodities.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Contractor Program Support:

(Section 1.0.9: Contractor Staff, Roles, and Responsibilities)

- Not able to meet State required background checks.

Office Depot Technical Evaluation – General Overview

- Response on industry knowledge did not show deep knowledge of the industry as expected for this program.

(Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's)

- Size and scope on all resumes were insufficient; showing the proposed resources do not have experience with a contract relationship of the size proposed in the RFP.

The following was considered in the JEC's scoring of General Proposal Requirements:

(2: Company Background Information)

- No explanation for contract terminations

(6: Experience)

- Experience #1 was not of sufficient size and scope.
- Experience #2 was not of sufficient size, scope, and information was not complete as requested.
- Experience #3 was not of sufficient size, scope, and information was not complete as requested.

(7: Strategic Relationships)

- Did not demonstrate and define partnerships.

(9: Standard Contract Terms)

- Provided significant redlines on terms and conditions.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Reporting:

- Asset management reporting does not meet the State's requirements.

SHI International Corp Technical Evaluation – General Overview

SHI International Corp – Step 2 Technical Evaluation General Overview			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products; • Section 1.0.6: Statement of Work Process; • Section 1.0.7: Leasing • Section 1.0.12: Transition Plan at Contract's End; • Section 1.0.13: Contract Performance • Section 1.0.14: Pricing and Invoicing Requirements 	30	24
2.	Contractor Program Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.9: Contractor Staff, Roles, and Responsibilities; • Section 1.0.10: Roles and Responsibilities of the State; • Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's 	15	10
3.	Section 1.0.11: Contract Program Implementation Plan	10	10
4.	Exhibit B: General Proposal Requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2: Company Background Information 4: Experience with the State of Michigan 5: Gross Annual Sales 6: Experience 7: Strategic Relationships 9: Standard Contract 	30	28
5.	Section 1.0.8: Reporting	15	13
Total (100 points possible)		100	85

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **SHI International Corp**, based on a score of **85, DID MEET** the RFP's minimum passing point threshold for **General Overview**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider's ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of General Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products)

- Lack of detail on additional delivery options.
- Lack of notification email as requested.
- Will not provide packing slips as requested.
- State not able to return unopened boxes as requested.

(Section 1.0.7: Leasing)

- Lacks details, comments are not responsive, and no identification of leasing value add given as requested.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Contractor Program Support:

(Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's)

- Scope and size of experience for all three resources were insufficient for a contract of this size.
- Onsite information and references were insufficient for all three resources for a contract of this size.

SHI International Corp Technical Evaluation – General Overview

The following was considered in the JEC’s scoring of General Proposal Requirements:

(6: Experience)

- Experience #1 was not of sufficient size.

(9: Standard Contract Terms)

- Redlined terms and conditions.

The following were considered in the JEC’s scoring of Reporting:

- Cannot meet State’s monthly reporting requirements for quote times.
- Ad Hoc reporting cannot be done independently by the State.

SHI International Corp – Step 3 Technical Evaluation Module 1 Hardware			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Hardware Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.3: In Scope • Section 1.1.4: Out of Scope • Section 1.1.7: Product Technology Roadmaps • Section 1.1.10: Environmental (Green) Requirements 	10	9
2.	End-User Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.5.1: End-User Devices; • Section 1.1.5.3: End-User Device Asset-Tagging; • Section 1.1.5.4: State Hard-Drive Image; • Section 1.1.5.5: Evaluation Units 	25	17
3.	Section 1.1.5.6.1: Core Server Brands	25	18
4.	Miscellaneous Hardware <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.1.5.2: Peripherals • Section 1.1.6: Discretionary Hardware 	10	6
5.	Section 1.1.8: Hardware Installation, Integration, and Implementation Services	20	15
6.	Exhibit B: Experience with Hardware Services	10	1
Total (100 points possible)		100	66

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **SHI International Corp**, based on a score of **66, DID NOT MEET** the RFP’s minimum passing point threshold for **Module 1 - Hardware**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider’s ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC’s scoring of General Hardware Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.1.3: In Scope)

SHI International Corp Technical Evaluation – General Overview

- Did not accept State's statement of what was in-scope.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of End-User Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.1.5.1: End-User Devices)

- Didn't indicate how State offices in the Upper Peninsula would be covered.

(Section 1.1.5.3: End-User Device Asset-Tagging)

- Did not meet the requirement as requested, proposed an unacceptable alternative.

(Section 1.1.5.4: State Hard-Drive Image)

- Minimum imaging offered.
- Times for large orders are not clear.
- Overall confusing imaging proposal.

(Section 1.1.5.5: Evaluation Units)

- Evaluation unit section was not clear on process.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Core Server Brands:

- No warranty/maintenance/on-site services provided in proposal for HP products.
- No mention of on-site services provided in proposal for Dell products.
- No warranty/maintenance/on-site services provided in proposal for IBM products.
- No warranty/maintenance/on-site services provided in proposal for APC products

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Miscellaneous Hardware:

(Section 1.1.5.2: Peripherals)

- Indicated state would have to negotiate pricing on peripherals.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Hardware Installation, Integration, and Implementation Services

- Cannot follow State standards for end-user hardware.
- Did not provide experience for installation, integration, and implementation of servers.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Experience with Hardware Services:

- Experience #1 scope and size are small.
- Experience #2 not provided.
- Experience #3 not provided.
- Overall section did not have information needed.

SHI International Corp Technical Evaluation – General Overview

Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Software Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1.2.3: In Scope Section 1.2.4: Out of Scope Section 1.2.5.1: Software Delivery and Licenses Section 1.2.5.2: Publisher Software License Agreements 	10	10
2.	Section 1.2.5.3: Core Software	40	34
3.	Section 1.2.5.4: Discretionary Software	20	20
4.	Section 1.2.6: Software Installation, Integration, and Implementation Services	20	20
5.	Exhibit B: Experience with Software and Services	10	8
	Total (100 points possible)	100	92

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **SHI International Corp**, based on a score of **92, DID MEET** the RFP's minimum passing point threshold for **Module 2 - Software**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider's ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Section 1.2.5.3: Core Software:

- Failed to adequately address how Bidder would assume State's existing Microsoft Enterprise Agreement.
- Services partnerships for all core software were not clear or sufficiently shown.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Exhibit B: Experience with Software and Services:

- Bidder provided only two relevant software experiences.

Vaske Computer, Inc. (Collier IT) Technical Evaluation – General Overview

Did Not Pass Mandatory Minimums - Not Evaluated

Zones, Inc. Technical Evaluation – General Overview

Zones, Inc. – Step 2 Technical Evaluation General Overview			
Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Points Possible	Score
1.	General Service Capabilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products; • Section 1.0.6: Statement of Work Process; • Section 1.0.7: Leasing • Section 1.0.12: Transition Plan at Contract's End; • Section 1.0.13: Contract Performance • Section 1.0.14: Pricing and Invoicing Requirements 	30	21
2.	Contractor Program Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.0.9: Contractor Staff, Roles, and Responsibilities; • Section 1.0.10: Roles and Responsibilities of the State; • Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's 	15	7
3.	Section 1.0.11: Contract Program Implementation Plan	10	7
4.	Exhibit B: General Proposal Requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2: Company Background Information 4: Experience with the State of Michigan 5: Gross Annual Sales 6: Experience 7: Strategic Relationships 9: Standard Contract 	30	20
5.	Section 1.0.8: Reporting	15	12
Total (100 points possible)		100	67

The Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) determined **Zones, Inc.**, based on a score of **67, DID NOT MEET** the RFP's minimum passing point threshold for **General Overview**. This was determined through an assessment of the Service Provider's ability to meet the requirements identified in the RFP relative to the evaluation categories identified in the summary table above. Evaluation comments are provided below.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of General Service Capabilities:

(Section 1.0.5: Requirements/Deliverables for All Products)

- Did not address how to change an order after it is placed.
- Return policy is less than the requested number of days.
- State cannot write on box as requested.
- Bidder does not address how to ship large/heavy shipments, which adds a burden to the State.

(Section 1.0.7: Leasing)

- Lack sufficient detail for State to understand Bidder's provided leasing information.

(Section 1.0.13: Contract Performance)

- Metric responses were not sufficient, and bidder took exception to all liquidated damages.

(Section 1.0.14: Pricing and Invoicing Requirements)

Zones, Inc. Technical Evaluation – General Overview

- Pricing index and scenario weak as it Bidder's standard website may not include State standard products with associated pricing.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Contractor Program Support:

(Exhibit D: Key Personnel Resume's)

- Resources proposed do not have experience equivalent to the scope and size of the State.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Contractor Program Implementation Plan:

- No implementation time line given or indicated.

The following was considered in the JEC's scoring of General Proposal Requirements:

(4: Experience with the State of Michigan)

- Lacks experience working with the State.

(6: Experience)

- Experience #1 scope and size are small.
- Experience #2 scope and size are small.
- Experience #3 scope is small.

(7: Strategic Relationships)

- Not as robust as expected.

(9: Standard Contract Terms)

- Redlined terms and conditions.

The following were considered in the JEC's scoring of Reporting:

- Does not provide warranty/maintenance start and end date reporting without added cost.
- Bidder does not meet asset reporting minimums without added cost.

PRICE EVALUATION SUMMARY

The State evaluated pricing for all Service Providers that passed Step 2 and one/both portions of Step 3.

- **Written Cost Clarifications** – The State issued written price clarification to confirm and normalize pricing for Core Software Agreements. These were sent to the four bidders whose pricing was opened in Step 4.
- **Pricing Negotiations**
After reviewing the cost clarifications, which normalized proposal pricing, the JEC requested best and final offers for all vendors. Additionally, CDW and Dell were requested to provide improved pricing on hardware and were given specific end-user hardware and accessory items to price so the State could select a primary end-user hardware and accessories provider. A second round of improved pricing was requested from CDW and Dell on a small number of specific end-user hardware and accessories. CDW, Dell, Insight, and SHI were all asked to provide improved pricing on all software items and the associated hourly services.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS SUMMARY

The State requested that all four vendors who the State was considering for recommendation of award participate in a group terms and conditions negotiations. This was held on one day with all parties agreeing to the terms with minor adjustments to finalize the language continuing for a period of time after. Insurance terms were also negotiated and are being finalized in parallel with the announcement of the award.

AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Based on the evaluation criteria in the RFP, the proposals submitted, and the JEC's careful review of each proposal against the evaluation criteria – the JEC recommends to the Chief Procurement Officer that the award recommendation be made to **multiple Bidders** as the responsive and responsible Bidders who offer the best value to the State of Michigan. The JEC recommends that the award be structured as follows:

Module 1 – Hardware

Portion of Module Awarded	Bidder Awarded	Estimated Annual Spend¹	Explanations
Core End-User Hardware	CDW, Dell	\$16,243,381.00	Dell is awarded the Core End-User Hardware for all State Standard Hardware that Dell can source to the State. This portion of the State's business under the Michigan Master Computing Program will be awarded annually starting in January 2017. Dell will be the primary provider of Core End-User Hardware through the remainder of calendar year 2016 until this portion is put out for new pricing in January 2017 and awarded to a current vendor awarded the ability to source hardware to the State. CDW is awarded the remainder of those items which Dell cannot source.
Core End-User Accessories	CDW, Dell	\$2,145,880.87	Dell is awarded the Core End-User Accessories for all State Standard Hardware the Dell can source to the State. This portion of the State's business under the Michigan Master Computing Program will be awarded annually starting in January 2017. Dell will be the primary provider of Core End-User Accessories through the remainder of calendar year 2016 until this portion is put out for new pricing in January 2017 and awarded to a current vendor awarded the ability to source hardware to the State. CDW is awarded the remainder of those items which Dell cannot source.

¹ Based on either (1) State purchased quantities for 1 year spanning 2014 and 2015 multiplied by bidders proposed price, or (2) State's historical annualized spend.

Server Configurations	CDW, Dell	\$800,000 +	CDW and Dell will compete on a server by server basis to win Server Configuration business.
Discretionary Hardware	CDW, Dell	No estimate available.	CDW and Dell will compete on an order by order basis to win business.
Optional Server Brands	CDW, Dell	No estimate available.	CDW and Dell may compete on an order by order basis to win business as requested by the State. Optional Server brands may also be purchased off of other State contracts.
Storage Solutions	CDW, Dell	\$11 million	CDW and Dell may compete on an order by order basis to win business as requested by the State. Storage Solution brands may also be purchased off of other State contracts.
Customer-Premise Telecommunications and Security Solutions	CDW, Dell	\$15 million	CDW and Dell may compete on an order by order basis to win business as requested by the State. Customer-Premise Telecommunications and Security Solution brands may also be purchased off of other State contracts.

Module 2 - Software

Portion of Module Awarded	Bidder Awarded a Contract to Compete for Software Purchases	Estimated Annual Value ²	Explanations
Core Software - Microsoft Enterprise Agreement	CDW, Dell, Insight, SHI	\$11,500,000.00	Awards for the software portion of this RFP will be bid out and awarded to Bidders who have been recommended for award. The Software purchases will be awarded on a bid by bid basis at the discretion of the State in a manner that
Core Software - Microsoft Premier Support	CDW, Dell, Insight, SHI	Not estimated at this time.	
Core Software - Microsoft Select Agreement	CDW, Dell, Insight, SHI	Not estimated at this time.	
Core Software - Symantec True-Up Agreement, Software Maintenance	CDW, Dell, Insight, SHI	\$727,000.00	
Core Software - BMC Software Maintenance	CDW, Dell, Insight, SHI	\$863,000.00	

² Based on the lowest pricing provided by the four bidders.

Core Software - Adobe Enterprise Term License Agreement	CDW, Dell, Insight, SHI	\$83,000.00	will drive the best value for each acquisition of software and associated services.
Core Software - Citrix Software Maintenance	CDW, Dell, Insight, SHI	\$258,000.00	
Core Software - HP Software Maintenance	CDW, Dell, Insight, SHI	\$900,000.00	
Core Software - VMWare Enterprise License Agreement	CDW, Dell, Insight, SHI	\$369,000.00	
Discretionary Software	CDW, Dell, Insight, SHI	Not Estimated Here	
Optional Software	CDW, Dell, Insight, SHI	Not Estimated Here	
Software Installation, Integration, and Implementation Hourly Rates	CDW, Dell, Insight, SHI	Not Estimated Here	

Best Value Considerations:

- 1) Setting up a multi-vendor award allows for the State to derive pricing value and value added services that will generate an overall better value to the State and allows the State to be more agile in its technology sourcing.
- 2) Dell was awarded the initial Core-End User Hardware and Core-End User Accessories portion of the RFP by providing discounted pricing of over \$700,000.00 lower than CDWG's proposed prices.