



MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Director's Office

Greg Gianforte, Governor
Misty Ann Giles, Director

doa.mt.gov

406.444.2460

doadirector@mt.gov

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD

Solicitation Title/Event Name:

Solicitation Number:

Solicitation Close Date:

Notice of Intent to Award Post Date:

Issuing Contracts Officer contact information:

The State intends to award a contract to the apparent successful offeror(s) of the above-mentioned solicitation. The Notice of Intent to Award shall not be considered a binding commitment by the state.

Under the Montana Procurement Act, the State has made the relevant scoring matrix/bid tab for the above-mentioned solicitation available for public inspection. Comments from the public regarding the proposed award must be submitted to the Contracts Officer listed above within this 7-day notice period.

Apparent Successful Offeror(s)

Unsuccessful Offeror(s)

	Category	Possible Points	AT&T Enterprises LLC	CenturyLink-DBA Lumen Technologies	Communications Venture Corp DBA Indigital	Motorola Solutions Connectivity Inc	NextGen Communications, Inc	NGA 911 LLC	Ring MD USA, INC	Synergem Technologies, Inc
Section	STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING	540 Possible points								
SOW Section 2.1	Technical Category 1: Proposed Design/Monitoring	115 points	109	95	90	110	105	75	50	70
SOW Section 2.2	Technical Category 2: Project Management/Staff Qualification	50 points	48	48	47	49	46	40	0	38
SOW Section 2.3, 2.4, 2.5	Technical Category 3: Implementation/Installation/Migration	75 points	70	60	55	73	71	60	0	50
SOW Section 2.6	Technical Category 4: Training	10 points	10	8	8	9	9	6	0	4
SOW Section 2.8	Technical Category 5: Maintenance/Support	50 points	45	38	43	48	45	35	0	38
SOW Section 3.3	Technical Category 6: Performance Criteria/Testing	50 points	45	46	45	47	44	40	0	30
Exhibit B – Specifications	Technical Category 7: Functional Specifications	90 points	80	75	85	88	85	78	0	67
SOW Section 4.2	Technical Category 8: Interrogatories and Operational Scenarios	50 points	37	42	46	48	45	39	0	45
Offeror Qualifications	Technical Category 9: Resumes & Company Profile & Experience	50 points	50	47	46	50	48	40	0	35
Offeror Qualifications	References	Pass / Fail	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	Pass	0	Pass

	TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE:	540 Possible Points	AT&T	Lumen	InDigital	Motorola	Allerium	NGA911 LLC	Ring MD	Synergem
	Total Technical Score	Preferred score: 80% 432/540	494	459	465	522	498	413	50	377
	STEP 2: PRODUCT DEMONSTRATION	260 Possible points								
	Product Demonstration	Preferred score: 80% 208/260	205	N/A	N/A	260	230	N/A	N/A	N/A
	STEP 3: TOTAL COST PROPOSAL:	200 Possible points								
	Cost Proposal	200 points	200			183	110			
	Equal Pay for Montana Women	5% of Bonus Points								

Offerors who agree and certify compliance to Executive Order No. 12-2016, Equal Pay for Montana Women, will receive a bonus of 5% of the total points available. Offerors who do not comply will not receive bonus points.

Technical	540.00	494.00	459.00	465.00	522.00	498.00	413.00	50.00	377.00
Demonstration	260.00	205.00	N/A	N/A	260.00	230.00	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cost Proposal	200.00	200.00	N/A	N/A	183.21	109.63	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Points	1,000.00	899.00			965.21	837.63			
Bonus Points Possible	50.00	50.00			50.00	50.00			
FINAL TOTAL	1,050.00	949.00			1,015.21	887.63			

AT&T

	Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section	STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING	540 Possible points	Score	Justification
SOW Section 2.1	Technical Category 1: Proposed Design/Monitoring	115 points	109	Does deploy legacy gateway for PSAPs that are not yet IP Compliant. Included latency figures but did not provide carrier diversity, Network is basically already in place.
SOW Section 2.2	Technical Category 2: Project Management/Staff Qualification	50 points	48	Project Manager will coordinate and provide oversight as well as meeting scheduling and provide a plan list with milestones. Shows an aggressive eagerness to start the project with competency to produce results. Waterfall methodology could produce problems but overall good response.
SOW Section 2.3, 2.4, 2.5	Technical Category 3: Implementation/Installation/Migration	75 points	70	Pre event processes were thorough, clearly defined roles and responsibilities for vendors in the state. Migration responsibilities were clearly outlined. The head of plan outlines each step and demonstrates leveraging smaller piece apps for an early test bed.
SOW Section 2.6	Technical Category 4: Training	10 points	10	Class size listed in detail for different sections and separate trainings for administrators and GIS staff. Well qualified but 8 regional lessons may not be enough for the size of the state.
SOW Section 2.8	Technical Category 5: Maintenance/Support	50 points	45	Had sufficient disaster recovery backup plans. Maintenance done with no scheduled downtime and Offered 24/7 support
SOW Section 3.3	Technical Category 6: Performance Criteria/Testing	50 points	45	Sufficient operation test plan and included backup plan. Customized final acceptance plans per PSAP. Performance criteria seemed competent but doesn't test with NENA i3.

AT&T

Exhibit B – Specifications	Technical Category 7: Functional Specifications	90 points	80	Program manager will oversee implementation in addition to Project Manager. Interoperability with neighboring jurisdictions. Compliant with redundancy of major system components. Included their disaster recovery network monitoring security standards and functional elements were in compliance. Delay of reason for outage report was excessive
SOW Section 4.2	Technical Category 8: Interrogatories and Operational Scenarios	50 points	37	Stated their ESInet does not support the OCG 10-69r2 now, but they will in the future, but no indication of how long that could be. Spatial interface will not support additional fields outside of the needed model. They have audit trails and logs, traffic interactions with pre vetted entities.
Offeror Qualifications	Technical Category 9: Resumes & Company Profile & Experience	50 points	50	Comprehensive experience and have migrated hundreds of PSAPS
Offeror Qualifications	References	Pass / Fail	Pass	
	TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE:	540 Possible Points		
	Total Technical Score	Preferred score: 80% 432/540	494.00	
	STEP 2: PRODUCT DEMONSTRATION	260 Possible points		

AT&T

Product Demonstration

Preferred
score: 80%
208/260

205.00

Presentation covered most things but not all. Felt very rehearsed. Didn't follow prompt provided so difficult to identify different portions that were covered. Several items from Prompt were either missed or only briefly touched on. Didn't clearly identify direct interface contact person. Dashboard didn't appear to be user friendly. Looked like a black and white word doc. Seemed to show most information just didn't present as well. State to State transfers weren't directly covered. Way's to upload GIS Data may be more workaround connectivity with MSAG. Different Dashboards didn't seem as customizable. Tracking of tickets was mentioned but not deeply discussed. Felt like more of a sales pitch than demo.

CenturyLink - Lumen

	Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section	STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING	540 Possible points	Score	Justification
SOW Section 2.1	Technical Category 1: Proposed Design/Monitoring	115 points	95	Overall response was adequate but lacked detail in some areas. They use more than one network provider Geo redundant core sites. Knock team has alerts but didn't discuss access to dashboard. Discussed optional services but didn't describe if that's included in base price. Stated real time monitoring is not allowed by state employees. Virtualization applications are unclear and specific routing hardware not reported on.
SOW Section 2.2	Technical Category 2: Project Management/Staff Qualification	50 points	48	Appear to include Project Manager and Primary Project Manager. Separate Engineering and sales staff. They will provide status reports and weekly progress meeting.
SOW Section 2.3, 2.4, 2.5	Technical Category 3: Implementation/Installation/Migration	75 points	60	Change order Management was sufficient. availability of a real time punch list. Stated existing legacy infrastructure needs to be upgraded before it can be integrated. Migration plan is lacking details considering delay of upgrades for system that will be replaced.
SOW Section 2.6	Technical Category 4: Training	10 points	8	Training based on mutually agreed times including evenings and weekends. Provide some E training for management telecommunicators as well as concept training. They do charge for any additional training that's needed, but didn't really specify what that might be.
SOW Section 2.8	Technical Category 5: Maintenance/Support	50 points	38	Can provide updates with no downtime and had 24/7 support. Didn't appear that Montana would have dashboard access. Bug fixes are irregular, so they cannot provide a frequency. Does not provide training for replacement hardware if different or remote diagnostics while previously stating real time monitoring is not allowed. Based on network design appeared they would need subcarriers.

CenturyLink - Lumen

SOW Section 3.3	Technical Category 6: Performance Criteria/Testing	50 points	46	Integration system testing in the controlled environment they had a failover testing for each element. User acceptance testing and their sample test plans seemed adequate and pointed to previous success.
Exhibit B – Specifications	Technical Category 7: Functional Specifications	90 points	75	Cannot comply with the NGCS 54. also couldn't guarantee they can send Montana final reason for outage reports within 10 days as needed. didn't comply with the text requirement and ESInet 115 now, but may be able to in the future.
SOW Section 4.2	Technical Category 8: Interrogatories and Operational Scenarios	50 points	42	Any errors are sent back to the reporting agencies and to the State Library for resolution. Geospatial MSAG seems to be an additional charge. Frequency of vulnerability scans is adequate. Policy routing details seem comprehensive and sufficient
Offeror Qualifications	Technical Category 9: Resumes & Company Profile & Experience	50 points	47	Staff has relevant experience
Offeror Qualifications	References	Pass / Fail	Pass	

Venture Corp - InDigital

	Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section	STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING	540 Possible points	Score	Justification
SOW Section 2.1	Technical Category 1: Proposed Design/Monitoring	115 points	90	Appreciated humor in response. System Architecture and Montana data monitoring made sense and was adequately described. Largely dismissed I3 compliance as outdated standard. Partners with 1 spatial for GIS. Plan for conversion/integration with ESInet compliant PSAPs first but may be extra charges for non compliant PSAPs. Redundancy only listed fiber connections without extra charges, so no other diverse connections other than Star Link, which could be additional cost. Many I3 standards for compliance would be additional charges and MTU sizes isn't currently supported.
SOW Section 2.2	Technical Category 2: Project Management/Staff Qualification	50 points	47	Change management policies separation and like the program manager, project manager roles. Punch list would be using Google Docs seemed informal.
SOW Section 2.3, 2.4, 2.5	Technical Category 3: Implementation/Installation/Migration	75 points	55	Installation plan proposes to reroute calls to alternate PSAPs, which concerns due to overloading. Stress on existing PSAPs would be absorbing other calls for an unknown period of time. Rerouting calls to alternate PSAPs during the installation is concerning.
SOW Section 2.6	Technical Category 4: Training	10 points	8	Offer regional training and train the trainer methodology. However didn't include details for class size or logistics.
SOW Section 2.8	Technical Category 5: Maintenance/Support	50 points	43	24/7 helpdesk and alarms at different sections for outages. Has remote support and can deploy in state staff but are not in the region yet.
SOW Section 3.3	Technical Category 6: Performance Criteria/Testing	50 points	45	Go live plan will involve State and consultant. Sample test plans are sufficient.
Exhibit B – Specifications	Technical Category 7: Functional Specifications	90 points	85	Supporting documents provided by 1 spatial was beneficial and clear understanding of their plan and their project vision.

Venture Corp - InDigital

SOW Section 4.2	Technical Category 8: Interrogatories and Operational Scenarios	50 points	46	Sufficient information to document compliance and current work with compliant partners.
Offeror Qualifications	Technical Category 9: Resumes & Company Profile & Experience	50 points	46	Relevant experience
Offeror Qualifications	References	Pass / Fail	Pass	

Motorola

	Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section	STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING	540 Possible points	Score	Justification
SOW Section 2.1	Technical Category 1: Proposed Design/Monitoring	115 points	110	Redundancy is impressive including 3 sperate cloud services. Test plan is good and included ability to revert. Original Manufacture for all equipment they use and has interoperability with adjacent ESInet systems and are carrier agnostic. Geodiversity network services. Wasn't clear on how all the potential solutions and diversity would be implemented.
SOW Section 2.2	Technical Category 2: Project Management/Staff Qualification	50 points	49	Staff has ample experience and understands scope and scale of Montana specific experience. Offer separate Project Manager and client services.
SOW Section 2.3, 2.4, 2.5	Technical Category 3: Implementation/Installation/Migration	75 points	73	Emphasis on communication between state and stakeholders. Provide a live project workbook which State has access to. Interoperability testing was also detailed.
SOW Section 2.6	Technical Category 4: Training	10 points	9	Training focused on system administrators and Technical Support personnel and included details such as class size and methodology.
SOW Section 2.8	Technical Category 5: Maintenance/Support	50 points	48	Has customer access portal with 24/7 monitoring. Each task goes through risk assessment to minimize disruption. Gave examples of user dashboard that are easy to use.
SOW Section 3.3	Technical Category 6: Performance Criteria/Testing	50 points	47	Provided system acceptance and functional specification plans were comprehensive and they're fully compliant with NENA standards. Included comprehensive testing and a remediation plans during the process
Exhibit B – Specifications	Technical Category 7: Functional Specifications	90 points	88	Redundant cloud systems are diverse. Uses 1 spatial, and can support legacy. Seemed they may not integrate text to 911 until standards were implemented

Motorola

SOW Section 4.2	Technical Category 8: Interrogatories and Operational Scenarios	50 points	48	System is agnostic and utilizes States existing GIS standards. Has integrations nation wide at other installations. Use and implementation of Text to 911 was unclear and seemed to possibly involve a separate fee. However, they are able to run both systems parallel if the State chooses to not implement.
Offeror Qualifications	Technical Category 9: Resumes & Company Profile & Experience	50 points	50	Well qualified and have multiple Statewide deployments in other States.
Offeror Qualifications	References	Pass / Fail	Pass	
TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE:		540 Possible Points		
Total Technical Score		Preferred score: 80% 432/540	522.00	
STEP 2: PRODUCT DEMONSTRATION		260 Possible points		
Product Demonstration		Preferred score: 80% 208/260	260.00	Provided everything that was asked for and brought majority of team and who would be assigned to the State. Data entry and error walkthrough was helpful. Walked through line by line of Prompt. Solution is entirely Cloud based which presents some unique advantages. Presentation was well organized and scenarios were helpful. Summarized key takeaways at the end of every section. Incorporated experience with neighboring states and other integration projects.

ComTech - Allerium

	Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section	STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING	540 Possible points	Score	Justification
SOW Section 2.1	Technical Category 1: Proposed Design/Monitoring	115 points	105	Provide legacy gateway for as long as needed. Multiple data centers including in Montana. Proposal is network agnostic and provides user accessible dashboard but unclear if that includes direct access for State. Virtualization software described but not named
SOW Section 2.2	Technical Category 2: Project Management/Staff Qualification	50 points	46	Included both project and program managers. Change management process is well defined and includes progress reports.
SOW Section 2.3, 2.4, 2.5	Technical Category 3: Implementation/Installation/Migration	75 points	71	Comprehensive plan including deployment time. Experience migrating legacy carriers from other States. Information was somewhat disorganized and hard to find.
SOW Section 2.6	Technical Category 4: Training	10 points	9	Very detailed with training specifically DOJ staff and include timeline
SOW Section 2.8	Technical Category 5: Maintenance/Support	50 points	45	Plans were included in detail and provided a thorough security audit plan, ISO and NIST compliant.
SOW Section 3.3	Technical Category 6: Performance Criteria/Testing	50 points	44	Plan includes continuous monitoring including call flow and two phase approach. Provided testing plan and methodology.
Exhibit B – Specifications	Technical Category 7: Functional Specifications	90 points	85	Aligns with 4 network providers and platform shows analyzed data with a dashboard for all users.
SOW Section 4.2	Technical Category 8: Interrogatories and Operational Scenarios	50 points	45	Uses network compatible with current Library GIS system.
Offeror Qualifications	Technical Category 9: Resumes & Company Profile & Experience	50 points	48	Several large scale projects in other states. Text to 911 service is used in many other PSAPS nationwide and highly relevant to Montana scale and scope.
Offeror Qualifications	References	Pass / Fail	Pass	

ComTech - Allerium

	TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORE:	540 Possible Points		
	Total Technical Score	Preferred score: 80% 432/540	498.00	
	STEP 2: PRODUCT DEMONSTRATION	260 Possible points		
	Product Demonstration	Preferred score: 80% 208/260	230.00	<p>Presentation was extremely professional and organized. Pointed out sections of Prompt for each slide but display issues made them difficult to read. Demonstration was clearly tailored to be Montana specific. One stop shop approach was impressive that they seek to resolve issues regardless of where the problem originates. Areas of responsibility are results driven, vs the "not our problem" scenario. Technical demonstration seemed to meet requirements. Dashboard demonstrations made sense and seemed user friendly. Redundancies weren't clear throughout each stage. Emphasized timeline is highly achievable and team is driven by Vendor. GIS resources are in place already and wouldn't need design/training. Program Manager has not been hired yet and Project Manager wasn't present.</p>

NG 911 LLC

	Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section	STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING	540 Possible points	Score	Justification
SOW Section 2.1	Technical Category 1: Proposed Design/Monitoring	115 points	75	Uses one cloud system. Portions of proposed design seem copy and pasted. Redundancy wasn't well described or addressed and some hardware discussed does not meet coverage requirements.
SOW Section 2.2	Technical Category 2: Project Management/Staff Qualification	50 points	40	Project Manager does periodic review of staff performance based on KPI. Left coordination with the OSPs up to the state which is not ideal.
SOW Section 2.3, 2.4, 2.5	Technical Category 3: Implementation/Installation/Migration	75 points	60	Proposal lacked clarity and detail with responsibility for OSP management. Describes a turn key approach but doesn't provide more information to support. Lack of detail raised concern about ability to execute.
SOW Section 2.6	Technical Category 4: Training	10 points	6	Training wasn't described in methodology or scheduling. Didn't discuss hours or type of offerings.
SOW Section 2.8	Technical Category 5: Maintenance/Support	50 points	35	Discusses some remote diagnostics, support, contacts and continuous monitoring. Proposal plan describes routine maintenance being responsibility of PSAP but doesn't consider remoteness or smaller PSAPs.
SOW Section 3.3	Technical Category 6: Performance Criteria/Testing	50 points	40	Provides enough information just for a high level understanding, but no details. Testing plans didn't provide clearly defined testing outcomes and performance criteria.
Exhibit B – Specifications	Technical Category 7: Functional Specifications	90 points	78	Only generally outlined compliance but didn't provide supporting information. Stated that their cost does not include dual fiber to the PCPS, which could be a huge additional cost.
SOW Section 4.2	Technical Category 8: Interrogatories and Operational Scenarios	50 points	39	Outlines compatibility with Library's data set and schema. Discusses error reporting mechanisms compliant with NENA. Doesn't provide more detail.

NG 911 LLC

Offeror Qualifications	Technical Category 9: Resumes & Company Profile & Experience	50 points	40	Staff experience seems like mix of general network experience with only some with direct work with 911 systems.
Offeror Qualifications	References	Pass / Fail	Pass	Included experience identified throughout Proposal wasn't included as reference.

Ring MD

	Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section	STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING	540 Possible points	Score	Justification
SOW Section 2.1	Technical Category 1: Proposed Design/Monitoring	115 points	50	Provides general references to technical capabilities but no detail. Lack of comprehensive diagrams, specificity and feasibility of design. Lack of coordination or planning for existing providers or location based routing
SOW Section 2.2	Technical Category 2: Project Management/Staff Qualification	50 points	0	No relevant experience on 911 networks. Didn't discuss project manager or any other details
SOW Section 2.3, 2.4, 2.5	Technical Category 3: Implementation/Installation/Migration	75 points		
SOW Section 2.6	Technical Category 4: Training	10 points		
SOW Section 2.8	Technical Category 5: Maintenance/Support	50 points		
SOW Section 3.3	Technical Category 6: Performance Criteria/Testing	50 points		
Exhibit B – Specifications	Technical Category 7: Functional Specifications	90 points		
SOW Section 4.2	Technical Category 8: Interrogatories and Operational Scenarios	50 points		
Offeror Qualifications	Technical Category 9: Resumes & Company Profile & Experience	50 points		
Offeror Qualifications	References	Pass / Fail		

Synergem

	Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section	STEP 1: TECHNICAL SCORING	540 Possible points	Score	Justification
SOW Section 2.1	Technical Category 1: Proposed Design/Monitoring	115 points	70	Difficult to find information. Listed dual independent carriers to address geographic challenges. Included real time monitoring 24/7 with dashboard. Most routing hardware is end of life so not ideal for a modern solution.
SOW Section 2.2	Technical Category 2: Project Management/Staff Qualification	50 points	38	Project manager assigned to Montana had some 911 deployment experience but does not describe a robust plan.
SOW Section 2.3, 2.4, 2.5	Technical Category 3: Implementation/Installation/Migration	75 points	50	Organization of proposal made information difficult to find. solution allows for incremental migration without interruption of service but overall lack of detail or explanation.
SOW Section 2.6	Technical Category 4: Training	10 points	4	Didn't include detailed trainings or descriptions. Charges extra for on site training. Missing some documents that were referenced.
SOW Section 2.8	Technical Category 5: Maintenance/Support	50 points	38	Montana based technicians and included chart for how PSAPs would submit tickets.
SOW Section 3.3	Technical Category 6: Performance Criteria/Testing	50 points	30	Continuity of operations described in some detail but overall not more description.
Exhibit B – Specifications	Technical Category 7: Functional Specifications	90 points	67	Utilize adequate resources during integration and are compatible with multiple spatial interface. Missing several details in their proposal, had spelling errors and version references that doesn't speak to attention to detail.
SOW Section 4.2	Technical Category 8: Interrogatories and Operational Scenarios	50 points	45	Actually provided information documenting compliance. Fully aligned with the libraries, data validation aggregation portal. Requires no additional validation, no additional cost for MSAG.

Synergem

Offeror Qualifications	Technical Category 9: Resumes & Company Profile & Experience	50 points	35	End to end solution has only been involved in two States but does have other relevant 911 experience. Other deployments do not match the scope and scale of Montana.
Offeror Qualifications	References	Pass / Fail	Pass	

**NG 911 RFP
JUS-RFP-26-0290TBH
Cost Worksheet**

Lowest overall cost receives the maximum allotted points. All other proposals receive a percentage of the points available based on their cost relationship to the lowest. Example: Total possible points for cost are 300. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 300 points. Offeror B would receive 200 points ($\$20,000/\$30,000 = 67\% \times 300 \text{ points} = 200$).

Cost			
Points Available		200	
Lowest Cost		\$18,284,064.00	
Vendor Name			
Vendor Name	Proposed Cost	Points Earned	Notes:
ATT	\$18,284,064.00	200.00	
Motorola	\$19,959,600.00	183.21	
NextGen	\$33,355,379.00	109.63	