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	Autocene Government Solutions, Inc.	Credential Engine, Inc.	PowerSchool Group LLC	Procyon Technostructure LLC	Resultant, LLC
Evaluated RFP Section	Point Values					
Provision of Services	65%					
Project design	260 points	170.00	250.00	195.00	0.00	220.00
Timeline	170 points	125.00	163.00	142.00	0.00	150.00
Implementation plan	160 points	115.00	152.00	119.00	0.00	140.00
Ongoing support plan	60 points	42.00	57.00	42.00	0.00	52.00
		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Offeror Qualifications	10%					
Company Profile and Experience	25 points	18.00	24.00	20.00	0.00	21.00
Relevant Experience	50 points	30.00	48.00	41.00	0.00	44.00
Relevant Past Projects	25 points	18.00	25.00	19.00	0.00	21.00
		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Resumes	5%					
Key Personnel	50 points	33.00	30.00	40.00	0.00	46.00
Cost Proposal	**20%** 200 points					
		200.00	118.03	101.50	0.00	101.63
Equal Pay for Montana Women Bonus Points	**5% Bonus Points**					
Technical Subtotal	800.00	551	749	618	0	694
Cost Proposal	200.00	200.00	118.03	101.50	0.00	101.63
Total Points	1,000.00	751.00	867.03	719.50	0.00	795.63
Bonus Points Possible	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
FINAL TOTAL	1,050.00	801.00	917.03	769.50	0.00	795.63

Autocene Government Solutions, Inc.			Xxxxxx
Category	**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
Evaluated RFP Section	**Point Values**		
Provision of Services	**65%**		
Project design	260 points	**170**	1. 182 - project design. Shows production database. Did not have existing resources. Output and deliverable 2. 180 - project design generic. Stakeholder engagement section. Validating credentials. Outside of their 3. 160 - did not demonstrate knowledge or workforce sectors. preference for existing database not preferred.
Timeline	170 points	**125**	1. 119 - aim to meet 90-day requirement. Little 2. 140 - able to meet 90 days. Project design requirements could be an issue. System components 3. 140 - Don't see familiarity with education or workforce sector
Implementation plan	160 points	**115**	1. 115 - gave good basic outline. No specific dates. Stakeholder engagement. Integration needs 2. 115 - standardize credentials or create that. Based integration unclear 3. 112 - similar reasons. Plans to standardize the data.
Ongoing support plan	60 points	**42**	1. 40 - limited details. 2. 42 - ongoing support real brief. Expertise is concerning 3. 42 - limited details. Blanket hours of support.

Offeror Qualifications	10%		
Company Profile and Experience	25 points	**18**	1. 20 - plenty of past experience. Large database management 2. 15 - database development. Lack of subject matter expertise 3. 18 - Clear experience on solution build.
Relevant Experience	50 points	**30**	1. 30 - know how to do database but lack sector knowledge 2. 30 - portal development but not in DLI area 3. 35 - similar reasons. Background work. Government projects
Relevant Past Projects	25 points	**18**	1. 15 - past projects and nothing in the desired area 2. 18 - system building experience not in workforce credential 3. 20 - past projects.
Resumes	5%		
Key Personnel	50 points	**33**	1. 30 - no workforce space experience 2. 34 - expertise in government 3. 35 - subject matter, government

Credential Engine, Inc.			xxxxxx
Category	**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
Evaluated RFP Section	**Point Values**		
Provision of Services	**65%**		
Project design	260 points	**250**	1. 255 - gave specificity to stars act. Nation wide . 2. 240 - met everything in RFP. Database pool. Customize. Worker mobility. Risk management. 3. 240 - design. Owners and creators was positive. Consistency and quality. Credential finder widget. Con - could come up.
Timeline	170 points	**163**	1. 168 - consistent with requirements. Detailed appropriately 2. 162 - everything they are looking for. 3. 160 - timeline map. Refined project. More than just the initial build.
Implementation plan	160 points	**152**	1. 155 - impressive implementation plan. Specific industry alignment language. Connections to career exploration. 2. 151 - mentioned lack of mitigation policies. Stakeholder engagement, good. Understood needs. 3. 149 - entire third phase highlighted Con - willing to move up.
Ongoing support plan	60 points	**57**	1. 57 - long period of support 2. 58 - plan included support through 2026. third party tools. 3. 56 - ongoing support. Additional add-ons.

Offeror Qualifications	10%		
Company Profile and Experience	25 points	**24**	1. 24 - strong connection to this project. 2. 25 - direct connection 3. 23 - demonstrated their proposal. Industry leader Con - could go down or up to meet.
Relevant Experience	50 points	**48**	1. 47 - knowledge and experience. Industry standard 2. 47 - credential management 3. 50 - already working in MT. credential management Con - strong proposal
Relevant Past Projects	25 points	**25**	1. 25 - development of credential transparency. Relevant references 2. 25 - translatable projects 3. 23 - Gave score based on submission. Not sure about giving full score.
Resumes	5%		
Key Personnel	50 points	**30**	1. 30 - external links to resumes 2. 30 - relevant titles. 3. skipped Con - four positions listed.

PowerSchool Group LLC			xxxxxx
Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Evaluated RFP Section	Point Values		
Provision of Services	65%		
Project design	260 points	**195**	1. 194 - narrative was light. Sector expertise, career navigation. May not fit STARS Act. Not much indication that they meet DLI needs. Relied on reference tools. Stakeholder engagement concerns. 2. 208 - product design, Peterson's database. secondary credentials. Broadness of where the data goes. lack of documentation. looked beyond the initial credential database. 3. 158 - proposing k12 product. proposal tailored towards. Petersons database Con - outlier. existing product. STARS Act.
Timeline	170 points	**142**	1. 150 - consistent with RFP. Light on some details 2. 136 - timeline. 3. 145 - timeline. Degree of input from DLI
Implementation plan	160 points	**119**	1. 128 - implementation plan was not set up step by step. Connected Intelligence. May be restricting 2. 115 - traditional phase project. Upload phase left to DLI. Less MT specific implementation. Square peg, round hole. 3. 115 - overall light on details on general implementation plan. Con - good points. connected intelligence. functionality
Ongoing support plan	60 points	**42**	1. 40 - discussed ongoing support. Sporadic. Not addressed in the proposal itself. Template contract 2. 40 - technical assistance notes and additional support. Help line. 3. 48 - mentioned product and data support. Credential database tie into the future. Support was not well defined.

Offeror Qualifications	10%		
Company Profile and Experience	25 points	20	1. 21 - good experience in K12 space. Relevant experience in NV. Upcharges and customization noted. 2. 19 - K12 experience. Workforce credential database 3. 21 - education career pathway space.
Relevant Experience	50 points	41	1. 48 - experience working with states. Peterson's database and credentialing 2. 38 - MT landscape. legislation 3. 40 - experience with portal development in education space. DLI project wedged into a prefab structure.
Relevant Past Projects	25 points	19	1. 17 - three projects, same just different states 2. 20 - noted they already work with 59 schools in MT. career exploration not credential registries. 3. 20 - similar reasons. Past projects more toward career exploration
Resumes	5%		
Key Personnel	50 points	40	1. 45 - good technical side and workforce career education spaces. 2. 39 - Resumes for just c-suite and top leadership. Not illustrative of the staffing 3. 40 - resumes included not sure if they were going to be the project.

Procyon Technostructure LLC			xxxxxx
Category	**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
Evaluated RFP Section	Point Values		
Provision of Services	**65%**		
Project design	260 points	**0**	1.Attachments were incorrect. Wrong fields. Received a file for a different RFP. Failed to respond. 2. Scope had issues on the response. Typos. 3. agree with everything stated. Con - **FOUND THIS VENDOR NON-RESPONSIVE**
Timeline	170 points	**0**	**FOUND THIS VENDOR NON-RESPONSIVE**
Implementation plan	160 points	**0**	**FOUND THIS VENDOR NON-RESPONSIVE**
Ongoing support plan	60 points	**0**	**FOUND THIS VENDOR NON-RESPONSIVE**
		0	**FOUND THIS VENDOR NON-RESPONSIVE**
Offeror Qualifications	**10%**		
Company Profile and Experience	25 points	**0**	**FOUND THIS VENDOR NON-RESPONSIVE**
Relevant Experience	50 points	**0**	**FOUND THIS VENDOR NON-RESPONSIVE**
Relevant Past Projects	25 points	**0**	**FOUND THIS VENDOR NON-RESPONSIVE**
		0	**FOUND THIS VENDOR NON-RESPONSIVE**
Resumes	**5%**		
Key Personnel	50 points	**0**	**FOUND THIS VENDOR NON-RESPONSIVE**

Resultant, LLC			xxxxxx
Category	**Possible Points**	**Points Awarded**	**Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded**
Evaluated RFP Section	Point Values		
Provision of Services	65%		
Project design	260 points	**220**	1. 240 - good proposal design. Detail. Snowflake. Stakeholder engagement piece was defined. No existing credential mapping. 2. 234 - designed well. Detail. Snowflake. Talent resource navigator. CTDL taxonomy. How system will be populated? Data management. 3. 210 - stakeholder engagement. no existing database. general career exploration tool. resonated poorly. key words in proposal. craft what we want to hear vs. what they can do. Delivery? Con -
Timeline	170 points	**150**	1. 136 - timeline was clear. Defined stakeholder engagement. 2. 150 - Things ending. Deliverables for each phase. 3. 160 - liked they had metrics to evaluate the progress. Con -
Implementation plan	160 points	**140**	1. 130 - proposal detail about specific credential. Understood end goal. Lots of jargon 2. 140 - liked minimum viable product. 30 credentials arbitrary line in the sand 3. 146 - clear deliverables. Basic reporting capabilities Con -
Ongoing support plan	60 points	**52**	1. 51 - clearly laid out what the support. Lacked career exploration. Snowflake database. Maintenance concluding in December. 2. 56 - strong section. Report and response time. 3. 52 - standard ongoing support proposal Con -

Offeror Qualifications	10%		
Company Profile and Experience	25 points	**21**	1. 21 - has profile of experience. Similar types of projects. 2. 20 - lacked credential database experience 3. 22 - experience with workforce in seven states. But not in credential. Con -
Relevant Experience	50 points	**44**	1. 43 - solid experience in workforce state space and state government. 2. 45 - similar reasons. Not a direct match on 3. 44 - similar reasons. Con -
Relevant Past Projects	25 points	**21**	1. 21 - Talent resource navigator. Directly relatable. Good training programs. 2. 20 - similar reasons. Workforce space past projects. 3. 22 - interested in ROI on Ed Con -
Resumes	**5%**		
Key Personnel	50 points	**46**	1. 46 - happy with info. C-suite to leads 2. 45 - good set of resumes provided. Lots of education and career pathways. 3. SKIPPED Con -

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% x 300 points = 200).**

	Cost	
Points Available	**200**	
Lowest Cost	$126,880.00	
Vendor Name	**Proposed Cost**	**Points Earned**	**Notes:**
Autocene Government Solutions, Inc.	$126,880.00	200.0	
Credential Engine, Inc.	$215,000.00	118.0	
PowerSchool Group LLC	$250,000.00	101.5	
Procyon Technostructure LLC	$249,000.00	101.9	
Resultant, LLC	$249,678.95	101.6	