



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)

Section Reference #	Category	Possible Points	Elyon Enterprise Strategies	Information Resource Group	Public Consulting Group	Public Knowledge, LLC	Treinen Associates
	Evaluated RFP Section	Point Values					
Step 1:	Provision of Services						
Section 2:	Offeror Qualifications						
	Staffing Roles, Responsibilities, and Offeror Qualifications	375 Possible Points					
2.1	Staffing Plan and Resource Availability	50	37.00	42.00	0.00	46.00	38.00
2.1.2.A	Child Support Operations Background	100	72.00	73.00	0.00	90.00	77.00
2.1.2.B	Knowledge of Business Process Redesign Methods	100	70.00	60.00	0.00	90.00	80.00
2.1.2.C	Knowledge of federal Child Support Enforcement Systems, rules and compliance	100	65.00	60.00	0.00	94.00	80.00
2.1.3	Resumes of Key Personnel	25	17.00	23.00	0.00	23.00	23.00
Section 3:	Scope of Work						
	Demonstration of Ability to Meet Deliverables	225 Possible Points					
3.2	Collateral Review	25	15.00	23.00	0.00	23.00	19.00
3.3	Gap Analysis, Cost Benefit Analysis, and Feasibility Study	50	33.00	44.00	0.00	46.00	44.00
3.4	Business Requirements Document and Business Processes	70	50.00	65.00	0.00	66.00	66.00
3.5	DDI RFP Package	50	36.00	37.00	0.00	46.00	38.00
3.6	Advance Planning Document Preparation and Support	10	6.40	8.00	0.00	9.00	8.00
3.7	Project Management Assistance	10	6.00	7.50	0.00	9.00	8.40
3.8	Project Risk Mitigation	10	5.00	8.00	0.00	9.00	7.00
	Total Technical Score	450 / 600					

	Offerors that do not receive 75% (450) of technical requirements MAY be removed from further Consideration.	(600 Points Possible * 75% = 450)	412	451	0	551	488
Step 2:	Oral Interview/Demonstration						
	Demonstration	200 Points Possible					
	Offeror Oral Presentation/Demonstration	200				190.00	140.00
Step 3:	Cost Proposal						
	Cost Proposal	200 Points Possible					
	Fixed Bid Price	200				199.59	200.00
	Equal Pay	50 Points Possible					
	Equal Pay for Montana Women	50				50.00	50.00
	Technical Subtotal	600.00	412.40	450.50	0.00	551.00	488.40
	Demonstration	200.00				190.00	140.00
	Cost Proposal	200.00				199.59	200.00
	Total Points	1,000.00	412.40	450.50	0.00	940.59	828.40
	Bonus Points Possible	50.00				50.00	50.00
	FINAL TOTAL	1,050.00	412.40	450.50	0.00	990.59	878.40

	Elyon Enterprise Strategies			xxxxxx
Section Reference #	Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
	Evaluated RFP Section			
Step 1:	Provision of Services			
Section 2:	Offeror Qualifications			
	Staffing Roles, Responsibilities, and Offeror Qualifications	375 Possible Points		
2.1	Staffing Plan and Resource Availability	50	37	Limited staff identified but very experienced in those positions. Heavily reliant on AI vs actual staff.
2.1.2.A	Child Support Operations Background	100	72	Support system was focused on financial audit but didn't provide deliverables. Not as focused on Child Support. Didn't provide detail on doing a full project from start to finish but has components.
2.1.2.B	Knowledge of Business Process Redesign Methods	100	70	Proposal language use of acronyms was difficult to follow. Referenced the wrong program when discussing goals. Good reference to needing to work closely with the program to establish deliverables. Didn't provide timeframe for recent experience. Quality of work in proposal does not reflect quality needed in reporting.
2.1.2.C	Knowledge of federal Child Support Enforcement Systems, rules and compliance	100	65	Stated they are aware of requirements but provided no specifics or examples.
2.1.3	Resumes of Key Personnel	25	17	Resumes are detailed, and extremely long, but doesn't have any direct relation to Child Support. Didn't include any of their sub-contractors

Section 3:	Scope of Work			
	Demonstration of Ability to Meet Deliverables	225 Possible Points		
3.2	Collateral Review	25	15	Relying very heavily on AI for output but didn't discuss detail, review, or interaction or outcome examples. No part of the response indicated how documents would be handled.
3.3	Gap Analysis, Cost Benefit Analysis, and Feasibility Study	50	33	Doesn't address need for input of child support information and mapping with existing data. Only one proven example from Financial perspective.
3.4	Business Requirements Document and Business Processes	70	50	Uses collaborative workshops and interactive/embedded support. However, doesn't identify key personnel with any experience in child support or address needs specific to program.
3.5	DDI RFP Package	50	36	Didn't discuss Subject Matter Experts or provide examples of what an actual package would look like.
3.6	Advance Planning Document Preparation and Support	10	6.4	No experience with child support services identified. Limited discussion on subcontractor experience. Response seemed like it was reusing work from another project not relevant to this.
3.7	Project Management Assistance	10	6	Describes Realtime dashboards and contextual help. Discrepancy in task table and description.
3.8	Project Risk Mitigation	10	5	Didn't make mention of the factors that Montana already identified or draw from previous experience.

	Information Resource Group			xxxxxx
Section Reference #	Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
	Evaluated RFP Section			
Step 1:	Provision of Services			
Section 2:	Offeror Qualifications			
	Staffing Roles, Responsibilities, and Offeror Qualifications	375 Possible Points		
2.1	Staffing Plan and Resource Availability	50	42	Described Knowledgeable staff with relevant experience. Mentions working on other concurrent full scale projects with concern for FTE availability. Proposal was very difficult to follow.
2.1.2.A	Child Support Operations Background	100	73	Currently involved in child support projects and referenced previous experience.
2.1.2.B	Knowledge of Business Process Redesign Methods	100	60	Organization continues to be a massive issue and response was difficult to determine if portions were answered.
2.1.2.C	Knowledge of federal Child Support Enforcement Systems, rules and compliance	100	60	No narrative or answer directly for this response but content was scattered throughout areas of proposal. This level of organization would not be acceptable in required reporting.
2.1.3	Resumes of Key Personnel	25	23	Staff identified are experienced and clearly identified qualifications for relevant past projects.
Section 3:	Scope of Work			
	Demonstration of Ability to Meet Deliverables	225 Possible Points		
3.2	Collateral Review	25	23	Section was much easier to navigate. Provided clear section and response. Described follow through and deliverables.
3.3	Gap Analysis, Cost Benefit Analysis, and Feasibility Study	50	44	Describes responsible parties with clear plan and comprehensive support and breakdown of ROI.

3.4	Business Requirements Document and Business Processes	70	65	Visual diagram was organized and clear. Narrative response missed a few items but was overall good.
3.5	DDI RFP Package	50	37	Referenced relying on Subject Matter Experts and collaborating directly with legal but CSSD should be the only direct contact
3.6	Advance Planning Document Preparation and Support	10	8	Demonstrated good understanding of funding and presented an organized plan
3.7	Project Management Assistance	10	7.5	Described partner oriented approach with ongoing training and development. Described existing network of resources. Missed part of the response requirements.
3.8	Project Risk Mitigation	10	8	Good outline meets expectations.

	Public Consulting Group			xxxxxx
Section Reference #	Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
	Evaluated RFP Section			
Step 1:	Provision of Services			
Section 2:	Offeror Qualifications			
	Staffing Roles, Responsibilities, and Offeror Qualifications	375 Possible Points		
2.1	Staffing Plan and Resource Availability	50		
2.1.2.A	Child Support Operations Background	100		
2.1.2.B	Knowledge of Business Process Redesign Methods	100		
2.1.2.C	Knowledge of federal Child Support Enforcement Systems, rules and compliance	100		
2.1.3	Resumes of Key Personnel	25		
Section 3:	Scope of Work			
	Demonstration of Ability to Meet Deliverables	225 Possible Points		
3.2	Collateral Review	25		
3.3	Gap Analysis, Cost Benefit Analysis, and Feasibility Study	50		
3.4	Business Requirements Document and Business Processes	70		
3.5	DDI RFP Package	50		
3.6	Advance Planning Document Preparation and Support	10		
3.7	Project Management Assistance	10		
3.8	Project Risk Mitigation	10		

	Public Knowledge, LLC			xxxxxx
Section Reference #	Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
	Evaluated RFP Section			
Step 1:	Provision of Services			
Section 2:	Offeror Qualifications			
	Staffing Roles, Responsibilities, and Offeror Qualifications	375 Possible Points		
2.1	Staffing Plan and Resource Availability	50	46	Direct knowledge of Montana systems with child support and technical support experience. Realistic availability and project timeline considering they are still actively working on other projects.
2.1.2.A	Child Support Operations Background	100	90	Extensive background in Child Support with experienced staff. Only one example of past project but it was large scale and also government agency.
2.1.2.B	Knowledge of Business Process Redesign Methods	100	90	Table and narrative were a little hard to follow but showed multiple projects with clear and concise deliverables. Collaborative approach focused on human perspective
2.1.2.C	Knowledge of federal Child Support Enforcement Systems, rules and compliance	100	94	Many years of combined experience in child support at various levels. Even discusses training offered and an attorney with key experience.
2.1.3	Resumes of Key Personnel	25	23	Complete, concise, and good background for all personnel.
Section 3:	Scope of Work			
	Demonstration of Ability to Meet Deliverables	225 Possible Points		
3.2	Collateral Review	25	23	Defined completion for each deliverable including level of effort, timeline, and analysis.

3.3	Gap Analysis, Cost Benefit Analysis, and Feasibility Study	50	46	Very clear and detailed including deliverables and work product stages. Data is complete with plan, deliverables, outcomes, and involving DPHHS.
3.4	Business Requirements Document and Business Processes	70	66	Very thorough and quality in both organization and detail. Assumptions, relationship tracking, and outcomes was clear. Prioritizes inclusion.
3.5	DDI RFP Package	50	46	Narrative and table format made very clear expectations. Never had protest or overturn in previous projects.
3.6	Advance Planning Document Preparation and Support	10	9	Clear and in depth knowledge of IAPD, and level of support and cooperation
3.7	Project Management Assistance	10	9	Understanding of timeline and methodology, well supported. Knowledge transfer is a core value between project management teams
3.8	Project Risk Mitigation	10	9	Emphasizes early identification, collaboration, and adaptive response.
Step 2:	Oral Interview/Demonstration			
	Demonstration	200 Points Possible		
	Offeror Oral Presentation/Demonstration	200	190	Very clear and organized presentation. Fully staffed without need for subcontractors. Identified extensive experience in Child Support. Well rounded group of staff focused on experience and communication with stakeholders. Partnership and collaboration is key to their process and acknowledged State's initial progress.

	Treinen Associates			xxxxxx
Section Reference #	Category	Possible Points	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
	Evaluated RFP Section			
Step 1:	Provision of Services			
Section 2:	Offeror Qualifications			
	Staffing Roles, Responsibilities, and Offeror Qualifications	375 Possible Points		
2.1	Staffing Plan and Resource Availability	50	38	Team member breakdown was thorough and direct experience to child support with heavy use of SMEs. Trading partner mentioned throughout proposal but role not clearly defined
2.1.2.A	Child Support Operations Background	100	77	Ample experience in Child Support although somewhat limited scope compared to this project. Partner Vendor seemed to be the operational provider but again no explanation on relationship or background.
2.1.2.B	Knowledge of Business Process Redesign Methods	100	80	Previous relevant projects listed were smaller and/or limited in scope and level of effort required. Still described adequate experienced and capabilities.
2.1.2.C	Knowledge of federal Child Support Enforcement Systems, rules and compliance	100	80	Experience is often from older work and without definition of roles or level of involvement between subcontractors, partners, etc.
2.1.3	Resumes of Key Personnel	25	23	Resume detail was disproportionate and scattered between subcontractor/partner consulting roles, or FTEs. Overall experience of personnel is exceptional.
Section 3:	Scope of Work			
	Demonstration of Ability to Meet Deliverables	225 Possible Points		

3.2	Collateral Review	25	19	Methodology was thorough and good depth of knowledge overall. plan was forward thinking. Discussion of review processes left concerns with cost structure and may be restrictive.
3.3	Gap Analysis, Cost Benefit Analysis, and Feasibility Study	50	44	Feasibility study mentions old template discussion. Did discuss options such as COTS system. Collaboration discussion sounded appropriate. Didn't specifically address Federal review requirements.
3.4	Business Requirements Document and Business Processes	70	66	Hybrid approach with focus on user experience stories and analysis.
3.5	DDI RFP Package	50	38	Identifies that final acceptance is contingent on approval but doesn't include that timeframe in overall timeline. Team "can" remain actively engaged but will they.
3.6	Advance Planning Document Preparation and Support	10	8	Didn't include timeline for review period. Demonstrated they have knowledge of regulation with team. Good member experience. Language sounds like they are partnering with OCSS, not CSSD which is a big concern.
3.7	Project Management Assistance	10	8.4	Good communication described and can tailor to States needs. Focus on communication, collaboration and knowledge transfer.
3.8	Project Risk Mitigation	10	7	Identified 3 additional risks and provide good early detection and mitigation strategies but depended heavily on using CSSD Time. Order of feasibility study didn't seem appropriate timing.
Step 2:	Oral Interview/Demonstration			
	Demonstration	200 Points Possible		

Offeror Oral Presentation/Demonstration

200

140

Didn't detail engagement with the Montana team or emphasize collaboration. Path and procedures outlined seemed less organized and more confusing. Relationship between subcontractor and Contractor was explained better but focus still seemed to be on their relationship vs with the State. Streamlined feasibility process didn't seem it had netted results. Initial Process maps will be generated based on previous models when each case should be different and generated from scratch. Previous experience referenced most frequently hasn't been completed yet.

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	\$336,812.00		
Vendor Name	Proposed Cost	Points Earned	Notes:
Elyon Enterprise Strategies	\$350,000.00		
Information Resource Group	\$346,000.00		
Public Consulting Group	\$797,400.00		
Public Knowledge, LLC	\$337,500.00	199.6	
Treinen Associates	\$336,812.00	200.0	