



PORTFOLIO TITLE: IT Vendor Managed Services

LEAD STATE: Connecticut

PORTFOLIO MAP

OVERVIEW:

The State of Connecticut in partnership with NASPO ValuePoint has awarded cooperative Master Agreements for IT Vendor Managed Services that includes a vendor managed system.

The Master Agreements allow Participating Entities that include but are not limited to states and local governments, to participate in the acquisition of technology contingent workers for purpose of staff augmentation and project-based work.

KEY BENEFITS:

This Master Agreement Portfolio is for the provision of Managed Service Provider ("MSP") services and an operational Vendor Management System ("VMS") for information technology ("IT") staffing resources, payroll staffing, and staffing support related to Contingent Workers in the IT industry.

Contractor Services shall also include assisting Purchasing Entities with Statement of Work ("SOW") drafting. Contractor Services shall be detailed in a SOW for Deliverable-based projects or in an applicable Purchase Order for hourly rate staff augmentation.

VENDOR RESPONSES:

A total of 16 proposals were received, and of those proposals, 10 proposals passed the minimum requirements of stage one of the evaluation. Of the 10 proposals, 4 suppliers were recommended for award based on responsiveness and final rankings against the pre-established evaluation criteria.

EVALUATION INFO:

Virtual evaluations were led by the Lead State of Minnesota. The evaluation was completed by the Sourcing Team on 7/13/2023.

INITIAL TERM:

November 1, 2023 through October 31, 2026

TOTAL POSSIBLE TERMS:

By mutual agreement, one or more extension options for a combined total period not to exceed the complete length of the original Term. If maximum extension options are exercised, end date of the Term will be **October 31, 2029**.

PRICING AND AWARD STRUCTURE:

The contracts will use a Vendor Funded model and is broken down by the following: The awarded Contractor will be compensated based on (1) the NTE Fully Burdened Hourly Base Rate or SOW-based fixed fee, (2) the Managed Service Provider (MSP) Service Fee, and (3) when applicable, the Vendor Managed System (VMS) Service Fee. The awarded Contractor will retain the MSP Service Fee percentage and, when applicable, the VMS Service Fee percentage, while the remainder is paid by the awarded Contractor to its Contingent Worker(s).

Staff Augmentation (Hourly-Based) Process Pricing: The pricing structure for staff augmentation (hourly-based) work is based on the contractual NTE fully burdened hourly base rate, service fees, and the number of hours of work performed.

SOW (Deliverable-Based) Process Pricing: The pricing schedule for SOW (Deliverable-based) projects is a new feature of this portfolio as a deliverable-based (project-based) structure that is to specific dates, Deliverables, the NTE fully burdened hourly base rate and Service fee(s). Purchasing Entities will pay upon completion of the defined deliverables and shall not exceed the quoted flat-fixed fee, regardless of the number of hours quoted or expended.

RFP INFORMATION:

- Solicitation Number: 22PSX0086
- Released: 1/18/2023
- Closed: 3/15/2023
- Total Days Publicly Posted: 56 days
- Number of Amendments Posted: 2
- Pre-Proposal Conference N/A
- Supplier Attendance: N/A

STATES ON SOURCING TEAM:

- Connecticut (Lead State)
- Colorado
- Kentucky
- Louisiana
- Montana

AWARD SUMMARY:

Awardees
Computer Aid Inc
Guidesoft
OST Global
Uwork.com

Responses were evaluated based on the following Evaluation Criteria:

The Sourcing Team evaluated proposals in multiple phases and steps. The evaluation criteria for each phase and scoring step were as follows:

STAGE 1: Administrative Response Requirements (Pass or Fail). All Proposals were reviewed first to ensure that they met the mandatory submittal requirements listed below. Proposals not meeting the mandatory submittal requirements were found non-responsive. The Lead State of Connecticut attempted to clarify with Responders' proposals that did not quite meet the requirements and provide an opportunity to clarify their response. The mandatory submittal requirements are listed below:

- Attachment A - Cost Proposal;
- Attachment B - Account and Technical Questionnaire;
- Attachment C - Business Questionnaire;
- Security Disclosure Statement in accordance with Attachment D; and
- Review and proposed edits to (1) 22PSX0086 Master Agreement and Exhibits and (2) Attachment E - RFP 22PSX0086 State of Connecticut Participating Addendum.

STAGE 2: Business and Technical Proposal. The Proposals that were deemed responsive from Stage 1, were reviewed and scored based on the evaluation criteria for this stage. Scores were assessed and scored based on a rating scale from 0-4 points and factored into the according weights. Only those Proposals meeting or exceeding a score threshold of three (3) points for Stage 2 were eligible to move on to Stage 3 (Cost Proposal). The evaluation criterion for this stage are listed in order of importance below:

- Technology;
- Demonstrated Performance, experience, capabilities and resources;
- Management and quality assessment;
- Business assessment;
- Approach; and
- Demonstrated ability to meet terms and conditions.

STAGE 3: Cost Proposal. The Proposals that exceeded the score threshold of three (3) points for Stage 2 were eligible to be reviewed and scored based on the evaluation criteria for this stage listed in order of importance below. Scores will be on a rating scale out of four (4) points and averaged. Maximum total points is four (4) for Stage 3 (Cost Proposal).

- Fees, rebates, and discounts
- Not-to-Exceed (NTE) hourly rate sheet
- IT position descriptions

Fees, rebates, and discounts along with the NTE hourly rates submitted were calculated and then ranked accordingly based on the weighted factors and the range outside of the average rate.

To be considered for award proposals meeting or exceeding a combined score threshold of six (6) (using the sum of the Proposer's Stage 2 Business and Technical Proposal scores and Stage 3 Cost Proposal scores) will be eligible for award.

Stage 2 and 3 were both conducted via consensus scoring. All of the scoring members individually scored and then during the sourcing team meetings were able to discuss/deliberate and come to an agreement on one score for each section.

After scoring was completed the Lead State and Multistate Sourcing Team had an opportunity to determine which Proposals are most advantageous to the Lead State and potential Participating Entities and Purchasing Entities. The following factors were considered:

1. Identification of a natural break in total scores
2. Identification of a minimum scoring threshold above which Proposers are deemed to be adequately qualified; and
3. Consideration of the optimal number of Contractors required to successfully supply Deliverables to Participating Entities and Purchasing Entities