

RFP Modernization

Kelly Johnson, CITO
Kansas Department of Labor



Group Scoring

Group	Average of Vendor A %	Average of Vendor B %	Average of Vendor C %	Average of Vendor D %
100 - Vendor	95.00	90.00	40.00	60.00
200 – Project Delivery	87.50	77.50	70.00	82.50
300 – Regulatory/Compliance	88.00	91.60	64.20	72.20
400 - Finance	49.13	69.32	59.39	72.93
500 - Technical	87.08	86.54	64.58	76.78
600 - Benefits	82.48	78.86	50.10	52.10
700 - Tax	84.00	70.00	13.00	79.00
800 - Appeals	76.52	79.87	61.31	73.64
900 - Legal	69.33	79.83	71.50	72.33
Grand Total	77.53	79.55	56.63	65.60

Scoring Results – Vendor Ranking

Vendor	Ranking Average
B	1.83
A	1.93
D	3.67
C	2.57

11 SMEs Top 2 Vendor Ranking

Vendor	In top 2
A	10
B	7
C	2
D	3

Counsel Requested Metrics

Rank	Code	Group	Item	Vendor A %	Vendor B %	Vendor C %	Vendor D%
1	505	Technical	Security	95.00	90.00	85.00	85.00
2	612	Benefits	Fraud	74.33	84.33	42.67	58.67
3	506	Technical	System Capabilities	90.19	98.86	63.95	84.46
3	101	Vendor Req	Experience	95.00	90.00	40.00	60.00
3	211	Project Delivery	Implementation - Go Live	87.50	77.50	70.00	82.50
6	609	Benefits	Investigations	85.00	90.00	50.00	50.00
7	604	Benefits	Manage Claims	85.00	90.00	50.00	50.00
8	608	Benefits	Charges	80.00	50.00	70.00	50.00
9	503	Technical	Data	95.00	95.00	50.00	60.00
9	700	Tax	Tax - All/General	84.00	70.00	13.00	79.00
		Grand Total		84.43	82.38	51.13	68.19

SME Responses

505 – Technical Security

Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Vendor D
80	75	85	85

- Vendor A Pro: Support SSO and OKTA.
- Vendor A Con: The API - there are some very specific guidelines for having secure APIs and its not addressed here.
- Vendor B Pro: Gateway Manager removes need for middle ware.
- Vendor B Con: Security testing often seems to be just 'access' centric and is not done until the end when the system is 'stable'.
- Vendor C Pro: Zero-trust architecture
- Vendor C Con: KDOL would have to take over the support of security infrastructure or keep vendor to maintain/mange.
- Vendor D Pro: Vendor has its own industry recognized security certification
- Vendor D Con: KDOL will have to integrate with Splunk.

SME Responses

612 – Benefits Fraud

Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Vendor D
81.5	89	54	83

- Vendor A Pro: Reduces time to detect/cancel fraud by SSN.
- Vendor A Con: While basic functionality is there, configuration will be needed if cases need prosecution.
- Vendor B Pro: Sets forth what modules they have to support the different UI processes needed, which shows they have a plan. In addition, appears minimal configuration needed for prosecution of cases.
- Vendor B Con:
- Vendor C Pro: 50 years experience.
- Vendor C Con: Significant configuration and customization to even perform basic tasks.
- Vendor D Pro: Flexible to meet KDOLs specific challenges.
- Vendor D Con: Does not provide much detail regarding how solution meets requirements.

SME Responses

506 – Technical System Capabilities

Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Vendor D
86.79	90.91	70.97	84.64

- Vendor A Pro: AWS Cloud
- Vendor A Con: Proposed system would need custom design work for audit trail of searched SSNs.
- Vendor B Pro: Lengthy History
- Vendor B Con: Post-implementation cost could be an issue with this product since it is indicated as partially meeting this requirement.
- Vendor C Pro: No additional cost for changes created through DOL-approved waivers.
- Vendor C Con: Very little out of box
- Vendor D Pro: Only vendor to answer yes to every technical requirement.
- Vendor D Con: A high number of custom developed work is needed to meet KDOL requirements.

SME Responses

100 Vendor Requirements

Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Vendor D
95.00	90.00	40.00	60.00

SME Responses

211 - Project Delivery Implementation Go Live

Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Vendor D
87.5	77.5	70	82.5

- Vendor A Pro: Will follow the Hybrid Agile implementation methodology.
- Vendor A Con: Uses sub-contractor.
- Vendor B Pro: Ten years of experience implementing their software.
- Vendor B Con: Not sure location of staff.
- Vendor C Pro: Detailed project plan.
- Vendor C Con: Did not see indication that they have installed UI in other states.
- Vendor D Pro: Nice layout of each task and what it is going to involve.
- Vendor D Con: Uses waterfall approach.

SME Responses

609 – Benefits Investigations

Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Vendor D
85	90	50	50

- Vendor A Pro:
- Vendor A Con:
- Vendor B Pro:
- Vendor B Con:
- Vendor C Pro:
- Vendor C Con:
- Vendor D Pro
- Vendor D Con:

SME Responses

604 – Benefits Manage Claims

Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Vendor D
85	90	50	50

- Vendor A Pro: They know UI terminology.
- Vendor A Con: Will they customize for Kansas or bring in from another state expecting us to use that?
- Vendor B Pro: They have developed “ICON and SIDES Subsystems.”
- Vendor B Con: Cannot tell if they system is user friendly for the employee. Demo will help here.
- Vendor C Pro:
- Vendor C Con: Automated testing will be 25% functional and 70% regression. Should numbers be higher?
- Vendor D Pro:
- Vendor D Con: Appears that Kansas will be developing training material and not the vendor.

SME Responses

608 – Benefits Charges

Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Vendor D
80	50	70	50

- Vendor A Pro:
- Vendor A Con:
- Vendor B Pro:
- Vendor B Con
- Vendor C Pro:
- Vendor C Con: Mostly configurable.
- Vendor D Pro:
- Vendor D Con: Sounds like they have to custom develop the ability to pay TRA benefits.

SME Responses

503 – Technical Data

Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Vendor D
95	95	50	60

- Vendor A Pro:
- Vendor A Con:
- Vendor B Pro:
- Vendor B Con:
- Vendor C Pro:
- Vendor C Con:
- Vendor D Pro:
- Vendor D Con:

SME Responses

700 - Tax

Vendor A	Vendor B	Vendor C	Vendor D
84	70	13	79

- Vendor A Pro: Clearly understands the policy and procedures of the UI Tax Division.
- Vendor A Con: Will require significant departure from current business practices.
- Vendor B Pro: 5 state customers.
- Vendor B Con: Copy/pasted all comments – no details/effort
- Vendor C Pro: More CF's, might leave room for customization
- Vendor C Con: No KDOL UI Tax knowledge of policy and procedures.
- Vendor D Pro: Worked with 7 different states.
- Vendor D Con: Some adaptation required for business users.

Reference Checks – Vendor A

- Strengths
 - Know UI.
 - Know their application.
 - BA staff is excellent.
 - Vendor leadership very willing to work with State leadership.
 - Accommodating.
 - Ensured the met the needs of the State, including executives.
- Weaknesses
 - Documentation – needs work, but fixed when asked
 - Communication – not always timely, but fixed when requested. Not proactive.
- Rehire?
 - Yes

Reference Checks – Vendor B

- Strengths
 - Organized.
 - Good methodology – flexible and adaptive.
 - Ease of use.
 - Configurable.
 - Troubleshooting and problem solving.
 - UI Knowledge.
- Weaknesses
 - Data conversion.
 - Documentation.
- Rehire?
 - Yes

Reference Checks – Vendor C

- Strengths
 - Manages client?
- Weaknesses
 - Leads are strong but developers and testers were just out of school and lacked skills.
 - Force things on the client.
 - Documentation was poor.
- Rehire?
 - No

Reference Checks – Vendor D

- Strengths
 - Cloud Solution.
 - Did not cut and run during the Pandemic.
 - Rolled with the punches.
- Weaknesses
 - Quality protocols – not enough testing by vendor.
 - State needs to do a lot of regression testing with every fix.
 - A lot is lost in translation when developing business rules.
 - Documentation.
 - Many workarounds in system to compensate for undelivered functionality.
- Rehire?
 - No