

Solicitation Cancellation Request

Route a completed request, as one file in PDF format, via e-mail attachment sent to: Agsprs.Agsprs@tn.gov

APPROVED	
	
CHIEF PROCUREMENT OFFICER	8-4-14 DATE

Request Tracking #	31701-03087
1. Solicitation #	31701-03087
2. Goods or Services Caption	Mobile Device Management/Mobile Application Store (MDM/MAS)
3. Requestor Contact Information - name, e-mail address & telephone #	Alan Atherton, alan.atherton@tn.gov, 615-253-6852
4. Approval Criteria <i>Per T.C.A. § 12-3-502(b) and Rule 0690-03-01-.06(3)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unreasonably high prices or failure of all responses to meet technical specifications <input type="checkbox"/> Error or defect in the solicitation <input type="checkbox"/> Cessation of need <input type="checkbox"/> Unavailability of funds <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lack of adequate competition <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other reason determined to be in the best interests of the state

5. Justification

As reflected in Item 4 above, there are multiple reasons for this request to cancel the subject solicitation.

The State received four (4) responses. Of these, two proposals (August Schell and IBM) were rejected for failure to comply with mandatory requirements. In the interest of more competition, the State attempted to remedy the non-compliance through clarification requests. Upon receipt of the responses to the clarification requests, the Evaluation Team determined that these two proposals were still non-compliant with one or more mandatory requirements. Therefore, the proposals from August Schell and IBM were disqualified.

The Evaluation Team deemed the remaining two proposals (Carahsoft and Excalibur) technically compliant and able to proceed to the Cost Proposal evaluation phase. Upon opening the Cost Proposals the State found the following:

1. Carahsoft's cost response did not follow the instructions for preparing the Cost Proposal. The additional information added by Carahsoft and its failure to use a Cost Proposal form substantially similar to the one provide in the RFP created unacceptable ambiguity with regard to the actual proposed cost.
2. Excalibur's proposed cost amount was significantly higher than the State's budget for this project. Even if Excalibur were to prevail in the evaluation, the State could not afford to contract with them at the proposed price.

In the judgment of the Evaluation Team and State procurement officials, the issues mentioned in items 1 and 2 above were not subject to remedy through clarification. The result is that the State has no viable proposers for this procurement.

It is therefore in the State's best interest to cancel this solicitation.

Agency Head Signature & Date – *contracting agency head or authorized signatory*

Kerry B. Stautman

8/4/14