



Montana Department of Administration

State Procurement Services Division

DOA.mt.gov/SPSD • (406) 444-2575 • spsd@mt.gov

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD

Solicitation Title/Event Name: Outdoor Recreation Licensing, Survey & Reporting, and Re

Solicitation Number: FWP-RFP-2026-1113MQB

Solicitation Close Date: 8/11/2026

Notice of Intent to Award Posting Date: 10/09/2026

Issuing Contracts Officer/Contact Information: Michaela Barnicoat;

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.

In accordance with the Montana Procurement Act, the State has made available for public inspection the relevant scoring matrix/bid tab for the above-mentioned solicitation. 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)

Tyler Technologies Inc.

UNSUCCESSFUL OFFEROR(S)

Brandt Information Services LLC
FSH Technologies
RA Outdoors LLC dba Aspira

**Outdoor Recreation Licensing, Survey & Reporting, and Recreation Access & Reservation
FWP-RFP-2026-1113MQB
SCORE SUMMARY WORKSHEET**

Category	Possible Points	Brandt Information Services LLC	FSH Technologies	RA Outdoors LLC dba Aspira	Tyler Technologies Inc
Evaluated RFP Section	Points Possible				
Primary Services	Total 1,000 Points				
Section 4.1 Overview and Overall Licensing Solution Fit	80	76	48	74	70
Section 4.2.1 Sales and Purchasing	80	76	45	70	68
Section 4.2.2 Customer Management	70	68	41	60	60
Section 4.2.3 Eligibility and Enforcement	60	55	35	54	50
Section 4.2.4 Digital Licenses and Tags	70	68	40	60	60
Section 4.2.5 Point of Sale (POS) Functionality	50	48	30	41	40
Section 4.2.6 Drawings and Applications	70	67	30	66	55
Section 4.2.7 Accounting and Financial Management	100	90	50	75	75
Section 4.2.8 Reporting	70	66	30	55	62
Section 4.2.9 Interfaces and Integrations	80	71	40	55	60
Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and section 7 – Technical Architecture, Security, and Compliance	80	70	50	65	65
Sections 4.3, 8, and 15 – Implementation, Migration, Training, and Change Management	90	85	40	79	75
Section 9 – Ongoing Maintenance, Support, and Continuous Improvement	40	36	20	32	30
Section 10 and 4.3 – Offeror Qualifications, References, and PR/DJ Experience	60	56	20	50	50
Total of Technical Proposal		932	519	836	820
Product Demonstration/Interviews	Total of 600 Points				
Demonstration	600	445	0	540	570
Cost Proposal	Total of 400 Points				
Cost	400	72.1	0	42	400
TECHNICAL SUBTOTAL	1,000.00	932	519	836	820
Product Demonstration/Interview	600.00	445	0	540	570
Total Points	2,000.00	1449.1	519	1418	1790
Cost Proposal	400.00	72.1	0	42	400
FINAL TOTAL	2,000.00	1521.2	519	1460	2190

Outdoor Recreation Licensing, Survey & Reporting, and Recreation Access & Reservation					
FWP-RFP-2026-1113MQB					
Individual Scoring Matrix					
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
Brandt Information Services LLC					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Evaluated RFP Section	Point Values			Score	Justification
Primary Services	Total 1,000 Points				
Section 4.1 Overview and Overall Licensing Solution Fit	80	76	1	76	Offeror provides a strong, overall licensing solution that is designed specifically for state fish and wildlife agencies. Their system addresses licensing permits, drawings, POS, mobile applications, fulfillment, accounting, reporting, and enforcement related functions. Their proposal also demonstrates experience working with western state wildlife agencies including Idaho, South Dakota, Washington, and Oregon.
			2	76	Offeror proposes a single statewide platform that brings customer accounts, licensing, permits, applications and drawings, payments, enforcement-related restrictions, digital credentials, reporting, and accounting into one system. The proposal emphasizes a centralized customer record; configurable product, eligibility, pricing, quota, and point rules; cross-channel service through online, mobile, POS, and operational support for high-volume seasonal events. Solution includes implementation, conversion, testing, training, phased deployment, warranty, and ongoing support services. Offeror identifies experience with outdoor licensing and recreation services across 25 states, including a stated western-state's relevant to FWP's operational environment.
			3	78	Brandt proposes a single Go Outdoors platform spanning public web, mobile, agent POS, administration, service desk, and law-enforcement access. It states that core KC1 functions are substantially out of the box and Montana-specific needs will be configuration plus targeted implementation.
			4	76	The Offeror has a lot of experience with similar state fish and wildlife agencies and has active, long-term statewide systems in place. Their proposed platform appears to offer everything FWP needs for licensing, customer accounts, applications and drawings, digital licenses and tags, reporting, payments, enforcement access, and administrative configuration. It also supports sales across online, mobile, and offices. They seem to understand FWP's connectivity challenges and describe mobile and limited-connectivity options that could be useful for customers, staff, and enforcement in remote areas. The system also includes additional features, such as CRM and communications, event management, and access-management tools, that could be useful as FWP's needs change over time. The Offeror was marked down in points due to the response relying on a lot of general "can support" and "will configure" language, so it is not clear what is already available versus what would require configuration, customization, or additional paid enhancement work. It is unsure if their POS setup will work well with FWP License Ambassadors, especially related to hardware requirements. It was also not clear on whether they can accommodate other fulfillment options beyond their standard digital and print fulfillment approach.
			2	78	Offeror's proposed solution uses a centralized customer record, product catalog, eligibility structure, payment framework, and audit trail to manage hunting, fishing, trapping, conservation, recreation, permit, pass, and raffle sales. Authorized FWP staff can configure products, pricing, effective dates, quotas, eligibility, channel availability, fulfillment, fund coding, and reporting attributes without creating disconnected workflows. Solution supports applications, drawings, surplus opportunities, permit applications, immediate, pre-drawing or post-drawing payment options, donations, and complex NRBGC scenarios. Each transaction remains linked to the customer, application, awarded privilege, financial record, reporting data, and audit history.
			3	78	The response addresses OTC/POS, online, and License Ambassador sales from one catalog and customer record, and specifically describes pre-application, payment timing, raffles, special permits, donations, effective-dated products, Big Game Combo-style logic, surplus events, and family purchasing.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
Brandt Information Services LLC					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.1 Sales and Purchasing	80	76	4	72	The Offeror appears to support most of the sales and purchasing requirement FWP needs, including hunting, fishing, trapping, conservation, permits, drawings, special permits, raffle sales, donations tied to purchases, complex Big Game Combo and refund logic, surplus tag sales, and family purchasing. They also indicate they can support applications that are pending selection and provide a virtual waiting-room or controlled-entry option for high-demand surplus sales, which could improve the customer experience and help manage peak demand. There was not a clear response to location-based purchase requirements. The payment responses are largely based on the Offeror's own payment framework, stored payment methods, and payment processing model, while FWP's preference is to use the State payment processor. It is not clear whether all, some, or none of the described immediate payment, pre-payment, post-selection payment, refund, and payment authorization functions will work with the state processor. Donations can be connected to license purchases, but there was not an option for a customer to donate all or part of a refund. There are also concerns about the linked account functionality. The response describes a linked person being selected during a purchase and keeping the privilege associated with that individual's account, but it does not clearly show that the primary account holder can later access and display a minor's or spouse's licenses and tags from their own account or mobile device.
			1	79	The offeror addresses ther equired sales channels, including online sales, FWP POS and License Ambassadors. The system supports hunting, fishing, trapping, conservation, and recreation products as well as drawings, different payment options, eligibility rules, pricing, inventory and fulfillment. The proposal provides a centralized product catalog and applies the same business rules across the sales channels.
Section 4.2.2 Customer Management	70	68	3	68	Brandt describes a unified profile for identity, residency, privileges, transactions, documents, communications, restrictions, and history; it also describes driver-license scanning, de-duplication, linked family/minor accounts, and organizational accounts.
			4	68	Strong overall customer-management solution with a unified customer account that brings together identity and contact information, residency, and customer classifications, licenses and tags, applications and drawing outcomes, points, transactions, refunds, fulfillment, restrictions, harvest reporting, communications, and customer-service history. The proposal indicates the same account can be used across online self-service, FWP offices, License Ambassador sales, contact-center workflows, mobile applications, and approved interfaces. The Offeror appears to support business or organization accounts, including accounts that can be used for commercial permits. They also indicate support for tribal member customer designations without requiring a Montana ID. The proposal provides several options for managing duplicate accounts, including duplication detection, automatic duplicate resolution, authorized account merging, and maintaining audit history for account changes. They also indicate they can integrate with CARS as part of its state system integration approach, although specific interface, data exchange, and implementation effort should be confirmed. They describe parents, guardians, spouses, and other linked customers being able to purchase for one another through a shared cart, while keeping the license, permit, tag, application, or points associated withthe actual recipient's customer record. However, the response makes the linked account functionality sound primarily transaction based. It does not clearly establish that the primary account holder can later access, view, or display a linked minor's or spouse's licenses and tags from the primary account or mobile app. This could affect family purchasing and field access to credentials.
			1	67	The Offeror provides a centralized customer account that connects customer information with licenses, permits, applications, preference points, payments, restrictions, communications and historical activity. The proposal also supports business and organizational accounts and allows relationships between individuals and organizations to be maintained.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
Brandt Information Services LLC					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
			2	68	Offeror proposes a unified customer-account model that connects identity, residency, licenses, permits, applications, PP & BP administration, restrictions, documents, financial transactions, communications, and historical activity across all service channels. Staff and Ambassadors can locate or create customer records through driver's-license or state-ID barcode scanning, or manual search and entry. Solution supports FWP-specific business needs, including tribal-member resident pricing without a MT-issued ID, test and training accounts in segregated environments, duplicate detection and controlled record consolidation, secure linking of family-member accounts, and individuals with business or organizational accounts.
Section 4.2.3 Eligibility and Enforcement	60	55	4	48	The Offeror appears to support FWP's eligibility requirements through configurable rules that can evaluate customer information such as residency, age, certifications, prerequisite licenses, points, purchase history, and current restrictions. The system can apply those rules across online sales, FWP office POS, License Ambassador transactions, applications, and other authorized channels. It can suppress ineligible products, prevent issuance, route transactions for review, and allow controlled overrides when permitted by FWP policy. The proposed system also supports restrictions and enforcement holds that can be applied to an entire customer account or limited to a particular product, species, season, hunt area, privilege, or transaction type. They describe effective dating, role-based permissions, supporting documentation, release or reinstatement conditions, controlled overrides, and audit history for enforcement-related activity. The response did not explain how holds are entered into the system. It is unclear whether holds must be manually entered by FWP staff or whether the system can interface with MRRE, IWVC, DPHHS, CARS, or other State and external enforcement sources to receive, update, and release holds. The proposal references restrictions received from approved external enforcement sources, but it does not identify the supported sources, interface methods, synchronization timing, error handling, or whether integrations are included versus requiring additional work. This is important because manual entry of all holds could create workload, timeliness, and data-quality risks. The fraud detection response is marked as "Minor," even though the response describes configurable controls for reprints, replacement requests, paper-to-digital switching, duplicate issuance attempts, unusual refunds, and other transaction patterns.
			1	55	The response provides real-time eligibility checks using information such as residency, age, certifications, previous purchases, season and other configured rules. Restrictions and enforcement holds can prevent a product from being issued or require additional review, and authorized staff can make controlled overrides with an audit history.
			2	55	Offeror's proposes a centralized, real-time eligibility and regulatory rules across online self-service, FWP office POS, License Ambassador, and authorized administrative channels. It evaluates customer information—including residency, age, certifications, prior purchases and privileges, season, active restrictions, and product-specific rules—before allowing a license, permit, tag, or application transaction to proceed. Solution supports restrictions and enforcement holds at the customer, program, product, species, season, privilege, or transaction level to prevent prohibited transactions across all sales channels. For potential fraud, Offeror proposes configurable transaction controls, exception flags, review workflows, and thresholds for activity such as multiple reprints, fulfillment changes, high-frequency transactions, and paper-after-digital requests.
			3	55	Brandt describes real-time, effective-dated eligibility rules, restrictions/holds, controlled overrides, audit history, and cross-channel enforcement. Its RTM self-rates fraud detection/flagging as Minor rather than Meets for KC1-4.2.3-003, even though the narrative describes configurable flags for reprints and paper/digital switching.
			1	69	The Offeror directly addresses the digital license and e-tag requirements. The proposal includes digital credentials, mobile display, print at home options, barcode validation, offline access, synchronization, reprints, and audit history. Their experience with Idaho electronic salmon and steelhead tagging and offline mobile e-tagging is especially relevant to Montana's field conditions and provides confidence in this area.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
Brandt Information Services LLC					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.4 Digital Licenses and Tags	70	68	2	68	Offeror's proposed solution supports digital licenses and E-Tags, paper or digital fulfillment choices, print-at-home documents, mobile license display, barcode-based ID validation, and offline access. Solution supports digital tags remain part of the customer's central licensing listing and can be loaded to a device in low/no connectivity, with updates returned to the central system once service is available. Solution can configure fulfillment rules by product, including paper, digital-only, customer-choice, print-at-home, document release timing, reprint, and format-change history.
			3	65	The proposal describes digital credentials/tags, paper-versus-digital choice, print-at-home, field display, validation, and offline synchronization. However, the all-capability RTM marks provision or integration of mobile apps as Minor, and the Scope says final integration with MyFWP or a replacement will be determined through the implementation approach.
			4	68	The response demonstrates the support of digital licenses and tags, including mobile display, barcode-based validation, print-at-home documents, and configurable paper versus digital fulfillment options. The proposal states that eligible credentials can be synchronized to a device and displayed offline, which is important for customers and enforcement in Montana areas with limited cellular service. They also support controls over paper and digital formats. FWP can configure whether a product is issued digitally, on paper, in both formats, or with a customer choice at checkout. They describe format change controls, including whether switching formats is allowed after issuance, reprint and replacement limits, fees, staff approval, and fraud flags for repeated paper to digital or digital to paper changes. This should allow FWP to prevent switching tag formats where policy requires it. Print at home capability is also supported for eligible licenses, permits, tags, and related documents. The linked account functionality does not clearly allow a primary account holder to later access and display licenses or tags issued to linked accounts, such as minors or spouses. The proposal explains that licenses and privileges remain associated with the recipient's individual customer account, but does not confirm that an authorized parent, guardian, or spouse can view or display those credentials from the primary account or mobile application.
			2	48	Offeror proposes a centralized, real-time POS environment for FWP HQ, regional offices, and other Ambassador locations. Staff would work from the centralized customer, licensing, inventory, payment, and transaction records. The web-based platform supports standard workstations and POS peripherals, including thin clients, desktop workstations, printers, barcode and ID scanners, cash drawers, and State-approved payment devices. It also supports keyboard shortcut workflows for fast, consistent transactions during high volume sales periods; cash, check, card, ACH, EFT, and other approved payment options; and role-based controls for actions such as voids, reprints, refunds, and corrections.
			3	48	Brandt addresses centralized regional-office POS, typical peripherals, keyboard navigation, cash/check/electronic payments, and granular permissions for voids, reprints, refunds, and corrections.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
Brandt Information Services LLC					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.5 Point of Sale (POS) Functionality	50	48	4	48	The Offeror supports centralized, permission-driven POS access for FWP regional offices. The proposal describes role-based functions and privileges that office staff need to complete transactions, including customer account maintenance, license and tag issuance, renewals, replacements, exchanges, voids, reprints, refunds, transaction corrections, eligibility and point verification, payment processing, fulfillment selection, and customer history access. They also describe configurable user roles and a broad set of out of the box permissions, allowing FWP to limit higher risk functions and establish appropriate approval controls. Their POS is designed for high volume use with keyboard friendly navigation, logical workflows, driver license and barcode scanning, customer research, validation prompts, and reuse of account information to reduce repetitive data entry. They indicate compatibility with common POS equipment, including thin clients, standard desktop workstations, printers, barcode scanners, cash drawers, drivers license scanners, and state approved payment devices. They were lacking information on hardware requirements. While the proposal identifies compatible equipment and plans to validate compability during implementation, it does not clearly identify which existing FWP hardware can be reused, what equipment FWP would need to purchase or replace, expected hardware specifications, equipment costs, or ongoing maintenance and replacement responsibilities.
			1	48	The response provides a dedicated POS system that supports customer accounts, license and permit sales, tag issuance, payments, controlled hunt applications, harvest reporting and staff management. The system also provides real time information and reporting. The proposal includes support for POS hardware, troubleshooting, maintenance and replacement which provides additional support for FWP's ambassadors if needed.
Section 4.2.6 Drawings and Applications	70	67	3	68	Brandt describes configurable Big Game Combo, special permit, surplus, preference/bonus point, application-status, notification, and multi-stage refund workflows, with system records and administrative oversight. This is detailed written coverage.
			4	62	The response appears to be able to support most of the complexity in FWP's current drawing and application processes. Their proposed draw engine supports regular and special-issue drawings, Big Game Combo licenses, special permits, surplus opportunities, leftovers, and future programs. The system can apply configured eligibility rules, quotas, resident and nonresident allocations, application choices, preference or bonus points, selection methods, notifications, issuance, and audit records. The response is particularly strong on payment and refund options. Offeror describes immediate payment, pre-payment, payment authorization, and post-selection payment workflows. The response also describes layered refund rules for complex applications, including full or partial refunds, retention of nonrefundable fees, refunds tied to individual components of an application, customer account credits, refunds to the original payment method, refund by mail, and administrative exception review. This appears capable of addressing many of the payment and refund scenarios FWP manages today. The response lacked detail on how party applications would be handled. While the proposal mentions individual and group applications, it does not clearly explain party leadership, member invitations or consent, eligibility validation for all party members, party changes or withdrawals, group-sized requirements, failed payment handling, partial eligibility issues, draw outcomes, refunds, or preference and bonus point treatment for party members.
			1	67	Brandt provides drawing and application functions for regular, unplanned, special issue, leftover and surplus opportunities. FWP would be able to configure application periods, eligibility, quotas, choices, preference and bonus points and selection rules. Applications, results, awards, and point changes remain connected to the customer account and audit history. The Offeror also provides an example of modifying an existing Idaho drawing process when the State changed its draw structure, demonstrating the ability to adapt the system to changing program requirements.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
Brandt Information Services LLC					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
			2	68	Offeror's proposed solution uses a centralized, configurable drawing rules engine to administer complex NRBGC licenses, special permits, surplus opportunities. FWP staff can configure drawing types, quotas, eligibility rules, PPs & BPs administration, application periods, selection methods, award processing, customer notifications, payment timing, and post-draw distribution without requiring redevelopment for each program. Solution maintains applications as active records throughout their lifecycle, allowing customers and authorized FWP staff to view current status, history, results, and required next steps. Solution supports configurable notifications and refunds at multiple points in the application and drawing process.
Section 4.2.7 Accounting and Financial Management	100	90	4	84	The Offeror provides many options for tracking financial data. The proposed system ties sales, applications, payments, refunds, adjustments, account codes, revenue distributions, and audit history back to the originating customer and transaction. It also supports effective-dated pricing and catalog changes, payment status tracking, refunds and reversals, and financial reporting. It was unclear whether FWP could distribute the revenue or fees from a single item across multiple funds or account codes. They refer to revenue distributions and fund coding, but the response does not clearly demonstrate how a single license, permit, fee, or transaction could be split among multiple funds, statutory purposes, or revenue accounts, including how partial refunds or adjustments would be allocated back to those funds. The response lacked detail on how reconciliation works in the system. The proposal states that financial activity is tied to originating transactions and supports reconciliation, but it does not explain the operational workflow for reconciling individual transactions to payment authorization, processor settlement, office or agent collections, deposits, refunds, reversals, and final posting to State financial systems. Their financial and payment responses rely heavily on their own payment framework, including stored payments methods, pre-authorization, post-selection charges, captures, settlements, refunds, reversals. FWP indicated that use of the State payment processor contract is preferred. Offeror states they can integrate with the state approved payment processors, but did not clearly confirm that all payment workflows will work through the state processor without functional limitations, additional interfaces, or added costs.
			1	97	The response provides detailed financial tracking, including revenue, refunds, fund coding, reconciliation, and audit history. Transactions can be reviewed by payment processor, sales channel, office, agent, product, fund, payment type, date, and fiscal period. The proposal also addresses SABHRS integration and PR/DJ allocation requirements.
			2	95	Offeror's solution would serve as a centralized financial system of record for licensing revenue, sales statistics, payments, refunds, voids, adjustments, donations, applications, permits, tags, passes, and related transactions across all authorized channels. Each financial event is tied to the customer, product or privilege, payment method, fund distribution, sales channel, fiscal period, receipt, user or system action, and audit history. The proposal supports configurable financial mappings, multi-step accounting approvals, transaction-to-revenue reconciliation, detailed audit records, tax calculations, SABHRS data exchange, and traceable PR/DJ allocation reporting. The approach is designed to reduce manual financial handling and preserve a complete trail from the originating customer transaction through settlement, downstream accounting, reconciliation, reporting, and audit review.
			3	85	The response describes a revenue system of record, transaction-level audit and reconciliation controls, fund coding, payment/refund handling, and a planned SABHRS interface. Brandt proposes to configure the SABHRS method, mappings, frequency, and exception processes during design, and its RTM labels mandatory federal/USFWS and PR/DJ reporting as Minor.
			1	67	Brandt provides standard and ad hoc reporting for sales, revenue, transactions, refunds, customers, drawings, inventory, fulfillment, agent activity and financial reconciliation. Reports can be filtered and exported for use by FWP staff and management.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
Brandt Information Services LLC					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.8 Reporting	70	66	2	63	Offeror's proposed solution supports routine operational reports and authorized ad hoc analysis using centralized licensing, transaction, revenue, application, and customer data. Users can drill from summaries into detailed transactions; filter, sort, and isolate records; and deliver report content appropriate to customers, agents, internal staff, management, and auditors. The same data environment is intended to support USFWS, PR/DJ reporting by retaining the financial and program attributes needed to identify qualifying activity, track allocations, reconcile revenue, and support oversight.
			3	68	Brandt describes standard and ad hoc reporting, filtering, export, operational dashboards, and centralized data for federal reporting. Their response is very thorough, clearly addressing all components individually, including screenshots.
			4	65	The response provides many options for standard or "canned" reports and indicates that FWP can generate ad hoc reports for evolving operational, financial, program, and management needs. The proposal includes examples for sales and revenue, transactions, refunds, adjustments, customers, applications and draws, inventory and fulfillment, agent and office activity, commissions, account-code and fund distributions, reconciliation, audit activity, system administration, and management dashboards. The system supports drill down, filtering, sorting, and export capabilities, allowing staff to move from summary information to supporting transaction, customer, product, refund, adjustment, sales-channel, or location-level detail. Reporting is role-based and can be tailored for customers, License Ambassadors, internal users, management, and auditors. The response also identifies multi-fund and revenue-code reports with split configurable distributions, which should support reporting on revenue allocated across multiple funds. They lacked information about the graphical user interface for adhoc reporting. The proposal does not clearly show how staff build a report, select data fields, apply filters, join information across modules, create calculated fields, save and share reports definitions, or manage report permissions versus control.
			2	72	Offeror proposes to integrate the solution with MyFWP, the FWP website, SABHRS, the Wildlife Violators Compact, USFWS, Hunter Ed, among other FWP applications, along with KC 2 and 3 if those capabilities are awarded to separate vendors. Solution's integration approach is based on secure APIs, file exchanges, or other approved methods; documented data ownership; defined validation and timing rules; exception monitoring; and controlled exchange of the data required by each business workflow. Solution would remain the authoritative record for licensing decisions, customer licensing activity, transactions, revenue events, eligibility outcomes, restrictions, and audit history.
			3	60	Brandt provides a coherent API/file/interface approach for MyFWP, the FWP website, payment processing, SABHRS, CARS, other State agencies, WVC/USFWS, hunter education, internal applications, KC2, and KC3. But several key interfaces are described as workflows to be defined during design—e.g., SABHRS exchange method, State-agency data purpose, fields, mappings, and timing—rather than as demonstrated existing Montana integrations.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
Brandt Information Services LLC					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.9 Interfaces and Integrations	80	71	4	74	The proposal describes a generally strong integration approach, including secure interfaces, data mapping, validation rules, exchange timing, logging, monitoring, retry procedures, error handling, reconciliation, and documented responsibility boundaries. For SABHRS, Brandt specifically identifies support for financial mappings, fund codes, revenue categories, fiscal periods, refunds, voids, adjustments, rejected-record handling, and reconciliation back to the original licensing transaction. Before fully understanding FWP's internal-system use cases, they proposed providing a replicated copy of licensing data through a secure site-to-site connection rather than direct access to live data or a clearly defined transactional API. A replicated database may be appropriate for reporting, analytics, GIS, and some downstream integrations, but it may not meet requirements that depend on current real-time or near-real-time data, immediate validation, write-back transactions, or operational decision-making. The proposal does not yet define refresh frequency, latency, data scope, query limits, schema/data dictionary, change-control process, outage handling, or whether and how internal FWP systems can submit information back to the licensing system. There was lacking detail in which interfaces already exist versus which require Montana-specific configuration or development, the data exchanged in each direction, synchronization timing, ownership of ongoing support, and whether all interfaces are included in the proposed cost. The State payment-processor integration should be clarified in particular, since FWP expressed a preference for using the State contract and the proposal frequently describes workflows through its own payment framework.
			1	74	The response provides a strong integration approach and identifies connections with myFWP, the FWP website, payment processors, SABHRS, DOJ CARS, Department of Revenue, Department of Labor, DPHHS, Wildlife Violators Compact, USFWS, Hunter Education, and other FWP systems. They also has experience integrating with multiple Hunter Education systems.
			3	65	Brandt proposes U.S.-hosted SaaS, separate environments, encryption, PCI DSS, RBAC/MFA, audit records, accessibility, mobile/offline capability, and State data ownership. The proposal leaves RPO/RTO values for the final hosting and SLA plan, and states no production AI/ML capability today.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
Brandt Information Services LLC					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and section 7 – Technical Architecture, Security, and Compliance	80	70	4	68	The response indicates that all data will be located in the US. They also states that FWP retains exclusive ownership of State data and that it will return or securely dispose of State data at contract completion based on FWP direction and State retention requirements. They indicate that FWP can request and receive full data exports at any time. There needs to be clarification on the process, cost, and whether FWP can obtain a complete database-level export throughout the contract without vendor intervention or additional fees. The response describes a scalable cloud environment and says it will monitor application traffic, server response times, resource utilization, database activity, and network performance, then adjust capacity before and during critical events. However, it is not clear whether FWP has the ability to request additional compute capacity or whether scaling decisions are solely determined by the Offeror. The Offeror generally agrees to align with applicable State IT-security policies and standards, but did not include a specific statement acknowledging DOA authority over software approval or agreeing that proposed software, third-party components, mobile applications, payment services, hosting services, and future enhancements will follow applicable State and DOA technology-governance processes. The response indicates that its production platform does not currently include AI or machine-learning capabilities. The proposal says it may evaluate potential AI uses in the future, such as natural-language search, support-inquiry routing, anomaly or fraud indicators, demand forecasting, recommendations, or image-assisted identification, subject to future review and approval. It does not commit to delivering AI or ML capabilities as part of the proposed solution. They also state that the solution will include automated database backups, protected backup storage, recovery procedures, monitoring, and disaster-recovery capabilities. However, the proposal does not provide specific Recovery Point Objective (RPO) or Recovery Time Objective (RTO) commitments. They state those targets will be documented later in the final hosting and service-level plan. I would want contractual RPO and RTO targets before award, including recovery-test frequency, test results and corrective actions available to FWP, notification requirements, and remedies if the recovery objectives are not met. The response states that it has initiated the GovRAMP Progressing Snapshot process and anticipates achieving GovRAMP Verification during the contract term. This means GovRAMP Verification is not currently complete. The proposal does not provide a target date, identify the specific verification level or scope, explain what happens if verification is delayed or not achieved, or state whether FWP can require verification before production go-live.
			1	71	Brandt provides a cloud based system with security controls, payment security, accessibility, audit capabilities and the ability to support a large number of users and transactions. The proposal also includes offline functionality and field access, which is important for Montana areas where connectivity can be limited.
			2	72	Offeror agrees to comply with MT IT policies and standards, approved enterprise software and legal framework compliance. Offer proposes a US-hosted SaaS platform with scalable cloud infrastructure, 99.9% availability, performance testing, API-based integrations, State SSO and MFA support, role-based access controls, accessibility compliance, responsive web access, offline-capable mobile workflows, and separate development, test/QA, training, and production environments. The platform also includes auditing, PCI accreditation, recurring vulnerability assessments and penetration testing, encryption, incident-response procedures, audit trails, State data ownership, open-format data exports, retention and disposal controls, backup and disaster recovery, and data-conversion and quality-management capabilities.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
Brandt Information Services LLC					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Sections 4.3, 8, and 15 – Implementation, Migration, Training, and Change Management	90	85	4	82	The Offeror presents a strong implementation approach and states that it has achieved a 100% on-time launch record across its 17 state-agency implementations. That experience is reassuring, although the proposal does not indicate whether those launches were completed on budget, delivered the full originally contracted feature set, or relied on post-go-live phases, deferred enhancements, or scope changes. The proposal describes formal governance, scope, schedule, quality, risk, communications, resource, change, and acceptance controls, while also using iterative development, demonstrations, testing, and FWP feedback. This combination should provide useful structure and visibility. There is some concern that the Waterfall portion of the hybrid model may be less collaborative if major requirements, design decisions, and scope are fixed too early. The proposed training and knowledge-transfer approach is well thought out. They describe role-based training for administrators, frontline and regional staff, POS users, License Ambassadors, technical staff, and other user groups, using onsite and remote sessions, online modules, hands-on exercises, user manuals, quick-reference materials, and a training environment. The Offeror agrees to provide in-person participation in Helena for critical project periods, including requirements validation, solution design, data-conversion review, integration testing, UAT, training, mock cutover, deployment, and stabilization. This is a strength because it should support quicker decisions, better collaboration, and more effective issue resolution during high-risk project phases. They had a good proposed project schedule and its intent to account for FWP's busy operational cycles, including application deadlines, draw processing, high-volume license sales, reservation openings, hunting and fishing seasons, survey cycles, financial deadlines, Commission activities, and staff availability. This approach should reduce risk by avoiding disruptive implementation work during critical business periods. The proposal does not provide enough detail on the change-management and communications plans. They describes a formal change-request process, approval requirements, impact analysis, and automated tracking, but it does not clearly identify the proposed governance structure, decision-makers, meeting cadence, communication audiences, status-report format, escalation path, issue-resolution timelines, customer/agent communication strategy, or how it will communicate project decisions and changes to FWP staff, License Ambassadors, and the public.
			1	85	They provide a structured implementation process that includes project management, requirements review, system configuration, data migration, testing, UAT, performance testing and preparation for go live. The proposed migration process includes repeated data loads and validation so FWP can review the information before production. The Offeror also identifies dedicated implementation and training resources and has experience with statewide system rollouts.
			2	87	Offeror proposes a hybrid Waterfall-Agile methodology governed by PMI/PMBOK project-control practices. The approach combines defined scope, schedule, cost, quality, resource, risk, communications, procurement, stakeholder, and change-management controls with iterative configuration, demonstrations, reviews, testing, and stakeholder feedback. The proposal addresses implementation from initiation through post-go-live support, including requirements validation, gap analysis, configuration, migration, testing, training, mock cutovers, production readiness, warranty support, and transition to ongoing maintenance. It also commits to phased implementation, scheduling around MT's seasonal operations, on-site participation in Helena during key milestones, and approval of remote-work arrangements.
			3	80	The scope includes a PMI-aligned hybrid approach, requirements/gap analysis, repeated conversion and reconciliation, mock cutovers, training, readiness/go-no-go controls, and post-go-live support. The detailed schedule is deferred until after contract execution; Brandt characterizes early estimates as major-feature guidance, and its deployment discussion acknowledges a period of several hours when licensing transactions may not be processed.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
Brandt Information Services LLC					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 9 – Ongoing Maintenance, Support, and Continuous Improvement	40	36	1	38	The Offeror provides ongoing application and infrastructure support, incident management, maintenance, security updates, system releases, monitoring disaster recovery and POS support. The proposal also provides defined response and restoration targets for critical issues, including a 15 minute initial response for Priority 1 incidents and a four hour restoration or workaround target. This provides a clear support structure after implementation.
			2	38	Offeror proposes continuous maintenance and support after warranty without changing established support channels or losing operational knowledge. The support model includes controlled updates, testing in nonproduction environments, release planning around FWP's operating calendar, tiered incident management, documented severity definitions, response and restoration targets, escalation procedures, proactive monitoring, disaster recovery, annual service reviews, and structured support for high-demand periods. The proposal specifically addresses seasonal licensing, drawing, reservation, BMA, hunting-season, and survey peaks through enhanced staffing, extended weekday coverage, after-hours emergency support, pre-event readiness reviews, monitoring, and specific escalation contacts.
			3	35	Brandt responds to the required severity/time targets, peak support, monitoring, updates, escalation, 99.9% availability, and service credits. The RPO/RTO values are not proposed, and the SLA states service credits are the sole and exclusive monetary remedy, capped at 10% of annual recurring charges; that materially limits the practical financial remedy for sustained service failures.
			4	36	They demonstrate a comprehensive ongoing-maintenance and support model. The proposal includes production application and infrastructure support, incident and problem management, corrective and preventive maintenance, security and compatibility updates, monitoring, release management, backups, disaster-recovery maintenance, technical support for FWP staff, and support for FWP office POS users and License Ambassadors. They also provide a tiered service-desk structure and commits to response and resolution targets based on issue severity. The proposal includes onsite and remote training, online modules, hands-on exercises, user manuals, quick-reference materials, and role-specific training environments. The response also indicates that training materials can be maintained and updated as the system changes. The annual update cycle and on-demand training at no additional cost as positive features because they should help FWP address staff turnover, new License Ambassadors, evolving business rules, and system changes after go-live. The proposal's proactive monitoring and release-management approach are also strengths. They plan to monitor application, API, infrastructure, database, network, transaction, payment, external-interface, capacity, backup, security, and SLA information. The response says maintenance releases will be scheduled around FWP's business calendar, with testing, release notes, documentation, training impacts, and rollback or recovery procedures provided for applicable releases. Several operational details remain unclear.
			2	58	Offeror reports more than 25 relevant active statewide outdoor license and recreation system contracts and delivered the platform to multiple state fish and wildlife, natural resource, and park agencies since 2011. Its cited capabilities include hunting, fishing, trapping, commercial licensing, permits, quets and letter systems.
			3	55	Brandt provides extensive state fish-and-wildlife experience, named KC1 references (South Dakota, Iowa, and Idaho), proposed key personnel, a current SOC 2 Type II representation, and a statement of 15 years providing the Go Outdoors platform since 2011. Its PR/DJ narrative describes agencies and related programs but does not identify a specific PR/DJ-funded project or document 2 CFR 200 allocation work; reference contract values are listed as "N/A."

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
Brandt Information Services LLC					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 10 and 4.3 – Offeror Qualifications, References, and PR/DJ Experience	60	56	4	53	The response has substantial relevant qualifications and production experience with statewide state fish-and-wildlife systems. The company identifies more than 15 years of relevant experience and active contracts with numerous wildlife, natural-resource, and parks agencies. Their platform experience includes hunting, fishing, trapping, applications and drawings, harvest reporting, mobile applications, agent POS, customer service and contact centers, law-enforcement tools, fulfillment, financial management, reporting, reservations, and public-access functions. The Offeror appears to have adequate organizational capacity, with 350 staff across development, implementation, QA, training, infrastructure, customer service, and operations. They identify a dedicated project manager, account director, technical architect, development and QA leads, training lead, data-conversion lead, data-science/statistical lead, and operations/support resources. Brandt is registered and in good standing in Montana, claims a current SOC 2 Type II report, and is not proposing subcontractors. The proposal does not specifically identify successful completion of a Big Game Combo draw as required acceptance evidence. It refers generally to successful processing of the Big Game Combo season, including product setup, eligibility, application processing, payments, customer communications, reporting, and reconciliation. That is useful, but FWP should require a complete Big Game Combo drawing process as an explicit acceptance condition—not only application intake. The acceptance test should include draw configuration; applicant and party/group eligibility; preference and bonus points; quotas and allocations; randomization; selection; partial awards; post-selection payments; customer choices; refunds; point updates; notifications; reporting; financial reconciliation; audit records; and error, correction, or rollback scenarios. The BGC draw is at least as complex as the application process and should be demonstrated end to end before final acceptance. The Offeror has relevant PR/DJ experience in the sense that it supports wildlife agencies with conservation-program, licensing, financial, reporting, survey, and harvest data environments. It describes the ability to retain product, revenue, fund, transaction, program, and participation information for allocation tracking, federal reporting, auditability, and traceability.
			1	56	The Offeror exceeds the experience requirements and reports 15 years of relevant experience and more than 25 statewide outdoor recreation system contracts. The company has direct experience with licensing, drawings, e-tagging, harvest reporting, customer management, POS, law enforcement, financial reconciliation, mobile applications, and system integrations. The Idaho and Oklahoma implementations provide particularly relevant examples of operating large, statewide outdoor recreation systems.
TOTAL OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL		1000	932		
Product Demonstration/Interviews		Total of 600 Points			
			3	500	The demonstration was more challenging to follow. The backend seemed more complicated, and the presentors jumped around a lot. The admin version seems difficult to use. The Offeror did mention several times how limited their time seemed to be. They mentioned that they have about 600 different permissions that can be assigned to underlying configured roles. The roles seemed configurable and flexible for setting up, along with permissions. However, this could be cumbersome and confusing. They do support multi license years for fishing licenses. The offeror demonstrated a scannable license that would work with their enforcement app. The self service kiosks are similar to what is being done with the current ambassadors. They do offer their own app. The enforcement app would pinpoint longitude and latitude every time enforcement were to scan for a customer account. This allows the ability to keep track of location. They seemed to configure down to a finite degree, but there is doubt on the benefit, or of it being too much or too confusing. The reports are role based and able to be drilled down with dashboards and parameters.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
Brandt Information Services LLC					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Demonstration	600	445	4	430	The demonstration included MFA and bot detection, and looked like multiple options for login were available. They have good configuration of items to show the customer, and can resolve eligibility. They are able to upsell to gather donations, and can add additional sales channels on the fly. The Offeror did not appear to make good use of their time and seemed scattered. The demonstration was hard to follow. The Offeror used the backend to use for the demonstration for sales, so there was not a view of how it would look for the customer at home. The sales report map did not work, and there was confusion on what the "can't haves" and "must haves" were. They could break down the fee distribution by item/percent, and there were multiple options shown for fulfillment. There was not a clear picture showing how the parties operate. The Offeror ran out of time to give useful insight on data migration or integrations for accounting. It was unclear if reports can be configured.
			1	415	The eligibility items to purchase include multiple business rules. The purchase history was appreciated as well as the communication preferences such as email, text, or call. The Offeror discussed legislative changes and how they can handle them. They have an auto upload when the user comes online, and the enforcement app can store data offline. The Offeror touched on parties and first, second, and third choices. They offer upsales for donations, landowner property reports, dashboard demographics, data migration. The Offeror lacked a timeline specifically with the demonstration and how they ran out of time. There is a question of how they ran out of time for this project, and lacked conciseness. They did not seem to understand the difference between bonus and preference points.
			2	450	The offeror does not appear to understand the difference between preference points and bonus points. They spent a short time on drawings, which is more complicated than what they seem to understand. They did not cover staled refund, and spent too much detail on license providers. This shows no understanding of FWP setup. The demonstration appeared to be overall messy and unorganized.
Cost Proposal	Total of 400 Points				
Cost	400	72.1			
TOTAL SCORE	Total of 2000	1449.1			

Outdoor Recreation Licensing, Survey & Reporting, and Recreation Access & Reservation					
FWP-RFP-2026-1113MQB					
Individual Scoring Matrix					
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
RA Outdoors LLC dba Aspira					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Evaluated RFP Section	Point Values			Score	Justification
Primary Services	Total 1,000 Points				
Section 4.1 Overview and Overall Licensing Solution Fit	80	74	2	74	Offeror's proposed solution includes a modern system with a centralized customer records to manage licenses, permits, drawings, and outdoor activities. Proposed solution supports online, mobile, and FWP license Ambassador transactions, with digital licenses and tags that can be used in areas with limited connectivity. Solutions allow management tools of products, fees, eligibility rules, drawings, notifications, financial activity, and reporting with little custom modification. Solution is a cloud-based platform is capable of handling high-volume sales and drawings and can integrate with state and federal systems, payment processors, accounting platforms, hunter education, mobile apps, and enforcement.
			3	75	The Scope describes a unified platform across licensing, reservations, surveys, customer administration, reporting, mobile use, and POS, with configurable workflows and a stated willingness to customize. The RTM identifies some Major migration work and material interface work.
			4	72	The Offeror demonstrates mature, production wildlife licensing and drawing systems with directly relevant state/provincial references, including Alberta RELM, New Jersey Fish and Wildlife, and Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. Utah provides especially relevant experience with large, complex draws, including preference/bonus points, quotas, allocation rules, payments, and fulfillment. The Utah draw reference says results were verified by Aspira and UDWR before finalization. It is unclear what "verified" means on page 4 and whether FWP would be expected to independently validate results, participate in defined system checks, or simply approve the outcome. Need a clear Montana draw-validation, audit, approval, exception, and rerun/correction process. Their platform is configurable and less risky than a custom build. It supports licensing, web/POS/agent/call-center channels, customer accounts, eligibility, draws, digital fulfillment, financial functions, reporting, and organizational accounts. Its unified-platform approach could reduce duplicate data and cross-system interfaces if multiple key capabilities are awarded. The payment approach needs clarification. The narrative emphasizes stored credit cards and automatic post-draw charging within their solution. Although the RTM identifies State payment-processor integration, The Offeror's rates the required State-system interfaces as a major effort pending discovery. The linked family accounts support purchasing for linked profiles, but it is unclear whether a primary account holder can retain, display, validate, or use another person's license or e-tag after purchase - need clarity. Business/organizational accounts are supported, including configurable data and document uploads. Need clarification on authorized users, delegated permissions, purchase authority, billing, license/tag ownership, compliance validation, audit history, and reporting. POS is web/browser based and uses real-time customer-profile and eligibility data. It appears compatible with centralized FWP and License Ambassador operations. Several Montana-specific requirements remain minor, moderate, or major work in the RTM.
			1	74	Aspira provides a complete licensing system that covers the main FWP needs, including licensing, customer accounts, eligibility, sales channels, drawings, payments, and reporting. The proposal also shows significant experience working with fish and wildlife agencies. There are concerns for Montana specific needs, integrations, and implementation work that will still be needed.
			3	75	The response addresses OLS/POS sales, agents and ambassadors, family/group activity, donations, draw products, refunds, and real-time administration in an integrated sales model. For complex layered big-game refund logic, the RTM records a Minor effort and says Aspira needs additional understanding of the requirement.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
RA Outdoors LLC dba Aspira					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.1 Sales and Purchasing	80	70	4	66	The response provides a mature, configurable sales and purchasing platform supporting online, POS, License Ambassador, and phone/call-center channels. The catalog approach can use the selected customer profile to display products that are available, unavailable, or already satisfied instead of simply hiding products that cannot be purchased. This should provide customers and staff better visibility into available options while still enforcing eligibility rules. They also describe effective-dated product configuration, family purchasing, organizational accounts, raffles, donations, draw applications, surplus-tag processing, and multiple payment timing options. However, for such a large and critical portion of KC1, The Offeror does not provide sufficient detail on many daily sales and purchasing workflows. The proposal identifies what the platform can generally do but does not fully explain how FWP will configure, approve, test, administer, audit, and support Montana-specific products, fees, eligibility rules, channel differences, payment exceptions, refunds, corrections, customer-service situations, and high-demand sales events. The payment approach remains a significant question. The response discusses stored credit cards and automatic post-draw charges, but it does not clearly establish that the State payment processor will be used for all required sales, application, POS, agent, ACH, refund, reversal, settlement, chargeback, and reconciliation workflows.
			1	75	The Offeror addresses the required sales channels and supports hunting, fishing, trapping, and conservation licenses. The proposal also covers drawings, special permits, raffles, donations, surplus tags, family purchases, and different payment methods.
			2	72	Offeror's proposed solution includes a centralized licensing system for hunting, fishing, trapping, conservation, recreation licenses and permits, with sales through FWP office POS, online self-service, and License Ambassador channels. The solution also supports applications and drawings, immediate, pre-payment and post-drawing payment models, raffle sales, special permit applications, donations, future effective product catalogs, surplus tag-day processing, and parent or guardian purchasing for linked family accounts.
Section 4.2.2 Customer Management	70	60	4	56	The response provides a generally strong customer-management foundation, including unified customer profiles, identity types and certifications, document uploads, duplicate prevention, linked family accounts, business/organizational accounts, restrictions, and historical interactions. It also states that it can integrate with IWVC. There was not a clear commitment or design for DOJ-based residency validation identified. They describe scanning, typed entry, identity types, certifications, and document uploads, but does not explain whether DOJ data will validate residency, how data will be matched, what happens when data conflicts, whether staff can override a result, or what audit evidence will be retained. The RTM identifies the broader State-system integration requirement as a major effort pending discovery. There are concerns about linked-account access. The Offeror clearly supports a parent/guardian or primary account holder purchasing for linked profiles, but it does not explain the authority model after purchase. The proposal does not say whether linked users can view, edit, display, possess, validate, transfer, or otherwise manage another person's licenses, tags, applications, points, personal information, or enforcement information. It also does not explain consent, adult-to-adult linking, relationship changes, privacy controls, or removal of account access. The Offeror appears to business and organizational accounts, but the proposal lacks detail on authorized users, delegation, billing, purchase authority, ownership of licenses and permits, compliance review, documents, audit history, and reporting. Its references to permit transfers are unclear and should be clarified; FWP needs confirmation that any transfer functionality won't be available for our customers.
			1	65	The Offeror provides customer accounts, family accounts, customer history, eligibility information and customer communications. The system uses customer information to determine what items the customer can purchase.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
RA Outdoors LLC dba Aspira					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
			2	62	Offeror's proposed solution provides a centralized customer account framework that maintains current and historical records. Solution supports customer records, linked family members, business and organizational account, duplicate detection and resolution, and segregated test and training accounts. Proposed solution supports multiple customer identity types (barcode and manual entry) that likely require additional development.
			3	60	Aspira describes a single customer record, duplicate detection/merge controls, household and organization management, test accounts, and ID-scanner support. The RTM classifies Montana digital ID scanning as Moderate effort because of potential work around digital IDs and barcode formats.
Section 4.2.3 Eligibility and Enforcement	60	54	1	56	The system can apply eligibility and enforcement rules when a customer is making a purchase and can prevent ineligible or duplicate purchases. Role-based permissions also provide controls for staff. There is a concern for the additional work needed to configure FWP's specific enforcement and fraud rules.
			2	54	Offeror's proposed solution supports complex customer eligibility across license types including residency, age, and seasons and restrictions. Proposal includes enforcement restrictions and holds for license sale/application transactions. Proposal does not specifically address fraud detection and flagging for paper-after-digital switching. Proposed solution supports related controls, however acknowledges FWP-specific rules for format changes, reprints, exceptions, approvals, notifications, audit records, and transaction blocking may require enhancement.
			3	55	The narrative describes configurable eligibility logic, validations, restrictions/holds, fraud tools, auditability, and rule-driven enforcement. The RTM identifies a Minor effort for the paper-license rule after a customer has a digital license, requiring confirmation of the precise policy.
			4	48	The Offeror demonstrates configurable, out-of-the-box eligibility options. Its rules engine appears able to apply age, residency, certification, license-year, prior-license, and other requirements to customer profiles and product eligibility. It also allows restrictions and suspensions to be applied by license, species, or across an entire customer profile, with effective dates and remedial-training requirements. However, the enforcement workflow is not described in enough detail. The response does not explain how holds enter the licensing system from other systems: if they can support integrations, how often they synchronize; what matching and error-resolution process is used. This may create substantial manual work for FWP and wardens if integrations are not completed or do not provide the necessary data. The response lacks clarity on fraud workflows. They identified paper-after-digital and excessive reprints as fraud-related concerns, but does not explain how suspicious activity is transmitted to wardens for review. The proposal does not describe case creation, warden notification, assignment, evidence, investigation status, customer messaging, escalation, decision authority, disposition, or the resulting updates to holds, licenses, tags, applications, points, and transactions. The RTM marks fraud flagging as "Minor" because FWP-specific paper-after-digital controls may require enhancement.
			2	60	Offeror's proposed solution supports customer's selection of print-at-home or digital fulfillment capability. Solution supports E- licenses and E-Tags using configurable templates. Solution identifies two dependencies needing customization for E-license & tag templates along with integrating with MyFWP mobile app to display digital tags.
			3	60	Aspira describes digital tagging with its iOS/Android application, validation, offline behavior, carcass/tag handling, and enforcement-oriented use cases. Its RTM calls document-template configuration and MyFWP display/integration Minor efforts.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
RA Outdoors LLC dba Aspira					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.4 Digital Licenses and Tags	70	60	4	55	The Offeror shows experience with both its own mobile application and integration with an agency mobile environment. This gives FWP flexibility to determine whether digital licenses and tags are delivered through MyFWP or an Aspira-supported application. They also describe a configurable fulfillment by product, including paper, print-at-home, and electronic options, and references online/offline e-tag notching and confirmation numbers. However, significant operational detail is missing. The response does not explain how offline e-tagging works; what license and tag data are stored on the device; how actions are time-stamped and protected from duplication; what occurs when a customer comes back into service; how notches, harvest information, restrictions, reprints, voids, and other changes synchronize; or how conflicts, delays, errors, and enforcement visibility are managed. The proposal also does not explain format switching. It is unclear when a customer may change between paper, print-at-home, and digital fulfillment; whether rules differ by license or tag type; whether a tag can be changed after use or notching; what approvals or fees apply; and how the system prevents fraud or duplicate use. Print-at-home is marked "Meets," but the proposal does not provide information on secure document generation, barcodes or QR codes, reprints, revocation, accessible document formats, printer requirements, or interaction with later digital fulfillment. It also does not provide a field-enforcement workflow for validating digital licenses and tags with or without connectivity. The digital-tag display in MyFWP requires integration work, and the broader MyFWP integration is rated moderate effort.
			1	61	Aspira provides digital licenses, electronic documents, and mobile functionality and describes support for offline use. The proposal also provides integration with myFWP and mobile applications. These capabilities address a significant portion of FWP's digital licensing needs. There are concerns for Montana specific digital licensing and e-tag requirements, including configuration, integration, and testing of the mobile and offline functions before they can be fully relied upon in the field.
Section 4.2.5 Point of Sale (POS) Functionality	50	41	3	40	The Scope addresses agent administration, POS hardware compatibility, role controls, transactions, receipts, cancellations/refunds, and its Ambassador option.
			4	39	The Offeror proposes a web-based, real-time POS for FWP offices and License Ambassadors. The centralized model is appreciated because staff and agents use the same customer, eligibility, product, and transaction data as other sales channels. The proposal describes customer lookup through license-document and driver-license barcode scanning, real-time visibility into eligible products, keyboard navigation, standard POS hardware compatibility, and support for cash, check, and electronic payments. The POS payment model requires clarification. The response states it supports multiple payment types, but does not clearly establish whether FWP regional offices can continue to accept cash and checks while License Ambassadors are required to use the State payment processor for electronic payments. The proposal also does not explain how the State payment processor would work at each channel, including POS terminals, online payment, agent sales, ACH, refunds, reversals, settlements, chargebacks, and reconciliation. The RTM identifies the combined State-system integration requirement, including the payment processor, as a major effort pending discovery - which seems odd since we provided a link with all of the info needed for payment integrations. They mark role-based staff functions as "Meets," including voids, no-fee/free reprints, refunds per policy, and transaction corrections. However, the response does not provide enough detail on what access can actually be controlled by roles. The proposal also lacks detailed daily POS operating workflows. It does not explain high-volume keyboard workflow, transaction-time expectations, or scan failures. Aspira's response lacked details.
			1	41	Aspira provides the required POS functionality, including real time eligibility checks, barcode scannign, license and document printing, payment processing, reprints, voids and refunds. The system also provides staff permissions and controls for POS users. The proposal directly addresses the day to day needs of FWP offices and sales locations and provides the functionality needed to support the required POS environment.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
RA Outdoors LLC dba Aspira					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
			2	47	Offeror's proposed solution supports centralized operations using a central system of record. Solution is compatible with POS workstations and peripherals, including thin clients, printers, monitors, barcode scanners, cash drawers, and driver's-license scanners. Solution supports keyboard shortcuts for high-volume entry. Solution supports cash, checks, card and ACH processing. Authorized FWP staff can perform voids, no-fee reprints, refunds, and transaction corrections.
Section 4.2.6 Drawings and Applications	70	66	4	51	The Offeror's Utah reference demonstrates experience with a complex, phased draw using preference and bonus points, youth quotas, multiple draw rounds, specialized allocation rules, payments, fulfillment, and joint agency/vendor verification. The Utah Big Game draw processed more than 568,000 applications from more than 195,000 applicants across eight species and reportedly completed without calculation errors. They also describe configurable draws, application status tracking, customer notifications, point management, manual review steps, alternates, and multiple payment timing options. The RTM marks immediate payment, pre-payment, post-selection payment, complex drawings, points, application status, results notification, and refunds as supported. However, important Montana-specific details are missing. The payment discussion is heavily focused on stored cards and automatic charges after an applicant is successful. It is unclear whether stored payment credentials and automatic post-selection charges will work with the required State payment processor. The proposal also does not adequately explain how pre-payment works, including non-refundable application fees, refunds for unsuccessful applicants, financial reconciliation (with refunds), and point consequences. Party applications are not adequately addressed. The response refers to group participation and joining or leaving a group, but does not describe party leadership, consent, membership changes, eligibility and point treatment for each party member, group choices, party validation, partial refunds, or communications. Montana party applications are complex and require a defined workflow. Refund functionality also lacks the detail needed to score with confidence. They do not explain partial refunds, layered Big Game Combo refunds, refund-by-component or fund, customer election to donate a refund, or SABHRS reconciliation. Aspira's RTM acknowledges that it needs more information on Montana's layered-refund requirements.
			1	58	The Offeror provides a strong drawing and application solution that addresses complex drawings, preference and bonus points, application tracking, customer notifications, withdrawals and refunds. The proposal also describes significant experience with large wildlife drawings, including 15 years of experience with complex draws and a Utah Big Game drawing involving more than 195,000 applicants.
			2	66	Offeror's proposed solution supports complex drawing processes for multi-level NRBGC drawing, special permits, and surplus tag opportunities. Solution supports PPs & BP administration, beginning-to-end application status tracking, drawing result notifications, and refunds during drawing and application workflows.
			3	68	Aspira supplies detailed draw-workflow material and a concrete Utah reference: seven draws, 568,000 applications, 195,000 unique applicants, and an 18-minute draw run. The reference is persuasive operational evidence, although final Montana rule configuration would still be required.
			1	92	The Offeror provides transaction level financial information, payment processing, refunds, reconciliation and financial reporting. The system can track sales and revenue information and provide the information needed for accounting and audit purposes. The proposal also addresses the handling of refunds within financial reporting. There is concern about Montana specific financial requirements, including SABHRS integration, State accounting processes and related interfaces that will require additional configuration, mapping, and testing.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
RA Outdoors LLC dba Aspira					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.7 Accounting and Financial Management	100	75	2	82	Offeror's proposed solution serves as a centralized system of record for revenue and sales statistics, accurately manage and report revenue across product categories and fiscal periods, assign revenue to fund codes, support multi-step accounting workflows, and reconcile transactions, revenue, and refunds. The proposal identifies three implementation dependencies and require development. Configuring MT-specific tax structures and corresponding audit records; the SABHRS interface through APIs or file exports; and configuring PR/DJ allocation and reporting rules for Montana-specific funding requirements.
			3	75	The response describes financial reporting, settlements, revenue allocation exports, reconciliation, tax/audit support, and data exports. The material limitation is explicit: "Aspira has not provided PR/DJ funding allocation tracking and reporting for current agency partners"; the RTM also identifies Minor work for tax/audit, SABHRS specifics, and PR/DJ reporting
			4	68	The response provides a reasonable financial-management foundation. I like that it proposes a financial dashboard, real-time transaction tracking, configurable fund allocation, multi-step accounting workflows, reconciliation reporting, and the ability to distribute a single product, fee, or donation across multiple funds using fixed amounts, percentages, or other configured allocation logic. These are important capabilities for FWP's financial operations. The Offeror also states that they can provide a financial export for FWP's financial system or establish a direct SABHRS API connection. However, FWP requested the option to integrate with SABHRS, and the proposal does not make a firm commitment to the specific integration approach. Its RTM identifies SABHRS as a minor gap requiring definition of API development or file exports, while the broader State-system integration requirement is rated major effort pending discovery. FWP needs a binding design and commitment for SABHRS integration rather than a general financial-export option. The response for this section lacks detail and leaves significant operational detail unresolved. The proposal does not explain how financial operations will work at FWP regional offices, including cash and check handling, deposits, end-of-day close, over/short handling, approval controls, office-level reporting, check returns, and reconciliation of local activity to the licensing system and State financial records. Refunds and financial adjustments are particularly underdeveloped. The response does not explain how refunds, partial refunds, Big Game Combo layered refunds, voids, reversals, chargebacks, returned ACH/check payments will be recorded, approved, allocated back to the correct funds, reflected in the appropriate fiscal period, reported, reconciled, and transmitted to SABHRS.
			2	66	Offeror's proposed solution provides reporting tools for routine operations and ad-hoc reports. Users can drill into report details, filter and sort information, export reports, and produce information tailored to customers, agents, internal users, management, and auditors. Solution supports mandatory federal reporting, including USFWS and PR/DJ reporting requirements.
			3	55	Aspira proposes standard and ad hoc reporting, JasperReports, dashboards, data exports, a data mart, and role-controlled access.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
RA Outdoors LLC dba Aspira					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.8 Reporting	70	55	4	48	The Offeror states that they provides canned/standard reports, ad hoc reporting, dashboards, drill-down, filtering, sorting, role-based access, scheduled delivery, and multiple export formats. However, the reporting response provides little detail beyond two screenshots. It does not identify what standard reports FWP receives out of the box, which reports are configured during implementation, which reports require custom development, or which future report requests would be billed as enhancements. For a statewide licensing system, FWP needs a detailed report inventory covering daily sales, revenue, deposits, payment settlements, refunds, voids, corrections, licenses/tags issued, applications, drawings, points, agents, office operations, customer service, enforcement, audit activity, fund allocations, PR/DJ, and management reporting. It was undetermined whether FWP must purchase Jaspersoft. The cost proposal does not list Jaspersoft or another third-party reporting product as a separate cost, and says no third-party/pass-through costs are required unless expressly identified. However, the Offeror does not disclose the reporting technology, whether a reporting tool is embedded, what licensing and authoring rights FWP receives, or whether advanced reporting and report development are included in the proposed price. The federal and PR/DJ reporting claims also need more support.
			1	55	Aspira provides broad reporting capabilities across the licensing system and related business functions. The proposal includes operational and performance reporting and provides access to information needed by staff and management. The centralized system should allow FWP to use licensing and transaction information for routine reporting as well as management and program needs.
Section 4.2.9 Interfaces and Integrations	80	55	3	60	The proposal describes REST APIs and examples of integration experience. The RTM records MyFWP/website integration as Moderate, State system integrations as Major, and hunter-education/internal applications as Minor; for the State-system item, Aspira says it hopes to revise its estimate after understanding the scope....
			4	50	The Offeror provides a laundry list of APIs, data exchanges, and integrations used by other states, including hunter education, customer-data, mobile, financial, certification, and agency system interfaces. It appears to have meaningful integration experience and identifies multiple technical methods, including APIs, secure file exchange, real-time lookup, scheduled interfaces, and data exports. However, the response did not instill confidence because it is largely a list of prior or potential interface types rather than a detailed plan for Montana. The most significant concern is that the response rates the required State-system integrations as a major effort pending discovery. The proposal says the effort estimate may change once the scope is understood. This makes it difficult to assess cost, schedule, implementation risk, and production readiness for essential KC1 interfaces. The Offeror also does not clearly establish that all payment workflows will use the State payment processor. Its narrative emphasizes stored cards and automatic charges, while its SABHRS discussion offers either export files or direct API integration "as needed." FWP needs a firm commitment and detailed design for the State payment processor and SABHRS interfaces rather than general options.
			1	56	The response provides an API-based approach and identifies the ability to connect with State systems, payment processors, mobile applications, identity services, financial systems, enforcement services and myFWP. The overall approach is reasonable, however this is an area where FWP will have significant amount of work to complete during implementation. Several required Montana interfaces will need additional development, discovery, mapping, and testing.
			2	61	Offeror's proposed solution includes a unified platform that can reduce or eliminate integration needs between KC 1, 2, and 3 if awarded. Solution integrates with the Wildlife Violators Compact and USFWS. Proposal identifies a major integration gap for the required multiple MT state systems and payment processor. Integration with MyFWP, the FWP website, Hunter Ed, and other internal FWP apps also requires development.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
RA Outdoors LLC dba Aspira					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and section 7 – Technical Architecture, Security, and Compliance	80	65	4	60	The response proposes a U.S.-hosted AWS SaaS solution, four environments, modern API-based architecture, configurable platform, SOC 2 Type II, encryption, role-based access, State data ownership, open-format export, and stated availability and performance targets. The Section 2.2 response was confusing. It appears focused on pre-award activity—reviewing requirements, using State clarification processes, checking the Approved Enterprise Software List, and obtaining approval for third-party components through the Q&A board rather than explaining how they will manage the ongoing need for working with DOA. The proposal does not explain governance for releases, security changes, new AWS services, third-party components, mobile changes, integrations, emergency changes, or future enhancements. The Offeror assumes FWP will use its unified KC1/KC2/KC3 platform. A shared platform can be beneficial if all three capabilities are awarded to the Offeror, but KC2 and KC3 are optional. The proposal does not provide sufficient information on how it will support API-based, secure, vendor-neutral interoperability if FWP awards KC2 or KC3 to a different vendor or offers these options internally. The backup, disaster-recovery, and incident-response responses are too high level. The Offeror marks the requirements "Meets," but does not provide RPO/RTO values, backup frequency, retention, geographic replication, restoration sequence, recovery testing, time to restore, incident-notification timeframes, FWP/DOA escalation roles, forensic support, root-cause analysis, or post-incident corrective-action process. Several technical requirements remain incomplete or require additional work. State SSO and MFA are rated minor; complete administrative audit trails are rated moderate; offline mobile capability is rated moderate; and the current platform does not support AI/ML capabilities despite the RTM marking that requirement "Meets."
			1	70	The Offeror provides a cloud based system with security controls, user access controls, multi factor authentication, mobile capabilities, backup and recovery processes and stated availability requirements. The proposal also addresses accessibility and other technical requirements identified in the RFP. There is a concern because they are unsure of the State's security, data handling, integration, and compliance processes against FWP and State requirements before implementation.
			2	70	Offeror agrees to comply with MT IT policies and standards, approved enterprise software and legal framework compliance. Offeror's proposed solution is US-hosted, cloud-based platform with scalable architecture, 99.9% availability, performance targets, API-based integration, role-based access control, accessibility compliance, mobile-responsive interfaces, data ownership, open-format exports, retention controls, backup and disaster recovery, data-quality management, and separate development, test/QA, training, and production environments. Solution commits to core security controls, including State IT policy alignment, SOC certification, annual penetration testing, encryption, PCI payment compliance, US data residency, staff background checks, confidentiality agreements, and incident response procedures.
			3	60	Aspira describes AWS hosting in the United States, scalable architecture, security controls, REST interfaces, stated availability targets, and mobile capability. The RTM identifies Minor SSO/MFA work, Moderate offline and full-administrative-audit work, and Major migration work, so the response is not yet a fully proven fit for all cross-cutting requirements.
			1	85	Aspira provides a detailed implementation approach that includes project planning, requirements review, gap analysis, system design, configuration, development, testing, training, data migration, deployment, go live, and after implementation support. The proposal provides a structured process for working with FWP throughout the implementation and identifies activities needed to prepare staff and customers for the new system.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
RA Outdoors LLC dba Aspira					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Sections 4.3, 8, and 15 – Implementation, Migration, Training, and Change Management	90	79	2	82	Offeror's proposed solution includes PMBOK-aligned methodology with governance, defined deliverables, stakeholder engagement, risk and issue management, status reporting, milestone reviews, and decision processes. The approach addresses all core project phases—initiation, planning, execution, monitoring and control, and closeout—and includes collaborative requirements validation, gap analysis, solution design, controlled development and configuration, comprehensive testing, role-based training, data migration, deployment, stabilization, warranty support, and transition to ongoing maintenance. Offeror supports phased implementation and describes a formal change-management process that includes request submission, impact assessment, estimation, stakeholder review, approval workflows, implementation planning, testing, deployment, documentation, and governance oversight.
			3	75	The submission provides an organized phased approach, project governance, workshops, testing/UAT/pilot/parallel activities, role-based training, documentation, and change-management material. The detailed schedule is to be developed after award, the RTM calls migration Major effort.
			4	72	Although the response somewhat generic, the proposal provides a reasonable level of detail on project governance, requirements validation, configuration, development, migration, testing, deployment, stabilization, and ongoing operations. The proposed onsite participation is also a positive commitment. The Offeror explicitly commits to regression testing in the RTM and identifies regression testing, defect management, retesting, and release-readiness activities in its QA approach. They also commit to unit, integration, system, performance, UAT, pilot, parallel-process, security, accessibility, and field/survey testing where applicable. It could not be determined whether they are using agile, waterfall, or a defined hybrid methodology. The response refers to PMBOK, iterative delivery, phased implementation, configuration demonstrations, sprints, Scrum practices, capacity planning, and release controls, but does not clearly state the model that will govern the project.
			2	35	Offeror's proposed solution includes ongoing maintenance and support following warranty, including software fixes, security patches, platform updates, technical support, severity-based incident management, proactive monitoring, disaster recovery, annual service reviews, enhanced support for peak periods, extended service hours, on-call emergency support, readiness verification, escalation contacts, and monthly SLA reporting. Offeror commits to a minimum 99.9% availability target, sub-three-second normal response time, sub-five-second peak response time, tiered support, planned maintenance notifications, escalation procedures, and potential financial remedies for SLA failures.
			3	35	The Scope provides monitoring, support organization, release management, incident priorities, and peak-season support concepts. Its SLA table does not commit to all RFP target resolution times (for example, P1 is continuous effort/workaround rather than a four-hour target, P2 is one business day rather than eight hours), and service credits are left for contract finalization.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
RA Outdoors LLC dba Aspira					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 9 – Ongoing Maintenance, Support, and Continuous Improvement	40	32	4	28	The Offeror demonstrates relevant experience providing long-term maintenance and support for statewide wildlife and outdoor-recreation systems, including AlbertaRELM, New Jersey Fish and Wildlife, and Montana State Parks. They propose ongoing maintenance, patches, upgrades, monitoring, help desk support, enhanced peak-period coverage, monthly SLA reporting, annual maintenance reviews, and continuous improvement based on agency feedback, operational metrics, regulatory changes, and roadmap governance. The Offeror commits to extended weekday support and on-call weekend coverage during peak periods, but does not define the peak-period calendar, readiness checklist, staffing, weekend response/resolution standards, incident-command structure, customer/agent communications, or post-event review process. It also does not offer specific SLA remedies; service credits and calculation terms are deferred to contract negotiations. They identify named operational and account-support leadership. This is a positive strength, particularly because the leadership model extends beyond implementation into ongoing operations. However, the proposal does not identify the day-to-day help-desk operating model beneath these leadership roles, including named support-manager ownership, ticketing system, Tier 1/Tier 2/Tier 3 staffing, on-call rotation, escalation timeframes, status communications, root-cause analysis, and coordination during incidents involving State systems or third-party providers. The maintenance and continuous-improvement scope needs to be clarified. It says broadly available product improvements are included, but Montana specific work may require separate assessment and development.
			1	35	The response provides an established support and maintenance process that includes incident management, system updates, production releases, maintenance notifications, post release checks and ongoing performance reporting. The proposal includes response targets for critical issues and describes procedures for addressing problems and making system changes. Regular service reviews also provide an opportunity to address performance and improvement needs after implementation.
Section 10 and 4.3 – Offeror Qualifications, References, and PR/DJ Experience	60	50	3	50	Aspira provides four detailed public-sector references, including Utah, Alberta, New Jersey, and Montana State Parks, and asserts more than 40 years in outdoor/natural-resources technology and more than 30 years of enterprise wildlife licensing experience. The direct PR/DJ funding-allocation gap reduces the score; Montana State Parks is a reservation/visitor-services reference rather than a Montana wildlife-licensing reference.
			4	51	The Offeror has a strong and relevant customer base of state/provincial fish, wildlife, parks, and outdoor-recreation agencies. Its qualifications include more than 30 years of enterprise licensing experience, active contracts with 35 state/provincial agencies, long-running statewide wildlife relationships with AlbertaRELM and New Jersey Fish and Wildlife, a recent complex draw implementation for Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, and a Montana State Parks relationship dating to 2011. The qualifications matrix identifies draw services for Alberta Licensing, New Jersey Fish and Wildlife/DEP, Saskatchewan Licensing, and Utah. AlbertaRELM is particularly relevant because they have supported complex province-wide wildlife draws since 2013, processing approximately 483,000 draw applications annually; New Jersey also operates controlled draws and lotteries. The Offeror could have presented more detailed relevant examples rather than relying so heavily on Utah. Utah is a compelling, recent complex-draw reference, but it has only completed one annual cycle. More detailed examples from Alberta, New Jersey, Saskatchewan, or other wildlife clients would have provided stronger evidence of long-term draw operations, payment and refund workflows, corrections, financial reconciliation, customer support, and continuous improvement.
			1	50	The Offeror has significant experience providing licensing systems to fish and wildlife agencies. The proposal identifies references including AlbertaRELM and Saskatchewan Ministry of Environment and demonstrates experience with hunting and fishing licenses, complex drawings, harvest reporting, and ongoing system support. This experience is directly related to the type of licensing environment FWP operates and provides confidence that Aspira understands the operational requirements of a wildlife agency.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
RA Outdoors LLC dba Aspira					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
			2	50	Offeror's meets qualification requirements. Proposal includes relevant licensing, reservation-management, access-management, survey and harvest-reporting experience; active contracts with government agencies; financial stability; security certification. Proposal includes experience with hunter access, MT State IT, Hunter Ed, CRM, events, GIS, survey systems, statistical estimation, analytics, and CATI systems. Offeror has experience in PR/DJ allocation reporting. However experience is largely with park reservations rather than licensure.
TOTAL OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL	1000	836			
Product Demonstration/Interviews	Total of 600 Points				
Demonstration	600	540	4	540	The demonstration showed that there are multiple profiles per login and can switch between license years, and upsale. The price increases, distribution options, custom and configured rules with questions and actions based on cart items is good. They demonstrated automated and manual review, though the holds were granular. The Offeror has the option to track remedial hunter's education. They offer a marketing module, a training module on web POS. They used harvest reports versus e-tags, but the reports did appear to be similar. On the enforcement app, there is the capability to utilize license lookup and can capture scans offline. They showed draw odds in the customer screens, and offer payments at time of application submission or at the time of the draw. The Offeror could use the state payment processor, can do an export for SABHRS. The adhoc reports appear to be user friendly and are able to be emailed and scheduled. The Offeror could not demonstrate how to complete a sale, the UAT site was slow, and did not have many resources for a demonstration. They attempted to show an e-tag, but the capability did not work. They provided information on ambassadors, but they did not review those points. The Offeror also is not familiar with the myFWP app, and the online synchronization was not automatic.
			1	500	The Offeror demonstrated multi-license year sales, and included an upsale for paper. There can be multiple profiles in a family. The index year license increases automatically. The popup question to upsale certain items was noted. They show usability on a tablet, and can separate fishing and hunting within their application. They spoke to 75/25 split for preference points, and talking about adding items back it for a drawing. They provided information on age/gender reports, demographics, ad hoc reporting, and discussed POS hardware and only 250 stations. The site did not seem user friendly with a long list of information that a customer would be reading. They could not complete a sale, and if the user was out of service, they would need to go back into the app to update. This could result in the customer not being able to remember, or would have notifications turned off.
			2	550	The offeror noted multi level revenue distribution and can do it multiple ways, and levels. Configurable by license type, customer, and transaction. They seemed to understand how preference and bonus points work. The offeror was vague about a custom build with SABHRS. They showed knowledge on parties.
			3	575	The offeror demonstrated the user interface with different colors for hunting and fishing. There were popups for additional items visibility, and overall appeared more user friendly. The behind the scenes was easy to follow and understand. They were able to demonstrate all details of the transactions and customer level data, and when or if an agency made any changes. The reporting functionality was shown with data marked. They demonstrated the ability to build your own pivot tables with drag and drop features.
Cost Proposal	Total of 400 Points				
Cost	400	42			
TOTAL SCORE	Total of 2000	1418			

Outdoor Recreation Licensing, Survey & Reporting, and Recreation Access & Reservation					
FWP-RFP-2026-1113MQB					
Individual Scoring Matrix					
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
Tyler Technologies Inc					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Evaluated RFP Section	Point Values			Score	Justification
Primary Services	Total 1,000 Points				
Section 4.1 Overview and Overall Licensing Solution Fit	80	70	2	65	Offeror proposes a SaaS platform and support model with ongoing maintenance, quarterly updates, a multi-tier support structure, proactive monitoring, availability and performance targets, disaster-recovery testing, planned-maintenance notification, escalation planning, and peak-period support commitments. Proposal doesn't firmly address several of the most important service-level requirements—including priority response/resolution commitments, monthly SLA reporting, financial remedies, peak-hours coverage, and maintenance-review content.
			3	70	Tyler describes a SaaS replacement for ALS/ALX/OLS, a unified customer/transaction model, configuration by FWP administrators, native mobile, financial controls, and an end-to-end delivery method. It also supplies screenshots and workflow descriptions. The response is thorough, but several Montana-specific items still depend on later discovery or enhancement rather than being demonstrated as current standard capability.
			4	72	The offeror presents substantial wildlife licensing experience, a large delivery/support organization, and a Montana-focused team that includes its own prior FWP experience, long-standing State relationships, and Slalom's current Montana/FWP work. Their experience with Illinois, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Alabama, and Wisconsin provides relevant evidence of statewide wildlife licensing, complex draws, preference points, agent networks, harvest reporting, financial reconciliation, customer service, and high-volume operations. There is concern with the discussion of moving away from paper documents. The Offeror generally recommends limiting or restricting customers from returning to paper after they choose electronic licensing. That recommendation may not fit FWP's customer base or operating environment. FWP needs clear control over paper, print-at-home, special-paper, and digital fulfillment options by product and customer policy; the system should support customer needs rather than drive a digital-first policy that FWP has not adopted. The Offeror also focuses heavily on its own mobile app and does not provide enough detail about use of or integration with the existing MyFWP application.
			1	75	Tyler provides a well established licensing system designed for government outdoor recreation programs. The proposal addresses the major areas FWP needs, including licensing, customer management, eligibility, drawings, financial management, reporting, mobile functions, and multiple sales channels. They also have experience handling high volume seasonal transactions.
			3	70	The proposal supports POS, online and agent channels, multi-round drawings, payments, raffles, special permits, donations, catalog effective dating, and surplus sales. It expressly says post-selection payment, Big Game Combo layered refunds, and parent/guardian purchasing are not standard workflows today and will be enhanced; the KC1 RTM also marks layered refunds and parent/family purchasing Minor.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.

Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
Tyler Technologies Inc					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.1 Sales and Purchasing	80	68	4	62	Offeror proposes a configurable platform supporting online, FWP office, and License Ambassador sales; product catalog configuration; raffles; limited-hunt applications; donations; surplus-tag sales; and immediate, pre-payment, and post-selection workflows. It is unclear why the Offeror states that the system generates unique random numbers for permit/tag products “to allow harvest reporting.” This appears unrelated to the requirement for all hunting, fishing, trapping, and conservation sales. The donation response is also incomplete. The response describes Quick Sale and guest donations, but does not explain whether FWP can offer or require a donation associated with the sale of a specific license, tag, permit, or application; direct donations to a specified program or fund; or report and reconcile donations by product and fund. Refunds remain a significant concern. Tyler acknowledges that the required Big Game Combo layered-refund options are not standard functionality and will require enhancement. The proposal does not provide enough detail on partial refunds, component-level refunds, donate-a-refund options, point restoration, payment reversals, fund allocation, approvals, or financial reconciliation. Tyler’s discussion of linked accounts is inconsistent. It says parents/guardians can purchase for minors and linked accounts can be used to purchase for others, but the RTM marks account linking as a minor roadmap item to be implemented by go-live.
			1	72	The response provides online, mobile and agent assisted sales and supports configurable products, pricing, eligibility, fees, and sales periods. The system is designed to apply the same business rules across the different sales channels and supports the more complex purchasing needs identified in the RFP.
			2	68	Offeror’s proposed solution supports centralized sales records of hunting, fishing, trapping, licenses, permits, raffles, and donations through multiple channels. Solution provides centralized access to real-time inventory, quotas, pricing, and product availability across sales channels. Solution supports multi-level drawings, PP & BP administration, prepaid application fees, post-award payment, special permit applications, surplus tag sales, configurable product catalogs, and future effective dating. Role based configuration of product display, filtering, timing, quotas, and pricing.
Section 4.2.2 Customer Management	70	60	4	52	Tyler proposes unified customer profiles, driver’s license/ID barcode scanning, special eligibility classes, testing accounts, duplicate-profile management, and business/organizational accounts. I like that the system supports business accounts and can associate organizational owners, agents, and staff. However, there is not much operational detail on this important part of the system. The proposal does not clearly describe account creation, authentication, profile updates, identity/residency verification, account recovery, customer-service corrections, data migration, privacy, data visibility, auditing, duplicate resolution, or lifecycle management for customer records. Tyler says a linked customer can access another person’s profile, add items to the cart, and purchase products that are then placed on the other individual’s account. However, it does not clarify whether the primary account holder can access, display, print, store, validate, or manage another person’s license or tag after purchase. This is particularly important for digital tags to comply with MT laws. The RTM also identifies linked family accounts and organizational account relationships as Minor items that are on Tyler’s roadmap for delivery by go-live. These functions are therefore not currently proven standard capabilities. FWP needs a detailed design for relationship types, consent, access rights, purchasing authority, document/tag visibility, data restrictions, adult-to-adult linking, removal of access, audits, and exception handling. Tyler’s duplicate-prevention description also relies on full Social Security Numbers, driver’s license/state ID, and passport/visa information. Montana law prevents FWP from collecting full SSNs.
			1	68	The Offeror provides a central customer record that brings together licenses, permits, transactions, eligibility, residency, and payment information. The system supports both customer self service and staff assisted transactions and uses validation and business rules to help maintain accurate customer information.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
Tyler Technologies Inc					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
			2	60	Offeror provides central customer profiles across all sale channels; barcode scanning to locate or create customer records; configurable eligibility and pricing rules; test and training accounts; and duplicate-prevention and record-merge capabilities with record consolidation preserving transaction history. Solution supports configurable customer classifications that can be used to administer special pricing, including tribal-member resident pricing without requiring a MT-issued ID. Duplicate controls rely on unique identifiers, including SSN, DL or State ID.
			3	60	Tyler provides unified profiles, 2-D barcode scanning, configurable eligibility classes, dummy accounts, duplicate prevention/merging, and business accounts. Association of multiple individuals to an organization requires minor customization, and linked-account functionality is represented in the RTM as roadmap for go-live; these are core edge cases for FWP.
Section 4.2.3 Eligibility and Enforcement	60	50	1	51	Tyler provides configurable eligibility and revocation rules that can prevent customers with specific holds or revocations from purchasing affected products. The systems also provides staff controls and customer notification capabilities.
			2	54	Offeror's proposed solution uses configurable business and eligibility rules for customer eligibility by product, age, residency, price and other criteria. Role based access for administrative verification before purchase or allow configured purchasing based on eligibility rules. Solution supports product-level revocation. Active suspension or revocation records can make related products unavailable for purchase and can change the status of previously issued privileges to revoked. Customer-facing messages can be configured to explain ineligibility and direct the customer to appropriate assistance.
			3	50	The response describes product-level configurable age/residency/season rules, cross-references, revocation-driven purchase blocking, configurable customer messages, and audit/validation controls. Fraud support is comparatively thin: it says anomalies can be identified by reports and database-level tracking, but does not present a detailed detection workflow for the RFP examples.
			4	46	Tyler offers a useful configurable eligibility framework. It describes product- and price-point-level rules for age, residency, license conflicts, prerequisite licenses, safety education, seasons, species, management units, and special customer types. It also supports product-level revocation controls, configurable customer messages, and the ability to block purchases when a customer has an applicable suspension or hold. Tyler refers to a Secretary of State API to validate residency using driver's license or state-ID information, but FWP requested DOJ-based residency validation. Tyler does not explain how DOJ CARS will be used for residency, how data will be matched, how discrepancies and failed lookups will be handled, or what staff override and audit processes apply. The section on seasons also does not clearly demonstrate how Tyler understands or will configure Montana's specific requirements. It moves between seasons, species, sub-species, management units, time periods, inventory types, applications, permits, awards, tags, quotas, and draw rounds without a clear explanation of how these components work together for FWP's regulatory structure. I had a hard time tying their response back to our requirements. Tyler repeatedly says that customers complete forms for military, disability, landowner, lifetime, or other eligibility classifications, but provides little detail about the back-end process. It is unclear how documents are submitted, reviewed, approved, denied, renewed, expired, audited, and communicated; which staff roles are involved; and whether a customer can purchase at a special rate before eligibility is verified. The proposal's option to allow a purchase before verification is especially concerning without a defined process for failed verification, refunds, revocation, and corrections.
			2	65	Offeror's proposed solution allows role based configuration of electronic delivery at the product level for licenses, permits, and other eligible documents. Customers can elect digital credentials and access them through a mobile app or web-based customer portal. Solution supports print-at-home and digital etags and credentials can be displayed through the mobile app as part of the customer's licensing record.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
Tyler Technologies Inc					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.4 Digital Licenses and Tags	70	60	3	60	Tyler describes product-level electronic delivery choices, web and native-mobile display, print-at-home where appropriate, and administrative controls over delivery preference. It also commits to native iOS/Android and offline field access elsewhere. The response recommends limiting a customer's ability to revert to paper after opting in.
			4	37	Tyler's response to digital licenses and tags is heavily focused on electronic licenses, permits, print-at-home documents, and vendor fulfillment. The proposal does not describe tag issuance, activation, notching, offline use, synchronization, confirmation numbers, enforcement validation, corrections, reprints, replacements, revocation, data retention, or audit history. Tyler's digital-delivery model also does not fully align with FWP's needs. It recommends that agencies restrict customers from returning to paper after choosing electronic licensing. FWP does not intend to limit customers to a single license format, and the system must support paper, print-at-home, and digital options according to FWP policy and customer needs. The proposal does not explain how customers can switch between digital, print-at-home, paper, and special-paper formats; when switches are allowed; what happens after a tag has been issued, used, notched, revoked, reprinted, or replaced; or how format changes affect fraud prevention, customer service, and enforcement. Tyler also appears to limit mailed fulfillment to its third-party partner. It states that customers can print at home or have documents fulfilled on special paper through Tyler's fulfillment partner. The proposal does not establish whether FWP can continue using State print-and-mail or if Tyler is our only option. The scope, cost, controls, and responsibility for physical fulfillment need clarification. Tyler discusses its own mobile app but does not provide a plan to integrate digital licenses or tags into the MyFWP app. It also does not explain how wardens validate digital tags in the field, how offline tag events synchronize, or how linked-account access to licenses and tags will work.
			1	66	The offeror supports electronic licenses and tags, including digital delivery preferences, mobile and web display, and administrative controls. The proposal addresses the majority of FWP's digital licensing requirements and provides a good foundation for moving customers toward electronic licenses and tags.
Section 4.2.5 Point of Sale (POS) Functionality	50	40	3	45	Good POS narrative: browser/thin-client support; printers, scanners, cash drawers, and ID scanners; keyboard navigation; cash/check/card/ACH; cash reconciliation; and configurable roles.
			4	38	Tyler proposes a centralized system that gives FWP offices and License Ambassadors the same customer, eligibility, product, inventory, and transaction information. The response also provides useful high-volume features, including driver's-license barcode scanning, product barcode scanning, keyboard shortcuts, tab navigation, receipt printing, and quick access to a customer's prior profile and transaction history to support our current "buy what I had last year" feature that our customer enjoy. Tyler describes support for cash drawers, receipt printers, scanners, signature devices, opening/closing cash amounts, tender tracking, automatic variance calculation, and check tracking. Tyler says it will integrate with Montana's PayZang environment and refers to electronic payment methods approved by the State, but the POS response does not explain terminal compatibility, EMV/contactless/mobile-wallet support, stored cards, ACH, refunds, reversals, voids, chargebacks, settlement, or reconciliation through PayZang. Tyler also offers its own Tyler Payments service as an optional alternative, so we would need to confirm that use of PayZang is fully supported across online, regional office, and License Ambassador channels without requiring Tyler Payments. The proposal is also unclear on offline payments and operations. It is browser based and requires internet access, but it does not explain whether any payment transactions can be processed during a local connectivity outage; how PayZang authorizations would work; how transactions would be queued or recovered; or how duplicate payment, duplicate sales, and reconciliation issues would be prevented when connectivity returns. Tyler describes role-based access broadly, but FWP needs a detailed permission matrix. It is not clear what front-desk staff, office managers, accounting staff, ambassadors, enforcement users, and IT administrators can access or change—including reports, customer data, refunds, reprints, voids, cash reconciliation, product configuration, and audit records. Tyler claims Section 508 and WCAG compliance, but the presentation's dense formatting, small text, and color choices do not create confidence in its accessibility approach. This is not proof that the application is inaccessible, but Tyler does not provide any evidence that the interface has been validated for accessibility either.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.

Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
Tyler Technologies Inc					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
			1	48	Tyler provides a centralized POS system that is connected to the licensing system and customer information. This allows agents to use the same customer information and business rules used by the other sales channels. The proposal addresses the day to day POS needs of FWP.
			2	36	Offeror's proposed solution uses a centralized, cloud-based system for all sales channels. Solution framework is intended to support flexible POS workstation, keyboard-shortcuts, cash, check, card, ACH payments, and configurable role-based permissions. Proposal doesn't firmly document several specific capabilities, configurations, workflows, or demonstrated evidence but rather address those broadly. This limits confidence in operational readiness for FWP's multi-location, transaction-intensive licensing environment.
Section 4.2.6 Drawings and Applications	70	55	4	52	Tyler provides a generally capable drawing and application platform. FWP appears able to configure application fields, instructions, hunting districts/management units, species, choices, eligibility, quotas, pricing, and other business rules. The proposal also supports the option to allow customer-editable individual applications before a drawing, group-hunt applications with a group leader, multiple drawing rounds, quota controls, surplus allocation, application status tracking, and drawing-result notifications. The payment workflow is a significant concern. Tyler's primary description requires customers to pay the application fee at submission and keep a credit card on file so Tyler can process payment after a permit is awarded. If the stored card is missing, expired, or declined, the customer has a limited period to correct the issue; Tyler says it will make four contact attempts, after which the customer forfeits the award and the permit moves to a secondary drawing or over-the-counter process. FWP needs the ability to configure payment at the time of application and refund unsuccessful applicants when that is the applicable program rule. We have apps that require payment at time of application and apps that requirement payment if successful. Tyler makes a general statement that other states support full payment at application with refunds, but it does not clearly commit that this workflow is available for FWP's drawing products, explain which funds are refunded, or show how it will be configured. The refund response is internally inconsistent. Tyler's narrative states that automated refunds at required workflow points are not standard functionality and will require enhancement. Yet the RTM identifies multi-stage drawing/application refunds as "Meets" and "Standard functionality." Separately, the RTM calls Big Game Combo layered refunds a minor development item. This creates material uncertainty over whether FWP's refund requirements are currently supported, must be developed, and are included in the proposed scope, schedule, acceptance criteria, and cost. The proposal also does not adequately distinguish preference points from bonus points. It uses the terms together and says the system can calculate and apply "bonus points," while also saying "preference is given" to qualifying customers. It does not explain whether preference points create ranked selection priority and whether bonus points increase an applicant's odds through weighted random selection. It does not provide the underlying algorithms, configuration controls, test cases, or auditable examples needed to establish that FWP can apply FWP's two point systems correctly and independently.
			1	58	Tyler provides established drawing functionality, including application processing, preference and bonus points, tracking of applications and results, quotas and testing before a drawing is released. The proposal demonstrates a structured process for managing drawings and reviewing results before they are made available.
			2	53	Offeror's proposal demonstrates functional support for configurable drawing applications and PP/BPs administration. However, the proposal provides limited evidence for beginning-to-end application status management, customer notification workflows, and refunds at multiple draw/application stages, which are important component in FWP's drawings.
			3	55	Detailed configuration, group-hunt, multi-round, quota, preference/bonus-point, audit, notification, and surplus mechanisms are described. However, automated refunds at specified points are expressly not standard today and will be enhanced; post-selection payment and certain layered refund requirements likewise depend on implementation work.
			1	78	Tyler provides a strong financial management system with transaction level infmromation, accounting codes, revenue allocation, settlements, reconciliation and reporting. The system can connect financial information back to the customer, product, payment, and sales location, which provides good tracking and auditability. The proposal also addresses SABHRS and PR/DJ requirements.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
Tyler Technologies Inc					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.7 Accounting and Financial Management	100	75	2	85	Offeror's proposed solution offers centralized financial reporting function. Proposal states that licensing, permit, customer, sales transaction, revenue information will be maintained in a centralized system of record. Transactions are allocated to designated accounting codes during processing and can be reported by time/date, product, location, agent, and other configurable parameters. Solution addresses trackable audit trails, modification logs, taxes, deferred revenue recognition, daily batch processing, reconciliation, and financial-system integration. Offeror commits to support a SABHRS integration and to configure PR/DJ revenue.
			3	75	Tyler describes transaction-level accounting codes, agent sweep/ACH settlement, reconciliation/deposit reports, audit trails, tax components, SABHRS integration, and mapping to PR/DJ methodology. However the SABHRS and PR/DJ approaches remain future implementation/design commitments rather than a submitted FWP interface/control specification or demonstrated allocation report.
			4	60	Tyler identifies the appropriate high-level financial concepts: transaction-level detail, configurable accounting codes, revenue allocation, audit trails, reporting, refund reconciliation, and SABHRS integration. However, the response does not provide sufficient operational detail for a 100-point accounting and financial-management section. Approximately three pages are devoted to the section, with a meaningful portion occupied by a graphic, leaving little explanation of how FWP's actual financial processes would be supported. The most significant gap is reconciliation. Tyler does not clearly explain how daily reconciliation will work at FWP front desks. The proposal does not describe the process for tracking cash, checks, card payments, voids, refunds, or transmission to State accounting. While Tyler discusses cash-drawer functions and automatic variance calculation in the POS response, it does not tie those functions to a complete FWP financial reconciliation. The online reconciliation workflow is also unclear. Tyler states that it will integrate with the existing State PayZang payment environment and support SABHRS integration, but it does not show how Tyler transactions will be matched to PayZang authorizations, settlement files, bank deposits, refunds, chargebacks, ACH returns, and SABHRS postings. It also does not identify interface timing, error-handling procedures, or ownership of reconciliation activities. The response places substantial emphasis on agent sweep management. Because FWP does not intend to reinstate sweeps or providers, and License Ambassadors don't need sweeps, this content is not responsive to FWP's RFP. Refund accounting is another area requiring clarification. Tyler says that transactions can be reconciled to revenue and refunds, but it does not provide workflows for refund authorization, refund processing, partial refunds, PayZang processing, SABHRS posting, customer notification, exception handling, and audit reporting. This is especially important because Tyler acknowledges elsewhere that some required drawing/application refund automation is not standard and will require enhancement.
			2	62	Offeror's proposed solution includes reporting and analytics capability, including configurable dashboards, standard and ad hoc reports, filtering, drill-down analysis, exports, scheduled distribution, and support for USFWS and PR/DJ reporting. Proposal doesn't firmly address several core capabilities rather addresses them broadly.
			3	65	Tyler offers Data & Insights dashboards, ad hoc reports, filters, drill-down, scheduled/on-demand distribution, exports to CSV/Excel/PDF, and federal license-certification/PR-DJ support.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
Tyler Technologies Inc					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.8 Reporting	70	62	4	55	Tyler provides a credible reporting and analytics foundation. The proposal describes configurable dashboards, standard and ad hoc reporting, drill-down, filtering, exports, alerts, historical comparisons, scheduled and on-demand distribution, and reporting for multiple audiences. Tyler's reporting approach appears well aligned with core licensing operations, including license and permit sales, transactions, revenue, customer activity, financial controls, audit support, and required USFWS/PR-DJ reporting. However, the reporting response is more generic and sales/R3-oriented than tailored to Montana FWP's management context. It emphasizes customer acquisition, retention, churn, auto-renewal, marketing, and product performance. Those measures may be valuable in some states, but our licensing environment also require strong use of licensing, drawing, quota, tag, and harvest-related information in wildlife-management and regulatory decision-making. The proposal does not adequately explain how reporting will support management-unit/HD analysis, species and season evaluation, quota and permit utilization, resident/nonresident allocation outcomes/trends, or other information used to inform FWP management decisions. The proposal also lacks a standard-report catalog, report examples, delivery options, report access/permission detail, and a clear distinction between reports available as standard functionality and reports requiring agency configuration or vendor effort. As a result, the proposal demonstrates a solid general reporting capability but provides less assurance that the reporting environment is tailored to FWP's specific operational and wildlife-management priorities.
			1	64	Tyler provides a broad range of standard and configurable reports covering operations, financial information, customers, agents, management, and audit needs. Reports can be filtered, sorted, reviewed in more detail, and exported. The proposal also addresses reporting needed for federal and PR/DJ purposes.
Section 4.2.9 Interfaces and Integrations	80	60	3	60	A sound REST/OpenAPI/OAuth/OIDC framework is described, and Tyler specifically commits to PayZang and hunter-education integration with Kalkomey. However, many mandatory named targets (MyFWP, CARS, DOR, DOL, DPHHS, Wildlife Violators Compact, USFWS, KC2, KC3) are listed as systems the platform is "capable of integrating" with and remain to be specified in discovery; data ownership, responsibility boundaries, messages, timing, and error handling are not supplied.
			4	60	Tyler provides a credible technical foundation for interfaces and integrations. The proposal describes RESTful APIs aligned to OpenAPI standards, Swagger/OpenAPI documentation, OAuth 2.0 and OpenID Connect security, monitoring, auditing, authorization, and API-management capabilities. It also identifies numerous required integration targets, including PayZang, SABHRS, FWP internal applications, the FWP website, DOJ CARS, DOR, DLI, DPHHS, IWVC, USFWS, and Kalkomey. The strongest integration statements concern PayZang, SABHRS, and Hunter Education. Tyler states that it will integrate with Montana's existing PayZang payment environment and that it will support SABHRS financial integration. It also identifies a Kalkomey API integration for Hunter Education status verification. The response does not adequately address integration with the existing MyFWP application. Rather than describe the option to retain and integrate with MyFWP, Tyler responds by proposing its own native iOS/Android application. The proposal does not explain how FWP could preserve MyFWP. The digital-license approach further raises concern because Tyler frames electronic delivery as customer opt-in. Our customers currently get digital and paper options for licenses. The response does not demonstrate a flexible FWP-controlled approach that supports customer choice across MyFWP, Tyler's app, print-at-home, paper, and other authorized formats. More generally, the proposal provides broad statements that the platform can integrate with numerous State, federal, and FWP systems, but does not provide system-specific interface details.
			1	69	Tyler provides an established approach for connecting the licensing system with financial systems, customer facing applications, identity services and other State systems. The proposal specifically addresses integration with Montana's SABHRS environment and other required systems. The architecture also allows the core licensing system to remain consistent rather than creating a separate customized system for each interface.
			2	52	Offer's proposed solution provides a modern API framework and an approach to Hunter Ed integration. Proposal response does not sufficiently demonstrate the specific required integrations with MyFWP, the FWP website, several state systems, Wildlife Violators Compact, USFWS, or KC 2 and 3.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
Tyler Technologies Inc					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and section 7 – Technical Architecture, Security, and Compliance	80	65	4	60	Tyler provides a strong high-level technical architecture, security, and compliance response. It agrees to the requirements in Sections 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3; proposes a U.S.-hosted AWS SaaS environment; and affirms State ownership of data. The solution includes a modern API approach, four U.S.-hosted environments, stated availability and performance targets, encryption, SOC 2 Type II, PCI DSS, annual third-party security testing, MFA, RBAC, audit logging, data migration, and disaster recovery. Tyler's role-based access-control approach is a particular strength. The proposal describes least-privilege access, configurable roles, record/function restrictions, real-time permission changes, account deactivation, and auditability. The response also takes a generally practical approach to AI by framing AI-enabled capabilities as subject to Montana's Right to Compute law, Montana AI Risk Management Framework, and NIST AI RMF standards rather than presenting AI as an unrestricted or fully autonomous function. Several key compliance areas are less definitive than the RTM's "Meets" designations suggest. Tyler states that it supports SSO through SAML and OIDC, but does not clearly commit to integration with Montana's State identity-management system or describe identity provisioning, role mapping, MFA enforcement, account lifecycle, or implementation approach. Tyler's background-check commitment is also qualified. The proposal states that screenings are performed in accordance with Tyler company policy and applicable requirements, rather than expressly confirming compliance with Montana's State-specific background-check requirements for all personnel with protected-data access. The full-data-export requirement is not adequately demonstrated. Tyler says users can export ad hoc query results to PDF, Excel, or CSV, but that does not establish FWP's ability to obtain a complete export of all State data in open formats, including historical data, transactions, configuration, audit logs, attachments, metadata, and data definitions. Finally, Tyler claims WCAG 2.1 and Section 508 compliance but the format of their proposal gives me pause. The density, small text, and color use in the written proposal do not establish that the production application is inaccessible, but they do not create confidence that accessibility has been prioritized and validated in practice.
			1	67	Tyler provides a cloud based system designed to support large transaction volumes, system availability, backups and recovery. The proposal includes security controls such as user access controls, multi factor authentication, audit logging, vulnerability testing, and other security measures. Tyler also provides SOC 2 Type II documentation.
			2	65	Offeror agrees to comply with MT IT policies and standards, approved enterprise software and legal framework compliance. Proposed solution presents a broadly capable, US-hosted SaaS platform with strong stated coverage for availability, API framework, authentication, encryption, audit logging, PCI compliance, data migration, and multiple non-production environments. Proposal response does not address several critical requirements rather addresses generally at a high-level. Most notably offline mobile app capabilities.
			3	70	Tyler commits to U.S.-hosted AWS, 99.9% uptime, stated 3/5-second performance targets, REST APIs, SSO/MFA/RBAC, WCAG 2.1/§508, SOC 2 Type II, annual third-party testing, AES-256/TLS 1.2+, PCI DSS Level 1, U.S. data ownership/location, four environments, and RPO/RTO of 4/12 hours. One compliance statement says Tyler is "confident in [its] ability to comply" and will address specific requirements in contract negotiations, rather than supplying a detailed state-policy crosswalk; accessibility/security artifacts were not included in the text materials reviewed
			1	84	Tyler provides a detailed implementation approach that includes requirements review, system configuration, integrations, data migration, testing, training, change management, go-live, and post go live stabilization. Tyler also identifies dedicated project and technical resources. The Pennsylvania implementation, including the migration of more than 4.6 million customer accounts, provides evidence that Tyler has experience with large-scale data migration and statewide system implementation.
			2	80	Offer proposes PMBOK-based methodology using Agile principles, structured workstreams, phased delivery, collaboration with FWP around seasonal constraints, and on-site support in Helena during major milestones. Proposal includes comprehensive training options. Offer's proposed solution includes formal change-control process, documented impact analysis, FWP approval, change tracking, and a distinction between in-scope changes and separately out-of-scope enhancements.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.

Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
Tyler Technologies Inc					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Sections 4.3, 8, and 15 – Implementation, Migration, Training, and Change Management	90	75	3	75	Tyler proposes PMBOK/Agile workstreams, a phased approach, RTM-to-UAT traceability, gap-list governance, iterative static/dynamic conversion, role-based training, testing, and Helena presence at key milestones. A submitted MS Project plan is identified as an accompanying .mpp artifact, but it was not text-extractable for this review; therefore, its dates, dependencies, critical path, and staffing loads were not independently evaluated. Tyler's claimed "100% data migration accuracy" and 48-hour cutover target are targets, not evidence of an approved FWP conversion plan.
			4	68	Tyler provides a credible and generally well-structured implementation framework. The proposal uses a PMW aligned with PMBOK principles and incorporates relevant agile/iterative practices. It identifies implementation phases and workstreams for project management, discovery, requirements validation, design and configuration, integration, data conversion, testing, training, organizational change management, go-live, stabilization, and support transition. The use of the RTM for requirements traceability is also a positive feature. Tyler's training and OCM approach is a strength. The proposed Slalom partnership enhances the change-management, stakeholder-engagement, communication, and training components of the project. Tyler also indicates that training and system documentation will be maintained and updated throughout the contract as approved changes occur. The proposal provides less assurance that the methodology has been converted into a fully defined Montana-specific delivery approach. Tyler's reference to "field-based innovation and collaborative creation" as a way for the State to evolve the solution is not clearly explained. The proposal does not establish how Montana identifies, prioritizes, approves, funds, and receives requested changes; how FWP priorities will be treated relative to Tyler's shared product roadmap; or whether Montana-specific needs will be included, deferred, or billed as enhancements. Tyler's strong preference for a common SaaS platform rather than Montana-specific customization has potential benefits, but it also creates concern about responsiveness to unique FWP requirements. The proposal contains numerous statements that functions will be supported through configuration, enhancement, scoped work, future development, or implementation collaboration. Because several of those same requirements are marked "Meets" in the RTM, the proposal does not consistently distinguish standard functionality from included development, configuration, future roadmap work, and potentially chargeable customization. The response does not adequately describe business-account access and login workflows. Tyler states that users generally log into an account and that business accounts can include associated individuals, but it does not explain delegation, multiple user logins, organization-level roles, employee turnover, access revocation, payment authority, audit controls, or separation of individual and business data. The fulfillment response is also incomplete. Tyler recognizes that FWP does not require vendor fulfillment, but its proposed physical-document process focuses on print-at-home documents or Tyler's third-party fulfillment partner. The proposal does not clearly show that FWP can retain and operate its own print-and-mail process, use a State-selected fulfillment provider, receive print-ready files, or configure a hybrid fulfillment model. Finally, Tyler provides a reasonable generic migration methodology but limited Montana specific detail. The
			1	34	Tyler provides ongoing system maintenance, security updates, monitoring, technical support, controlled system releases, and disaster recovery. The proposal also describes continued improvements to the platform rather than treating the implementation as a one time project.
			2	30	Offeror proposed solution provides ongoing SaaS support model, including updates, tiered support, monitoring, quarterly releases, peak-period support, 99.9% uptime, page-load targets, escalation planning, and disaster-recovery testing. Proposal response does not address multiple SLA reporting requirements including priority response/resolution times, SLA reporting frequency, financial remedies, and annual maintenance reviews.
			3	30	The response addresses patching, release communication, 24/7 escalation, monitoring, DR testing, peak support, and 99.9% uptime. It does not fully propose the required SLA: the Scope section contains no substantive answer following the SLA prompt, and the RTM defers monthly reporting and financial remedies/service credits to contract negotiation.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.

Offeror (Company) Name:		Total Points Awarded:			
Tyler Technologies Inc					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 9 – Ongoing Maintenance, Support, and Continuous Improvement	40	30	4	29	Tyler presents a credible ongoing maintenance and support model, including RTM-based defect resolution, standard product updates, security and platform maintenance, planned maintenance notice, escalation planning, peak-period support, and a stated 99.9% availability target. Tyler also describes a Client Advisory Board, user groups, annual summits, and working sessions through which agency needs can influence the shared product roadmap. Tyler's common-SaaS approach has a meaningful advantage: it allows FWP to remain on a maintained platform and gives authorized FWP staff substantial control over routine operational configuration. Tyler states that FWP can manage products, prices, dates, business rules, eligibility, forms, content, communications, drawing setup, quotas, reports, agents, and related administrative settings without routine custom code or vendor releases. The concern is not that FWP would lack all control or that Tyler would refuse all Montana-specific work. Rather, the proposal does not clearly identify how FWP can influence the roadmap for needs that exceed standard configuration, how those needs are prioritized, whether FWP has a formal role or voting authority in advisory governance, when requested functions would be delivered, or whether they would be included in the base solution, added to the shared roadmap, deferred, or charged as custom development. Tyler's cost proposal states that broadly applicable improvements may be incorporated into the common platform at no additional cost, while highly customized, Montana-specific, complex, unique, or accelerated changes may be billed at specified hourly rates. The proposal does not provide objective criteria or a governance process for distinguishing included product updates from chargeable custom enhancements. The response therefore provides confidence in Tyler's routine support and configuration model, but less confidence that FWP can reliably obtain unique, mission-critical Montana functionality on its own schedule and within the proposed cost model.
Section 10 and 4.3 – Offeror Qualifications, References, and PR/DJ Experience	60	50	2	48	Offeror demonstrates strong qualifications in multiple state recreational licensing and broad related capabilities. Proposal response broadly addresses several core qualifications, partner capabilities, future commitments, or general API readiness rather than direct, demonstrated experience in the specific capability requested. Offeror has experience in PR/DJ allocation reporting.
			3	50	Tyler cites nearly two decades of recreational-licensing experience; documented wildlife-system examples include Illinois, Pennsylvania, Alabama, Rhode Island, and prior FWP/State of Montana work. It provides three KC1 references and describes PR/DJ reporting support. The PR/DJ narrative is general rather than naming completed PR/DJ project deliverables or 2 CFR 200 allocation implementations, and the Alabama reference was newly live in July 2026 according to the proposal.
			4	50	Tyler demonstrates substantial relevant experience in state recreational licensing and natural-resource agency operations. The proposal identifies active or recent statewide work with Pennsylvania, Illinois, Rhode Island, and Alabama, and describes experience with hunting and fishing licenses, permits, drawings, quota management, harvest reporting, agent POS, enforcement support, mobile applications, financial reconciliation, reporting, and integrations. Tyler's Pennsylvania and Illinois examples are particularly relevant because they involve statewide licensing programs, drawing/lottery processes, large customer populations, and extensive external sales-agent networks. Tyler also provides a credible PR/DJ experience narrative. It identifies the customer, license, privilege, residency, transaction, and revenue data needed for USFWS license certification and PR/DJ-related reporting, reconciliation, audit support, and federal funding administration. Its recognition of unique paid license-holder counts and resident/nonresident reporting demonstrates familiarity with an important federal reporting requirement. Tyler's prior work with Montana State government and FWP is a positive qualification. It may reduce discovery and implementation risk because Tyler claims familiarity with FWP's legacy environment, Montana processes, and State systems such as SABHRS. The proposed Slalom partnership also strengthens the organizational change-management and Montana-specific implementation experience available to the project. The proposal provides less evidence that its existing production platform supports the complete combination of Montana-specific requirements at go-live. Across the broader response, several important functions are described as enhancements, scoped work, roadmap items, or future implementation development. In addition, the proposal does not provide client-verified outcomes, detailed implementation results, service-level performance, production metrics, or evidence of comparable State payment-processor and MyFWP integration. Tyler's reluctance to diviate from their SAAS implementation added to this concern. The Alabama reference is relevant but very recent, with a stated July 2026 go-live date. It therefore provides limited evidence of sustained operational performance across a complete annual licensing cycle, peak periods, drawings, financial reconciliation, support, and maintenance.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
Tyler Technologies Inc					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
			1	50	Tyler has extensive experience with state wildlife and natural resource agencies. The proposal identifies work with Pennsylvania, Illinois, Rhode Island, Alabama, and Wisconsin, including licensing, customer management, drawings, harvest reporting, and financial functions. Tyler also demonstrates experience with PR/DJ reporting, revenue reconciliation, eligibility information, and audit requirements. This experience is directly applicable to FWP.
TOTAL OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL	1000	820			
Product Demonstration/Interviews	Total of 600 Points				
Demonstration	600	570	2	550	Tyler was able to answer all clarifying questions at the end of their demonstration. They had an organized presentation and covered a lot of items, while also leaving time for the questions at the end. Their digital version was good, and showed a selection of license by product and customer, along with purchase history. There is harvest reporting on the app and online. The ability to identify duplicate licensing is good. Tyler talked well about pricing and accounting, and distribution on revenue. They also touched on revocation and suspensions while highlighting errors that would save time. They showed understanding of lottery and applications, season party management, preference and bonus points. They demonstrated a high level of knowledge on what they are. They have the capability to do a lot of configuration. The customer can look at regulations in real time via their app. They addressed scaleable refunds for unsuccessful applicants. They covered real time and post payment options, audit records for changes, reprint parameters, price changes on mass or micro level, percentage increase or license type.
			3	525	The offeror demonstrated a QR code as an option for their enforcement app. The drawing selection audit report could be handy and useful. They discussed AL coming from legacy system which seems to be something FWP would be doing. A lot of the information was not really gathered until the end during the Q&A portion. Things appear to still be in development, and the offeror is updating designs to make it more mobile and user friendly.
			4	570	The Offeror demonstrated the client advisory board and RBAC. They acknowledged that they would need to set up a second set for both types of points: Preference and Bonus points. They did not have advanced UI in production, but is planned for 2027. They can assign ambassadors to regions, have a drivers license scanner, and can stack roles in RBAC. They also have the capability to give more access to a specific role when needed. They offer offline e-tag capabilities, and push notifications would allow the user to sync when not done. They presented a possible plan for data migration for Montana including lessons learned on past projects. They will offer training for ambassadors.
			1	575	The Offeror has shown the knowledge to be able to work with Montana, as they provided 226 specific instances. It was noted that Tyler includes notifications on mailing of the licenses for the customer, a mobile app that can also work on a web display. They discussed PRR requests, show an understanding of SABHRS, and willing to support the state payment processor. The dashboard capability is good with customer demographic reports, building and comparing dashboards. The Offeror demonstrated that they are constantly testing and monitoring systems. They have training videos for customers, ambassadors, and staff. They have cart counters for high peak days, drawing notifications for winning or losing drawings. They also shared their lessons learned from their previous mistakes.
Cost Proposal	Total of 400 Points				
Cost	400	400			
TOTAL SCORE	Total of 2000	1790			

Outdoor Recreation Licensing, Survey & Reporting, and Recreation Access & Reservation					
FWP-RFP-2026-1113MQB					
Individual Scoring Matrix					
The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
FSH Technologies					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Evaluated RFP Section	Point Values			Score	Justification
Primary Services	Total 1,000 Points				
Section 4.1 Overview and Overall Licensing Solution Fit	80	48	4	38	FSH proposes a modern, custom-built licensing solution intended to replace ALS, ALX, and OLS with one cloud-hosted system for online sales, FWP office POS, and License Ambassador sales. The response describes a unified customer account, licensing products and eligibility rules, digital and paper fulfillment, Big Game Combo and other drawings, party applications, POS support, holds, SABHRS reporting, and integration with MyFWP, payment processing, Hunter Education, and other systems. FSH also proposes an early MVP, parallel operation with ALS/OLS, and phased validation before full cutover. These are reasonable design ideas for reducing risk during a large system transition. FSH does not have direct experience with state fish, wildlife, or parks licensing, reservation, access-management, survey, or PR/DJ systems. The proposal itself acknowledges that FSH has not deployed a wildlife licensing or recreation-reservation system. Its cited government work involves local-government records management, compliance training, social-program/grant management, school nutrition, and HR/scheduling platforms. Those are not equivalent to statewide fish-and-wildlife licensing, complex drawings, distributed License Ambassador sales, e-tags, enforcement, or financial reconciliation. The lack of relevant domain experience is also apparent in the enforcement response. FSH states that Wildlife Violators Compact holds will be checked synchronously against Montana DOJ CARS at issuance and describes the Compact, CARS, and eligibility workflow as though they are the same process. FWP would need clarification that the system can support the actual IWVC eligibility and enforcement workflow, including the correct data source, match logic, timing, hold status, exceptions, appeals, overrides, updates, and releases—not simply a generic DOJ CARS hold check. FSH is proposing another ground-up build at a time when FWP does not have staff capacity to support extensive custom development, design decisions, validation, testing, and troubleshooting for every core licensing function. The proposal says all licensing business logic will be built specifically for FWP. This shifts substantial project and operational risk to FWP and would require sustained subject-matter-expert involvement from staff. There is a concern with the proposed SABHRS sequencing. FSH's plan says the Week 20 KC1 MVP would include only basic SABHRS batch output, while full SABHRS reconciliation is not planned until Phase 2, Weeks 20–36. If FSH is processing real license sales in production at Week 20, it is unclear how FWP would complete required transaction-to-revenue reconciliation, resolve financial exceptions, validate deposits and refunds, or ensure accurate accounting before full SABHRS reconciliation is available. FSH references both State payment-processor integration and Stripe, but it does not clearly establish whether FWP can use the State payment contract for all required workflows—including online, POS, agent, pre-payment, post-selection payments, refunds, reversals, settlements, and reconciliation.
			1	60	FSH addresses the major components of FWP's licensing solution, including licensing, customer accounts, eligibility, drawings, POS financials, reporting and integrations. The proposed system is designed specifically around FWP's requirements, rather than adapting an existing commercial product. The main concern is because FSH is proposing a new system and does not have a previous wildlife licensing implementation of this type.
			2	50	Offeror proposes a custom-built, cloud-hosted solution. Proposal conceptually addresses the major functional requirements using a custom-built, un-demonstrated platform for FWP rather than a mature established wildlife licensing product.
			3	55	FSH proposes a cloud-hosted replacement for ALS/ALX/OLS with one API for online, office POS, and agents. But it is a purpose-built system rather than a deployed product, and the response provides narrative only—not the requested diagrams, workflows, example screens, or reports—leaving substantial delivery and usability risk.
			1	51	FSH addresses all three required sales channels: online sales, FWP POS, and License Ambassadors. The proposal also covers hunting, fishing, trapping, and conservation licenses, bundled purchases, raffles, donations, surplus tags, and multiple payment methods. Concern because the licensing functions will be configured and developed specifically for FWP rather than being demonstrated through an existing wildlife licensing implementation.
			2	57	Offeror's proposed solution provides a newly developed un-tested custom-built system that addresses the required sales channels, eligibility, customer accounts, draws, electronic tags, POS, financial reporting, federal reporting, and core integrations.
			3	55	The response names storefront, cart checkout, bundled purchases, raffles, donations, surplus tags, cash/check/electronic payment, and channels. It does not substantively show configurable/effective-dated catalog administration, special-permit workflows, or the complex Montana FWP scenarios beyond assertions; all are future custom development.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
FSH Technologies					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.1 Sales and Purchasing	80	45	4	23	FSH proposes to support the core sales and purchasing functions FWP needs, including hunting, fishing, trapping, conservation, and combination license sales; online, office POS, and License Ambassador channels; applications and drawings; multiple payment timing options; raffle tickets; special permits; donations; Big Game Combo logic and refunds; surplus tags; and family purchasing. The proposal describes a unified cart and shared API intended to use the same customer and transaction records across public, staff, and agent channels. There is major concerns with this response because nothing is actually built yet. The proposed purchasing, payment, drawing, refund, family-account, agent-sales, and surplus-sale functions are hypothetical custom-development commitments, not demonstrated product capabilities. FSH does not have a deployed state fish-and-wildlife licensing system, and the response does not provide production examples of complex drawings, Big Game Combo workflows, party applications, high-volume surplus sales, License Ambassador operations, payment/refund processing, or family purchasing. It appears that FSH does not fully understand the breadth and depth of FWP's sales and purchasing operation. It identifies many of the required functions but generally states that they will be supported without explaining the detailed business rules, exceptions, operational controls, financial impacts, customer-service needs, and audit requirements involved. The RTM marks every Section 4.2.1 requirement as "Meets," but FSH's own proposal says that the licensing business logic, eligibility engine, draw algorithm, payment workflows, and interfaces will be built specifically for FWP. There was not a clear response to location-based purchasing requirements. Clarification is needed on payment processing because FSH references both integration with the State payment processor and the use of Stripe. FWP's preference is to use the State payment contract, and it is unclear whether all sales, POS, agent, draw, refund, reversal, settlement, and reconciliation workflows can use that contract without requiring Stripe. The donation, family-account, party-application, and surplus-tag responses need substantially more detail. Donations are described as cart-based, but there is no clear option to donate a refund. Family purchasing is limited to a reference to parent/minor account linking and does not explain spouse or other linked-account rights, post-purchase access, or display of licenses and tags. Party applications, Big Game Combo outcomes, randomization, payment failures, refunds, and rollbacks are asserted but not operationally described. Surplus-tag processing is listed as supported, but the response does not describe queue or waiting-room controls, inventory locking, oversell prevention, eligibility rechecks, channel handling, or peak-demand testing.
Section 4.2.2 Customer Management	70	41	2	52	Offeror's proposed solution includes a centralized customer centric model that addresses several core requirements for customer records, ID scanning, tribal-member pricing, test/training accounts, duplicate record management, family and organization accounts. Proposal is conceptual and un-tested and includes operational details and functionality that have not been demonstrated in a wildlife licensing environment.
			3	40	FSH covers unified accounts, barcode scan, de-duplication review, minor linkage, tribal pricing, and business accounts. The response does not expressly address typed/digital-ID entry, dummy/training accounts, spouse/family linkage beyond minors, historical-interaction treatment, or multiple people associated to one organizational account.
			4	20	FSH's response to Customer Management is limited to a brief overview statement that proposes unified customer accounts, driver-license/Montana-ID barcode scanning, manual account entry, duplicate-account review, minor accounts linked to parent accounts, tribal-member resident pricing, and business or organizational accounts. The response is not detailed enough to evaluate whether it meets FWP's customer-management requirements. It does not describe an existing solution or provide workflows, screenshots, examples, or comparable production implementations. FSH is proposing that these functions be built specifically for FWP, but provides almost no explanation of how they will operate. The response does not explain how duplicate-account management would work beyond a staff-review queue, including match logic, merge authority, audit history, reversal of incorrect merges, and protection of active licenses, tags, points, applications, restrictions, enforcement history, payments, refunds, and other customer records. The linked-account response is limited to minor accounts linked to a parent. It does not address spouses, other household members, consent or attestation, guardian verification, account-linking controls, permissions, post-purchase access, or whether a primary account holder can view and display licenses or tags for linked minors or spouses. FSH also provides no operational detail about tribal-member pricing without a Montana ID, business and organizational accounts, multiple individuals associated with an organization, customer history, self-service profile updates, communications preferences, eligibility documentation, staff approvals, or audit controls. The RTM marks all Customer Management requirements as "Meets," but the response does not provide enough information to substantiate those ratings
			1	42	FSH proposes customer accounts with Montana ID/driver's license barcode lookup, duplicate account detection, parent/minor relationships, tribal resident pricing and business/organizational accounts. This does speak to e-tags and paper at home licenses configurable. The approach is technically strong, but the proposal provides limited evidence of these capabilities operating at comparable, statewide wildlife scale.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:	
FSH Technologies					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.3 Eligibility and Enforcement	60	35	3	35	The proposal gives a specific rule basis (license type, residency, age, season), a synchronous CARS hold check, a hold table, and fraud flags for reprints, paper-after-digital switching, and multi-channel activity. Evidence of an actual configurable rule-administration/audit implementation remains future-state, but the described functional approach is comparatively specific.
			4	20	FSH proposes basic eligibility rules based on license type, residency, age, and season; a synchronous check for enforcement-related holds at issuance; an enforcement-hold table for court orders, outstanding balances, and administrative holds; and fraud flags for excessive reprints, paper-after-digital switching, and same-customer activity across channels. The response is too limited to demonstrate that it understands or can support FWP's eligibility and enforcement requirements. The proposed eligibility rules are described only at a basic level and do not address the broader range of prerequisites, certifications, purchase limits, points, existing privileges, residency documentation, customer classifications, species/area/season restrictions, reporting compliance, group rules, or program-specific exceptions that affect FWP transactions. The proposal also appears to confuse IWVC eligibility with DOJ CARS. It says Compact holds will be checked through CARS, but does not identify the actual source of IWVC information, how records are matched, how updates are received and released, or how FWP staff manage exceptions, appeals, overrides, and false positives. It is unclear whether holds from MRRE, IWVC, DPHHS, CARS, and other applicable sources would be automatically interfaced or require manual entry. Beyond the basic hold functionality, there does not appear to be a meaningful proposal for license-fraud prevention, detection, or enforcement. FSH mentions flags for excessive reprints, paper-after-digital switching, and same-customer activity across channels, but does not describe how the system would identify suspicious behavior; the thresholds or rules used; whether activity would be blocked, warned, or routed for review; who would investigate; what evidence staff would see; or how a decision would be recorded and audited. The response also does not address fraud controls for duplicate issuance, identity misuse, suspicious account creation, unusual purchase patterns, agent activity, refund or void abuse, payment disputes, credential sharing, or repeated replacement requests. The response does not explain staff review workflows, enforcement alerts, investigation queues, supervisory approval, fraud reporting, audit history, or integration of fraud findings with restrictions and holds. Since FSH does not have a proven wildlife-licensing platform, these controls would need to be designed, built, tested, and refined with FWP during implementation.
			1	35	The proposal includes eligibility rules based on license type, residency, age, and season, as well as DOJ CARS hold checks. It also addresses enforcement holds and controls for reprints and switching between digital and paper licenses. There are concerns because these functions will need to be configured and tested for FWP's specific rules and CARS processes.
			2	40	Offeror's proposed solution includes a conceptual eligibility and enforcement model that addresses age, residency, season, and license-type rules; real-time restriction checks; administrative holds; and fraud flags for reprints and paper-to-digital switching. Solution is custom built system and does not provide sufficient detail regarding fraud investigation, exception handling or proven wildlife licensing operation.
Section 4.2.4 Digital Licenses and Tags	70	40	4	15	FSH proposes print-at-home and digital E-Tag fulfillment, with format selection configurable by license type and customer preference. It also identifies digital E-Tag display, reprint controls, MyFWP integration, and a mobile-responsive/PWA experience. The response is very limited and does not provide enough detail to evaluate whether the proposed system will meet FWP's digital-license and tag needs. FSH does not have an existing wildlife licensing or e-tag platform, so these functions would be built specifically for FWP. The response does not describe the customer, staff, or enforcement workflow for tag issuance, display, format changes, replacement, validation, harvest, revocation, or audit history. But FSH's response does not appear to address offline capability for KC1 digital licenses and tags. FSH provides a detailed offline architecture for optional KC2 BMA check-in/check-out, including cached application data, QR codes, GPS timestamps, queued offline actions, synchronization, deduplication, and quota reconciliation. However, the KC1 licensing platform is described as browser based and requiring reliable internet access. The response does not explain whether digital licenses and tags can be stored on a device, displayed offline, validated by enforcement offline, tagged or harvested offline, or synchronized safely when connectivity returns. FSH appears to propose a browser-based Progressive Web App rather than a dedicated native iOS/Android mobile application for KC1. While a PWA can provide an app-like experience and may access some device functions, the proposal does not explain how it will reliably integrate with the mobile capabilities FWP may need, including GPS/location services, camera or barcode scanning, secure credential storage, push notifications, background synchronization, offline access, and device permissions. This is especially concerning for digital licenses and tags used in remote areas, where customers and enforcement may need reliable offline access and field functionality. The response also does not confirm linked-account access to a minor's or spouse's licenses and tags.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
FSH Technologies					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
			1	44	FSH provides for digital licenses and e-tags, including digital display, reprints, and mobile/offline functionality. The proposal addresses the required functions, but there is limited evidence of previous statewide e-tag implementations. The deduction recognizes the execution risk associated with introducing a new production e-tag system.
			2	50	Offeror's proposed solution includes conceptual print-at-home and digital E-tag option by license type and customer preference, with digital tag display planned through the MyFWP mobile app. Proposal addresses all requirements in concept, but it provides limited implementation detail on document generation, tag-specific rules, mobile/offline presentation, field validation and reissuance. Proposed solution does not provide the detailed operational design necessary to validate statewide digital-tag use, demonstrated workflow for issuance, display, offline access, enforcement validation, reprints, format changes, revocation, document security, physical-tag exceptions, MyFWP integration, and audit controls.
			3	40	FSH states that print-at-home and E-tags are configurable by license/customer preference and proposes a digital E-tag display in Phase 2. But its cross-capability response also says the platform is browser-based and "requires reliable access to the internet," while it describes a PWA rather than native KC1 apps; this does not clearly satisfy field reliability/offline expectations.
Section 4.2.5 Point of Sale (POS) Functionality	50	30	1	29	The proposed POS supports the required licensing transactions and common POS equipment, including scanners, cash drawers, receipt printers and payment terminals. The POS uses the same underlying application and API as the other sales channels.
			2	35	Offeror's proposed solution conceptually includes a centralized browser-based POS model for FWP offices and ambassadors, identifies support for standard POS peripherals and keyboard shortcuts, and states that cash, check, and electronic payments will be supported. Proposal provides limited evidence of production-ready POS hardware integration, payment operations, statewide continuity procedures, and the specific role-based controls required for voids, reprints, refunds, and corrections.
			3	35	The thin-client POS proposal addresses keyboard navigation, DL/barcode scanners, cash drawers, receipt printers, and payment terminals, and it uses the shared API. It does not specifically evidence ACH, staff permissions for voids/free reprints/refunds/corrections, or a tested hardware compatibility plan; FWP also supplies all hardware.
			4	10	FSH proposes a browser-based POS using the same application and API as its online system, with keyboard navigation and support for ID scanners, barcode scanners, cash drawers, receipt printers, and payment terminals. FSH says FWP would provide all hardware while FSH supports the software layer. The proposed POS is not an existing, proven licensing POS product and the architecture is unclear. The response refers to both a browser-based application and a "thin-client configuration," but does not explain why FWP or License Ambassadors would need thin clients rather than browser-capable existing workstations. A thin-client requirement could add device, peripheral, driver, network, lifecycle, and support complexity. FSH also does not clarify whether it means dedicated hardware, virtual desktops, or simply a web-based POS. The response does not demonstrate sufficient understanding of how hardware and software would work together in FWP offices and License Ambassador locations. It does not identify compatible device models, browser or operating-system requirements, drivers, payment-terminal integration, installation, testing, endpoint security, maintenance, replacement, or troubleshooting responsibilities. Since FSH says FWP provides hardware and it supports only the software layer, FWP may be responsible for significant hardware and configuration support. There is concern about connectivity and agent operations. FSH describes a browser-based system that requires reliable internet access and a thin client requirement. The references to APIs should be clarified; API management should occur at the server/application layer, while POS devices should normally use the web interface and supported peripheral integrations. Configuring APIs for every office and ambassador is not realistic.
			2	54	Offeror's proposed solution addresses principal requirements, but the drawing, PP & BP administration, customer notification, application-status, and multi option refund functions are all planned custom development rather than proven production features, and key operating controls are not sufficiently described.
			3	40	FSH specifically describes regular, unplanned, special-issue, and Big Game Combo drawings; weighted preference/bonus points; audit trail; payment/refund options; and party/group applications. It does not clearly demonstrate application-status management or drawing-result notifications, and the engine is custom/unproven.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:			Total Points Awarded:		
FSH Technologies					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.6 Drawings and Applications	70	30	4	10	FSH proposes a custom draw and application engine that would support regular, unplanned, special-issue, and Big Game Combo drawings; weighted preference and bonus points; party/group applications; pre-payment and post-selection payment; layered refunds; and audit trails. The draw engine is planned for Phase 2 of the implementation. Not sure when/how we could go live with a new system without the ability to complete drawings. The drawings and applications functionality does not exist today and would be built specifically for FWP. FSH does not have demonstrated production experience with statewide fish-and-wildlife drawings, Big Game Combo processing, preference and bonus points, party applications, high-volume application periods, or draw-related payment and refund processing. The proposal does not give enough detail on drawing randomization, auditability, or correction procedures. It does not explain how random selection is validated and reproduced, how point weighting, quotas, allocations, tie-break rules, and applicant populations are preserved, or how FWP can independently audit a draw. It also does not explain how FWP could roll back, correct, rerun, or partially rerun a drawing while preserving original results and properly managing awards, payments, points, refunds, notices, and issued privileges. Party applications and Big Game Combo are mentioned but not operationally described.
			1	15	FSH addresses the required drawing types, preference and bonus points, party applications, payment options and refunds. The proposal provides the required configuration options for FWP's drawing processes. Concerns because the drawing functionality is part of the new system and there is limited evidence of operating a comparable statewide wildlife drawing system.
Section 4.2.7 Accounting and Financial Management	100	50	3	50	Strong elements include transaction-line metadata, fiscal period/channel/license/PR-DJ fields, a SABHRS-compatible nightly SFTP batch, reconciliation exceptions, and USFWS reporting. Missing or insufficiently described are fund-code assignment, workflow approvals/multi-step verification, and end-to-end refund/revenue reconciliation; FSH also has no direct PR/DJ project record.
			4	15	FSH proposes to record financial information at the transaction line-item level, including fiscal period, sales channel, license type, and PR/DJ allocation metadata. It proposes a nightly SFTP batch to SABHRS, a reconciliation-exception dashboard, and support for cash, check, and electronic payments. The financial-management solution would be custom built and the response does not provide enough detail to evaluate whether it can meet FWP's accounting, reconciliation, State payment, and audit requirements. FSH does not have demonstrated experience operating a statewide fish-and-wildlife licensing financial system, implementing SABHRS for this type of transaction environment, or supporting PR/DJ financial reporting. There is also a lot of concern that FSH proposes to process real production sales in the Week 20 MVP with only basic SABHRS batch output, while full SABHRS reconciliation is deferred to Phase 2. It is unclear how FWP would reconcile revenue, sales, deposits, payment settlements, refunds, voids, reversals, and financial exceptions before full reconciliation is available. I would need a complete interim-control and acceptance plan before any production transactions are processed. FSH says it will integrate with the State payment processor, but elsewhere states that Stripe will handle all card processing. FWP's preference is to use the State payment contract. The response does not establish whether all required workflows can use the State processor without requiring Stripe. The response does not explain how fees or a single transaction would be allocated across multiple funds, how partial refunds and other adjustments would be distributed back to those funds, or how FWP would perform daily, monthly, fiscal-year, office, agent, payment-type, and SABHRS reconciliation. It also lacks detail on approvals, audit controls, cash/check handling, agent settlement, financial corrections, exception management, and reporting.
			1	61	FSH provides transactional level financial information containing fiscal period, sales channel, license type, and PR/DJ information. It proposes SABHRS nightly processing and Federal Aid reporting. The proposal also includes reconciliation and exception reporting with SABHRS processes. There are concerns because this is a new build with no experience with SABHRS integration.
			2	70	Offeror's proposed solution addresses custom development of detailed financial design including transaction-level revenue records, fiscal/channel/product tracking, PR/DJ allocation, a nightly SABHRS batch process, reconciliation reports and exports, and audit controls. Solution is a un-demonstrated and un-experienced wildlife-licensing offeror.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:	
FSH Technologies					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.8 Reporting	70	30	4	12	FSH provides only one brief paragraph addressing KC1 reporting. The response is heavily focused on PR/DJ reporting, with only general statements that standard and ad hoc reports will support drill-down, filtering, sorting, and export to CSV, Excel, and PDF. The reporting response is too limited to score with confidence. It does not provide a report inventory, report samples, dashboards, data definitions, mockups, or evidence of an existing production reporting capability. The reporting suite would be custom built for FWP. The proposal appears disproportionately focused on PR/DJ and Federal Aid reporting, rather than the broad range of daily operational reports FWP needs to run the licensing program. It does not explain reporting for daily sales, revenue, deposits, payment settlement, refunds, voids, corrections, licenses and tags issued, applications, drawings, points, surplus activity, customer service, enforcement holds, reprints, agents, office operations, inventory, exception management, audit activity, or management oversight. It also does not establish whether FWP staff can independently create, save, schedule, share, secure, and validate reports without vendor involvement. There is additional concern with FSH's proposed sequencing. FSH proposes to begin real production license sales in the Week 20 Phase 1 MVP, while its "complete reporting suite," including PR/DJ allocation reporting and USFWS Federal Aid export, is deferred to Phase 2. FWP cannot reasonably begin processing production license transactions without the operational, financial, management, audit, and regulatory reporting needed to monitor and control those transactions from day one. The proposal does not describe what interim reports, exports, dashboards, reconciliations, or compensating controls would be available during that period. The RTM marks all Section 4.2.8 reporting requirements as "Meets," but the proposal does not contain sufficient detail to substantiate those designations or demonstrate that the reporting solution will support FWP's daily business operations, statutory reporting, financial controls, and audit requirements.
			1	32	FSH provides standard and ad hoc reporting with filtering, sorting, and CSV/Excel/PDF export. Reports are audience specific for customers, agents, internal users, management, and auditors, with PR/DJ allocation reporting. FSH also provides statistical estimation outputs, confidence intervals, and dashboards. Concerns for the need to establish and validate the full Montana reporting environment during implementation.
			2	45	Offeror's proposed solution states that it will protect sensitive data through role-based access, encryption, role based controls, and audit tools. Proposal does not expressly confirm mandatory confidentiality agreements for all staff and subcontractors with access to protected data.
			3	30	FSH describes standard/ad hoc reporting, drill-down/filter/sort/export to CSV/Excel/PDF, audience-scoped views, PR/DJ allocation reporting, and USFWS Federal Aid output. The proposal does not show reports or establish that routine report creation is self-service rather than a future custom feature.
			1	53	FSH identifies the required integrations, including myFWP, the FWP website, payment processing, SABHRS, DOJ CARS, Department of Revenue, Hunter Education, and KC2/KC3. The proposed API architecture provides a reasonable approach for these interfaces. There are concerns because most of the integrations will need to be developed, configured, and tested specifically for FWP.
			2	55	Offeror proposes a modern API-based integration framework and provides specific technical approaches for SABHRS nightly batch processing and verification. Proposal commits to integrate KC1 with MyFWP, the FWP website, the State payment processor, Hunter Ed, KC2 & KC3. However, several integrations are described only as intended future work rather than a demonstrated direct integration. Proposal does not yet establish production-ready, approved, and testable integrations.
			3	35	The proposal identifies MyFWP, website, payment processor, SABHRS, DOJ CARS, Revenue, Hunter Education, and internal KC2/KC3 APIs, with concrete SABHRS/CARS approaches. It does not provide integration plans for FWP internal applications, Wildlife Violators Compact, or USFWS; saying several are reached "through the DOJ CARS integration pathway" needs validation.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
FSH Technologies					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 4.2.9 Interfaces and Integrations	80	40	4	18	FSH attempts to provide some clarity on interfaces and integrations by naming the systems it intends to connect with and by providing high-level concepts for SABHRS and DOJ CARS. The proposal commits to integrating with the required systems without providing enough detail to assess feasibility, design, timing, or operational readiness. For most interfaces, FSH provides only a statement that it will integrate. The response does not include an interface inventory, data-flow or architecture diagrams, interface specifications, data mappings, source-of-record decisions, authentication and authorization approach, timing and frequency requirements, error handling, retries, monitoring, support ownership, testing strategy, acceptance criteria, or fallback procedures. FSH offers slightly more detail for SABHRS and DOJ CARS, but the detail remains preliminary. Its SABHRS approach is a nightly SFTP flat-file batch with reconciliation exceptions shown in an administrative dashboard. Its DOJ CARS approach is a synchronous hold-status call at license issuance but the purpose of the integration is wrong. Neither description addresses the operational details necessary for a production licensing environment, including data matching, validation, acknowledgements, failures, outages, rejected transactions, retry or retransmission controls, corrections, audit trails, reconciliation, manual intervention, security, and support responsibilities. The timing is also a significant concern. FSH proposes to begin processing real license sales in the Week 20 MVP, but defers DOJ CARS integration, full SABHRS reconciliation, the Agent portal, digital E-Tag functionality, draw processing, and the complete reporting suite to Phase 2. The proposal does not explain how production sales can safely operate before those critical interfaces, controls, and supporting business functions are complete. FSH does not provide past experience implementing the required interfaces or comparable statewide fish-and-wildlife licensing integrations. Although it references general government-system and payment-processor integrations in other projects, it does not provide relevant examples, references, results, technical lessons learned, or evidence that it has successfully implemented high-volume licensing integrations involving a statewide accounting system, enforcement hold checks, payment processing, mobile applications, federal reporting, and multiple external agencies. The payment model remains unresolved. FSH says it will integrate with the State payment processor, but elsewhere states that all card processing is delegated to Stripe. The proposal does not establish whether the State payment contract can support all required payment and reconciliation workflows. The RTM marks all Section 4.2.9 interface and integration requirements as "Meets," but the response does not provide sufficient implementation detail or comparable delivery experience to support those designations with confidence.
			2	54	Offeror's proposed solution includes a US-hosted SaaS platform with a modern API infrastructure, encryption and role-based controls, stated 99.99% availability and performance targets, open-format data export, recovery design, and segregated environments.
			3	45	Architecture, U.S. AWS hosting, encryption, RBAC, audit logs, backup, performance targets, and accessibility are addressed. Material concerns are the conflicting SOC 2 statements, SSO/MFA "to be determined," internet-dependency language, and RPO/RTO to be set in Phase 1.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:	
FSH Technologies					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and section 7 – Technical Architecture, Security, and Compliance	80	50	4	48	FSH proposes a custom, AWS-hosted platform using PostgreSQL, FastAPI, and React. It describes U.S.-based hosting, four environments, encryption in transit and at rest, role-based access controls, data export in open formats, backups, disaster recovery, accessibility practices, and availability/performance targets. These are useful high-level architecture concepts, but the response does not provide enough evidence or design detail to validate compliance and production readiness. The architecture, security, and compliance response contains important gaps and contradictions. Most significantly, FSH first says it maintains an active SOC 2 Type II report, but later says it is pursuing SOC 2 Type II certification with completion targeted within 12 months of go-live. The proposal does not resolve whether FSH currently holds the required certification. The response does not provide sufficient detail on State identity integration, MFA, SSO, privileged access, identity lifecycle management, access reviews, API security, logging and monitoring, vulnerability remediation, patch-management commitments, secure development controls, change management, incident response, breach notification, staff background checks, or confidentiality agreements. Several of these requirements are marked "Meets" in the RTM without supporting narrative or evidence. FSH also defers critical decisions to implementation. It says MFA, SSO, or OIDC requirements will be determined during implementation; RPO and RTO will be established during Phase 1; and FWP will define retention requirements for FSH to implement. This approach is insufficient for determining whether the proposed solution will meet State security, records, disaster-recovery, and operational requirements before real production data and license sales are processed. The proposal provides no detailed security architecture, data-flow, network, identity, monitoring, integration, or disaster-recovery diagrams. It also does not provide an incident-response or breach-notification plan, accessibility-conformance evidence, SOC 2 documentation, penetration-test evidence, recovery-test results, performance-test results, or comparable production evidence for the custom statewide licensing platform. There is concern about the payment architecture. FSH says it will integrate with the State payment processor but elsewhere says all payment processing is delegated to Stripe. The response does not identify the actual PCI responsibility model, payment data flow, State processor compatibility, token management, POS-terminal approach, or incident-response responsibility.
			1	53	FSH provides a solid system design with separate environments for development, testing, training, and production. The proposal addresses security, backups, recovery, data ownership, and compliance, and FSH has SOC 2 Type II. Concerns because these capabilities will need to be tested and confirmed in FWP's environment before going into production.
			3	50	The PMBOK-based phases, test regimen, parallel operation, UAT, training plan, and change process are substantive. Conversely, FSH proposes full custom KC1 go-live by Week 36, defaults to remote personnel despite Helena milestone-location requirements, gives no detailed ALS/ALX/OLS mapping/conversion plan, and provides no actual key-person resumes (only "available upon request").

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
FSH Technologies					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Sections 4.3, 8, and 15 – Implementation, Migration, Training, and Change Management	90	40	4	18	FSH proposes a five-phase, 60-week implementation. It would begin rear KC1 license sales for a subset of products in a Week 20 MVP, while Phase 2 would complete core functionality by Week 36. This sequencing is not credible for a statewide licensing replacement. FWP should not begin processing real production transactions before critical licensing, enforcement, financial, reporting, reconciliation, integration, and operational controls are complete and accepted. FSH does not provide an interim operating model, compensating controls, readiness criteria, cutover plan, rollback plan, or post-cutover reconciliation process that would make this approach acceptable. FSH also does not provide a credible KC1 data-migration plan. It identifies "full license catalog migration" in Phase 2, although the new catalog should generally be configured rather than migrated and the timing of the migration doesn't make sense. It briefly refers to UAT with converted ALS customer records, but does not identify customer-data migration as a workstream or explain how it would be completed. The proposal does not address migration, validation, reconciliation, retention, archival, or accessibility of core KC1 data: customer accounts and linked relationships; residency and eligibility history; historical licenses, tags, permits, and transactions; points; applications and drawing history; enforcement holds; financial activity; agent records; e-tags and reprints; audit history; and legacy documents and reports. It also lacks mappings, transformation rules, data cleansing and de-duplication methods, mock conversions, reconciliation thresholds, exception handling, delta loads, FWP acceptance criteria, and rollback procedures. This lack of response on a critical project component further demonstrates that FSH is not poised to deliver a successful statewide licensing replacement. FSH provides no comparable experience converting a statewide wildlife licensing system or its complex customer, transactional, financial, enforcement, drawing, and regulatory data. Its cited County of Ulster migration was a records/workflow project and does not establish comparable licensing-conversion capability. The training and organizational change-management approaches are also limited. FSH proposes train-the-trainer sessions, online and onsite delivery, videos, and a knowledge base, but includes only 10 training sessions totaling 20 hours annually; additional sessions cost \$2,500 each. It does not provide role-based curricula, audience counts, schedules, competency measures, training-readiness criteria, or evidence that the training approach can support statewide FWP staff, regional offices, agents, finance, enforcement, technical users, and ongoing turnover. FSH's change-management approach is primarily a vendor scope-control process, not an organizational adoption plan. It does not address stakeholder impacts, customer and agent communications, readiness, change champions, adoption measures, feedback, or post-go-live support. Further, because FSH treats undefined features, integrations, and material changes as potentially out-of-scope enhancement work, the limited design detail creates material risk of additional cost for requirements identified during implementation. The RTM marks applicable implementation, migration, training, and change-management requirements as "Meets," but the proposal does not provide sufficient detail or comparable evidence to support those designations.
			1	45	FSH provides a detailed implementation plan covering requirements, development, migration, testing, training, pilot activities and production deployment. The proposal includes automated testing, integration testing, UAT, performance testing, security testing, and field testing in areas with limited connectivity. The level of detail provided in the proposed implementation approach is very thoughtful.
			2	70	Offeror's proposed solution includes a PMBOK-aligned, phased implementation plan; named staff roles; formal testing and acceptance activities; training model; technical knowledge transfer; and a documented change-management process. Proposed solution is a custom build solution for licensing, drawing, financial reporting, integration, and optional KC2/KC3 integration. Proposal is ambitious and depends on a small team delivering a new extremely complex custom statewide licensing solution with multiple integrations and optional KC2 & KC3 capabilities.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:				Total Points Awarded:	
FSH Technologies					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
Section 9 – Ongoing Maintenance, Support, and Continuous Improvement	40	20	4	18	FSH proposes maintenance that includes bug fixes, security patches, browser and operating-system compatibility updates, regulatory updates, platform upgrades, quarterly maintenance windows, monitoring, monthly SLA reports, annual maintenance reviews, and quarterly improvement reviews. It proposes standard weekday support from 9:00 AM–6:00 PM MST, expanded weekday support during peak periods from 6:00 AM–8:00 PM MST, and on-call emergency weekend support. It also provides priority-based response and resolution targets and a 99.9 percent availability SLA target. The support approach is high level and is not supported by demonstrated experience operating a statewide wildlife licensing system. FSH has no comparable deployed system or proven support record for high-volume license sales, agent networks, applications, drawings, enforcement holds, financial reconciliation, and State-system integrations. The proposal does not establish a dedicated production-support organization. FSH says support requests will be handled by the assigned implementation team rather than a dedicated help desk, but does not identify dedicated support staff, after-hours rotations, backup staffing, escalation roles, ticketing tools, incident intake and triage, status communications, root-cause analysis, recurring-issue prevention, or FWP visibility into open issues. It is unclear how the same small team would provide reliable production support while continuing custom development, completing deferred functionality, resolving defects, supporting integrations, and delivering future enhancements. The peak-period approach is also insufficiently detailed. Weekend coverage is described only as emergency on-call support, with no defined staffing, support hours, P2 coverage, pre-season readiness activities, capacity testing, incident-command process, third-party dependency coordination, customer/agent communications, or post-event review. This is a significant concern for a system that must support high-volume sales, application deadlines, draw cycles, season openings, and weekend customer and agent activity. FSH's continuous-improvement response is largely generic. It proposes quarterly improvement reviews and a future technology roadmap, but does not describe a prioritized improvement backlog, FWP governance and approval process, included enhancement capacity, performance measures, customer/agent feedback analysis, or how regulatory, security, operational, defect, and enhancement needs would be evaluated, prioritized, and funded. There is concern with FSH's statement that personalized license and activity recommendations would be considered "after sufficient transaction history is accumulated." FWP has substantial historical customer, licensing, purchase, application, drawing, and activity data that should be migrated, validated, and available from the beginning of operations—not treated as data that will gradually accumulate only after launch. This statement reinforces the concern that FSH does not fully understand the scope and importance of KC1 historical-data conversion. The proposal does not provide a meaningful plan to migrate customer history, license and transaction history, points, applications, drawings, eligibility, enforcement, financial, agent, and audit data. Without that conversion, FWP would lose important continuity for customer service, eligibility, reporting, program administration, regulatory compliance, analytics, and future capabilities such as recommendations. FSH's
			1	24	FSH provides ongoing maintenance, security updates, regulatory changes, system upgrades, scheduled maintenance and additional support during peak periods. The proposal includes a one hour response target for critical issues and 4 hours for resolution time. There is a concern due to the smaller and less proven support compared with vendors with extensive statewide wildlife system experience.
			2	24	Offeror's proposed solution depends on a small team delivering a new complex custom statewide licensing system with multiple complex integrations and offers optional KC2 & KC3 capabilities. Proposal does not include a detailed master schedule, committed onsite staffing plan, detailed migration and reconciliation strategy, confirmed State system integration, measurable test and acceptance criteria, demonstrated capacity for overlapping phases, and contractual controls for change, quality, support, and transition.
			3	20	Support commitments match the RFP's P1–P4 response/resolution times, provide peak-period extended/on-call coverage, 99.9% availability, monthly SLA reporting, service credits, and annual reviews. The main caveat is that a small team with no identified support subcontractor must demonstrate it can sustain these commitments at statewide scale.
Section 10 and 4.3 – Offeror Qualifications, References, and PR/DJ Experience	60	20	1	15	This is the area of greatest concern. FSH was founded in 2021 and states that it has not previously deployed a wildlife licensing or recreation reservation system. It's government experience is relevant to technology development but does not include comparable statewide wildlife implementations. The proposal does not provide experienced technical staff, government project experience, and relevant survey/statistical capabilities.
			2	36	Offeror demonstrates some government technology experience, data migration, compliance platforms, and integrations. Proposal is transparent about its lack of prior wildlife licensing, recreation reservation, PR/DJ-funded, and state fish-and-wildlife deployment experience—the central qualifications sought for this procurement.
			3	20	FSH has government-platform experience and names three references, but admits no deployed wildlife licensing/recreation reservation system and no prior PR/DJ-funded work. References are not state/provincial wildlife agencies, direct contacts and contract values are withheld/"available upon request," no resumes are included, and the claimed mandatory qualifications are internally contradicted by the narrative.
			4	8	similar comments; noted disconnect between info and fact the number of items marked as meets in RTM, questioned accuracy and reliability of response.

The evaluator/evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a total number of 2000 points. The Provision of Services, Company Profile and Experience, Resumes, Cost Proposal portions of the proposal will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. References will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis.					
Offeror (Company) Name:					Total Points Awarded:
FSH Technologies					
Category	Possible Points	Consensus Score	Evaluation Member	Points Awarded	Mandatory Justification Comments for Points Awarded
TOTAL OF TECHNICAL PROPOSAL	1000	519			
Product Demonstration/Interviews	Total of 600 Points				
Demonstration	600		2		
			3		
			4		
			1		
Cost Proposal	Total of 400 Points				
Cost	400				
TOTAL SCORE	Total of 2000	519			

Outdoor Recreation Licensing, Survey & Reporting, and Recreation Access & Reservation
FWP-RFP-2026-1113MQB
Cost Worksheet

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 ($\$20,000/\$30,000 = 67\% \times 300 \text{ points} = 200$).

Cost			
Points Available	400		
Lowest Cost	\$6,250,000.00		
Vendor Name		Points Earned	Notes:
Brandt Information Services LLC		\$34,677,972.00	72.1
RA Outdoors LLC dba Aspira		\$50,972,302.58	49.0
Tyler Technologies Inc		\$6,250,000.00	400.0

Scoring Calculator Score

SH 100.00%
 SL 95.00%
 GH 94.90%
 GL 75.00%
 FH 74.90%
 FL 60.00%
 FDH 59.90%
 FDL 0.00%

Total Points Available									
Score	40	50	60	70	80	90	100	400	600
Superior (95-100%)	38 - 40	47.5 - 50	57 - 60	66.5 - 70	76 - 80	85.5 - 90	95 - 100	380 - 400	570 - 600
Good (75-94%)	30 - 38	37.5 - 47.5	45 - 56.9	52.5 - 66.4	60 - 75.9	67.5 - 85.4	75 - 94.9	300 - 379.6	450 - 569.4
Fair (60-74%)	24 - 30	30 - 37.5	36 - 44.9	42 - 52.4	48 - 59.9	54 - 67.4	60 - 74.9	240 - 299.6	360 - 449.4
Failed (0-59%)	0 - 24	0 - 30	0 - 35.9	0 - 41.9	0 - 47.9	0 - 53.9	0 - 59.9	0 - 239.6	0 - 359.4

**Outdoor Recreation Licensing, Survey & Reporting, and Recreation Access & Reservation
FWP-RFP-2026-1113MQB
SCORING GUIDE**

In awarding points to the evaluation criteria, the evaluator/evaluation committee will consider the following guidelines:

Superior Response (95-100%): A superior response is an exceptional reply that completely and comprehensively meets all of the requirements of the RFP. In addition, the response may cover areas not originally addressed within the RFP and/or include additional information and recommendations that would prove both valuable and beneficial to the agency.

Good Response (75-94%): A good response clearly meets all the requirements of the RFP and demonstrates in an unambiguous and concise manner a thorough knowledge and understanding of the project, with no deficiencies noted.

Fair Response (60-74%): A fair response minimally meets most requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror demonstrates some ability to comply with guidelines and requirements of the project, but knowledge of the subject matter is limited.

Failed Response (59% or less): A failed response does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.

Reference for Eval Committee				
Total Points Available				
Score	100	150	300	1000
Superior (95-100%)	95 - 100	142.5 - 150	285 - 300	950 - 1000
Good (75-94%)	75 - 94	112.5 - 141	225 - 282	750 - 940
Fair (60-74%)	60 - 74	90 - 111	180 - 222	600 - 740
Failed (0-59%)	0 - 59	0 - 88.5	0 - 177	0 - 590