

Notice of Intent to Award

Solicitation Number	390379	Award Date	11/14/2025 1:54 PM CST		
Solicitation Title	Grant Coordination Software System				
Buyer Name	Sandra Walker	Buyer Email	sandra.walker@nashville.gov		
BAO Rep	Christopher Wood	BAO Email	christopher.wood@nashville.gov		

Awarded Supplier(s)

In reference to the above solicitation and contingent upon successful contract negotiation, it is the intent of the Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County to award to the following supplier(s):

Company Name	Autocene Government Solutions, Inc.	Company Contact		Kirk Deininger		
Street Address	519 W. 22nd Street Suite 100					
City	Sioux Falls	State	South Dakota	Zipcode	57105	
Company Name	Company Contact					
Street Address						
City		State		Zipcode		
Company Name		Compa	ny Contact			
Street Address						
City		State		Zipcode		

16 date.

Equal Business Opportunity Program

Where applicable, the awarded supplier(s) must submit a signed copy of the letter of intent to perform for any and all minority-
owned (MBE) or woman-owned (WBE) subcontractors included in the solicitation response. The letter(s) should be emailed to
the referenced business assistance office (BAO) rep no more than two business days after the referenced award date.

Yes, the EBO Program is applicable.	No, the EBO Program is not applicable
-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Monthly Reporting

Where applicable, the awarded supplier(s) will be required monthly to submit evidence of participation and payment to all small (SBE), minority-owned (MBE), women-owned (WBE), LGBT-owned (LGBTBE), and service-disabled veteran owned (SDV) subcontractors. Sufficient evidence may include, but is not necessarily limited to copies of subcontracts, purchase orders, applications for payment, invoices, and cancelled checks.

Questions related to contract compliance may be directed to the referenced BAO rep. Yes, monthly reporting is applicable. No, monthly reporting is not applicable.

Public Information and Records Retention

Solicitation and award documentation are available upon request. Please email the referenced buyer to arrange. A copy of this notice will be placed in the solicitation file and sent to all offerors.

Right to Protest

Per MCL 4.36.010 – any actual or prospective bidder, offeror, or contractor who is aggrieved in connection with the solicitation or award of a contract may protest to the purchasing agent. The protest shall be submitted in writing within ten (10) days after such aggrieved person knows or should have known of the facts giving rise thereto.

A valid protest must demonstrate that the purchasing agent did not follow the law, the regulations, or the dictates of the solicitation. Protests based upon subjective scoring are not appropriate and may be grounds for placing the actual or prospective bidder, offeror, or contractor on the list of suspended or debarred persons.

Dennis Rowland	Zak Kelley
Dennis Rowland	(Initial)

Purchasing Agent & Chief Procurement Officer



RFQ - 390379-Grants Management System

Company	Qualifications & Experience (35 Points)	Project Approach (40 Points)	Cost Criteria (20 Points)	Round 2 Demonstration (100) Points	Round 3 Demonstration (35 Points)	Contract Exceptions (Y/N)	Total Points (235)
Autocene Government Solutions, Inc.	23	33	35	94	30		215.00
REI Systems, Inc.	27	35	9.85	80	28		179.85
Reality Technology Inc	17	18	13.03				
StackNexus Inc	30	35	8.28	88	20		181.28
StreamLink Software Inc. dba AmpliFund	29	33	6.54	100	35		203.54

^{*}Reality Technology Inc. did not advance to round 2. Their cost was not a part of the best and final cost evaluation.

Autocene Government Solutions, Inc.

trongthe

Detailed response to how the requirements and provisions of the scope of this project will be implemented. Detailed comprehensive plan, can integrate with Oracle, DocuSign, Outlook, and Adobe. Hosting cloud with amazon web services. Detailed timetable listed all step by step in comprehensive plan. The ADKAR project management methodology that will be utilized was very detailed and has interactive prototyping. Adequate response to efficient use of manpower, material resources, equipment, and technology necessary for completing the project. Detailed response to firm's years performing the scope of service. Detailed response on team's knowledge and project experience. Good team capacity to perform work. Good project team's organizational structure including defined responsibilities. Attached resumes of key individuals that will perform work on the project. Good overall system demonstration presentation. Good overall demonstration of items listed in round 3. Unlimited number of users under the proposed plan.

Weaknesses

Overall information was difficult to locate. Company's primary expertise area seems to be automation of business processes more than GMS building and it doesn't seem to be their primary focus based on the included examples and provided company description. The majority of projects the team members have worked on are more focused on automation of invoicing and contract management within different infrastructure units, such as transportation, roads, water supply etc. GMS system building experience does not seem to be a primary experience. Team lacks experience in grant management system. Failed to provide a response to current litigations. Projects listed not of similar scope. Failed to provide dates and dollar amount of projects. Failed to provide a response to Metro contracts. Exceeded ten-page limit. Failed to respond to day-to-day problems, manage project resources, project documentation and configuration control. Integration with Forms Assembly is uncertain. How a user can search for available or active grants within the system is uncertain. Failed to demonstrate a centralized database search for funding/grant opportunities in private foundations, corporations, and state/federal sources. Failed to demonstrate keyword-based searches. Failed to demonstrate how to alert users to potential duplicative grant pursuits by other internal users. Failed to demonstrate in round 3 how the system supports comprehensive grant lifecycle management with Metro as a grantee. Response to approach managing the project lacked specific detail.

REI Systems, Inc.

Strength

Detailed response to how the requirements and provisions of the scope of this project will be implemented. Detailed comprehensive plan listed day by day task breakdown and milestones. Detailed AGILE project management methodology. Strength of GAP analysis was good. Commitment to quality, CMM Level 3 (zero risk) and ISO9001:2008 processes. Detailed approach to managing this project. Project schedule was very detailed. Adequate response to efficient use of manpower, material resources, equipment, and technology necessary for completing the project efficiently within the constraints outlined in the scope. Firm's years performing the scope of service was good. Extensive government experience. Team has extensive grant management system deployment experience. Extensive team capacity to perform work. Project team's organizational structure including defined responsibilities was good and very detailed. Attached resumes of key individuals that will perform work on the project. Good overall demonstration of items listed in round 3.

Weaknesses

Failed to provide a response on current litigation. Projects listed on similar scopes lacked specific detail. Failed to provide starting dates of projects. Information in this section was difficult to locate. Failed to provide a response on metro contracts. Failed to provide owner contact information. Exceeded ten-page limit. Failed to demonstrate how template forms can be used. External roles are not included in the cost. Only twenty-five licenses will be provided to Metro, which does not include external clients. Did not follow demonstration order as requested. Failed to demonstrate in round 3 funding/grant opportunities for private foundations, corporations, and state sources. Failed to demonstrate in round 3 the process for migrating existing Metro grant data into the new system, including what this process will look like for Metro.

Reality Technology Inc

Strength

Weaknesses

Response to resumes of key individuals that will perform work on the project was adequate

Overall response to project approach and process was boilerplate and lacked specific detail. Response to how the requirements and provisions of the scope of this project will be implemented lacked specific detail. Comprehensive plan for completing the specified work in accordance with the scope lacked specific detail. Project management methodology lacked detail. Security protocols and cloud-based deployment lacked detail. Response to approach managing project lacked detail. Response to

demonstration of efficient use of manpower, material resources, equipment, and technology necessary for completing the project efficiently within the constraints outlined in the scope lacked detail. Response to overview of your firm's years performing the scope of service lacked specific detail. Response to team's knowledge and project experience in the provision of services related to the project lacked specific detail. Team lacks experience in grant management system. Teams have limited capacity to perform work. Failed to provide project team's organizational structure including defined responsibilities. Failed to provide a response on current litigation. Failed to provide dates and dollar amounts of projects. Failed to provide a response on metro contracts.

StackNexus Inc.

Strengths

Good overall detailed response to project approach and process. Implementation plan detailed implementation approach with three phases- baseline, implementation, enablement. Offers a Nexus Grant Management Accelerator, scalable commercial offthe shelf GMS. Built on Salesforce platform, leveraging Salesforce's Government Cloud Plus. Modular approach with related tools for grantor for administration and compliance, and grantee for self-service tools. Integrates with Oracle, Outlook and DocuSign. Detailed comprehensive plan for completing the specified work in accordance with the scope. Detailed project management methodology. Proposes using a hybrid methodology aligned with Salesforce Adaptive Methodology and enhanced by global standards such as PROSCI. Approach also centers around the ADKAR model, which outlines five key building blocks for successful change: Awareness, Desire, Knowledge, Ability, and Reinforcement. Detailed response on approach to managing the project including the identification of clearly defined project management process, tasks and deliverables. Detailed response on efficient use of manpower, material resources, equipment, and technology necessary for completing the project efficiently within the constraints outlined in the scope. Detailed response on overview of firm's years performing the scope of service. Detailed response to team's knowledge and project experience, specializing in delivering Salesforce-based GMS systems for government agencies. Good, detailed response to team's capacity to perform work. Detailed response to project team's organizational structure including defined responsibilities. Attached resumes of key individuals that will perform work on the project. Adequate response on current litigations. Projects of similar scope.

Weaknesses

Failed to demonstrate how template forms can be used. External roles are not included in the cost. Only thirty licenses will be provided to Metro, which does not include external clients. Overall demonstrations for round 3 were unclear and used a lot of PowerPoints based information and not live demonstrating. Failed to demonstrate a centralized database search for funding/grant opportunities in private foundations, corporations, and state sources. Failed to demonstrate how to alert users to potential duplicative grant pursuits by other internal users. Failed to demonstrate ad-hoc and template reporting. Failed to demonstrate the system's ability to support a fully customizable grant lifecycle/workflow when Metro is the grantor searching for Metro grants as an external user.

StreamLink Software Inc. dba AmpliFund

Strongt

Detailed response on how the requirements and provisions of the scope of this project will be implemented, with unlimited user access and high configurability. Detailed comprehensive plan for completing the specified work in accordance with the scope. Good and detailed project management methodology that will be utilized. Detailed response on overview of firm's years performing the scope of service. Detailed response to team's knowledge and project experience in the provision of services related to the project. Good response to team's capacity to perform work. Built as an end-to-end grant management system. Adequate response to project team's organizational structure. Attached resumes of key individuals that will perform work on the project. Adequate response to litigation. Projects of similar scope. Excellent and detailed overall system demonstration presentation. Good overall detailed demonstration of all items listed in round 3. Unlimited number of users under the proposed plan.

Weaknesses

Response to project management methodology exceeded page limit. Approach to managing this project lacked specific detail. Response on demonstrating efficient use of manpower, material resources, equipment, and technology necessary for completing the project efficiently within the constraints outlined in the scope. lacked specific detail.

RFQ:390379© rant Coordination Software System		Max. RFP Cost Points	
•		35	
Offeror's Name	Total Cost	RFP Cost Point Distribution	
Autocene Government Solutions, Inc.	\$141,000.00	35.00	
REI Systems, Inc	\$500,980.58	9.85	
StackNexus Inc	\$596,208.46	8.28	
StreamLink Software Inc. dba AmpliFund	\$755,000.00	6.54	