Special Public Services & Facilities Committee
9:00 a.m., Tuesday, September 1, 2026
1207 Palm Boulevard
City Hall Council Chambers

Public Comment:
Citizens who wish to speak during the meeting must email their first and last name, address and topic to Nicole DeNeane, City Clerk, at nicoled@isleofpalms.gov no later than 3:00 p.m. the day before the meeting. Citizens may also provide written public comment here: https://www.isleofpalms.gov/public-comment-form

Agenda

1. **Call to order** and acknowledgment that the press and the public have been duly notified of the meeting in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.
2. **Old Business-** Discussion and consideration of IT RFP responses
3. **Miscellaneous Business- next meeting: Tuesday, October 6, 2026 at 9am**
4. **Adjournment**

RFP 2026-09 – Managed Technology Services

Final Staff Screening and Shortlist Assessment

Final Revision, 15 September 2026 | Prepared for Special Committee Meeting – 23 September 2026

Executive Summary

Staff reviewed all 21 proposals using the City's published RFP evaluation criteria and the final 0–4 scoring/weighting document. The latter was not part of the RFP, but a tool developed by staff to assist in further screening of the proposals.

This review also applies the management screens developed during staff evaluation: an approximately $15,000 recurring monthly cost target ceiling, a capacity-risk flag for firms with 30 or fewer employees recognizing that all of a firm's personnel are not necessarily IT-engineers, heightened scrutiny for firms that do not demonstrate municipal managed-services experience, heightened scrutiny for firms with no or limited CJIS experience, reliance on subcontractors, and identification of one-time onboarding charges. These management screens are used to select a practical committee slate; they are not treated as new legal minimum requirements or as retroactive findings of non-responsiveness.

The recommended six are **VC3, Cantey Tech Consulting, Merit Technologies, Corsica Technologies, SoftSages, and Novatech**. Together, these firms provide the strongest balance of price, technical completeness, strategic support, municipal/public-sector relevance, continuity capability, and organizational depth while remaining at or very near the City's $15,000 ceiling.

Site visit notation. Ten proposers conducted site visits: VC3, Cantey Tech Consulting, Corsica Technologies, Novatech, InterDev, Asset Technology Group, Nano Defense, SNS Technologies, Portside Technology, and NetCertPRO. In summary tables these firms are marked "SV"; in the detailed company sections they are marked "SITE VISIT COMPLETED." The notation records supplemental due diligence and is not treated as a separate scoring criterion or an automatic score adjustment.

Finally, given the less prescriptive nature of an RFP as compared to a Request for Bids (RFB), staff recommends requesting that finalists submit additional pre-formatted documentation to support a more standardized, *apples-to-apples* comparison of key areas such as security, email provisions, storage, backup, and related services.

Recommended Top Six

#	Firm	Score /38	Recurring Cost	Capacity	Decision	Committee Theme
1	**VC3 (SV)**	35.5	[redacted]	600+	Advance	**Most Well-Rounded & Deep Bench.** Best-qualified continuity choice with unmatched municipal/CJIS depth; the City must ensure VC3 makes good on improvements related to past service shortfalls.

#	Firm	Score /38	Recurring Cost	Capacity	Decision	Committee Theme
2	**Cantey Tech Consulting (SV)**	35.5	[redacted]	126	Advance	**Dialed in on CJIS/ VCIO Role**. Best direct municipal/CJIS fit among the challengers; strong bench and SC footprint at a sub-$15K price, but commercial terms need cleanup.[1]
3	Merit Technologies	33.5	[redacted]	35	Advance	**Best Premium Challenger at the Target Line**; unusually strong security, continuity and executive-advisory depth, with a smaller bench than the largest finalists. Limited municipal experience.
4	**Corsica Technologies (SV)**	33.0	[redacted]	~200	Advance	**Best Simple-Price/Value Proposition**; exceptionally clean $9.5K unmetered and comprehensive structure with 36 mo. price lock; offset by missing references and unproven current CJIS personnel.
5	SoftSages	30.0	[redacted]	350+	Advance	**Large Bench with Near-Target Pricing;** less proven in IOP-sized municipal environments, and the service-delivery section reads as generic rather than tailored to IOP. Clarify CJIS and emergency-support charges.
6	**Novatech (SV)**	28.5	[redacted]	690 total / 101 Managed IT	Advance	**Good Mix of Enterprise Scale & Municipalities Close to IOP Size;** most detailed and comprehensive activation plan; robust local footprint; strong fit under $15K, but onboarding, and CJIS capabilities remain open.

The order above is a staff ranking, not a finding that the lower-ranked finalists are unacceptable. VC3 and Cantey are effectively tied on the weighted evaluation; the ordering breaks that tie in favor of VC3's proven continuity and direct knowledge of the City, although Cantey's three-year fixed rate and deep understanding of the vCIO role should be noted. Merit is the strongest premium challenger at the cost line. Merit presented a well-written proposal that illustrated a deep understanding of the vCIO position, an attunement to City needs, and a thorough transition plan. Corsica presented the clearest and easiest-to-understand price/value proposal but carries some documentation gaps. Its proposal is insightful, with most offerings included in the base compared with other proposers that treat similar offerings as extras. SoftSages brings a large bench but a comparatively generic service-delivery model, while Novatech brings enterprise scale and directly comparable municipal examples but a material onboarding charge. Staff recommends that the committee give strong consideration to interviewing these six companies.

[1] Cantey's proposal presents three commercial items requiring clarification: **(1)** the monthly price includes approximately **$693 for 132 Exchange Online Plan 1 licenses**, which does not reflect the City's mixed Microsoft licensing environment; **(2)** the proposed backup/BCDR solution could overlap with the City's existing VC3 backup agreement through April 2028 unless implementation is deferred or credited; and **(3)** the proposal's contract-term language should be reconciled with the City's intended **three-year initial term with a maximum five-year total term**.

[2] Results in monthly bill of $14,043.56 when amortized over 3 years.

Other Notable Proposals

Three additional proposals have attributes worth highlighting, but staff do not recommend advancing them as finalists. They are notable for price, scale, local presence, or demonstrated interest, while carrying material risks that the Top Six avoid more successfully:

- **CMIT Solutions of Charleston** [redacted] waived for a three-year commitment. The local prime has only 10 employees, no demonstrated firm-level municipal MSP client history, relies on outside CMIT/franchise or subcontract resources for scale, and does not prove a current CJIS-ready bench. The local presence and price are attractive, but continuity and control of surge resources remain material risks.
- **AAITPRO** — [redacted] with onboarding treatment not fully clear. Its 268-person scale is favorable, but the proposa oes not emonstrate a primary municipal MSP record, a meaningful South Carolina municipal portfolio, or current CJIS experience. The cost and raw capacity are competitive; the principal risk is relevance to IOP's municipal/public-safety environment and onsite support assurances are lacking.
- **Portside Technology (SV)** — [redacted] eadline plus [redacted] nboarding. This local firm conducted a site visit and offers a very low stated price, but it has only 15 employees, does not demonstrate a municipal MSP/CJIS record, and shifts routine onsite and after-hours/emergency work to hourly/travel charges. The headline price therefore is not comparable to the City's full Base Monthly Support model.

Strong but Outside Cost Screen

Two proposals are strong enough on qualifications or service design to merit separate recognition, but their pricing falls just outside the City's current value screen:

- **InterDev (SV) —** [redacted] onboarding; approximately [redacted] ffective monthly cost over three years. InterDev has one of the strongest municipal/CJIS qualification packages in the field and 52 employees, including 42 technical personnel and a regional office in Beaufort, SC. The reason it does not advance is cost, not capability.
- **CyberGarde** [redacted] etup fee is waived with a 36-month term. Its security/strategy model is strong and the price is only modestly above target, but employee depth is not conventionally disclosed and current CJIS-ready staffing is not proven. It remains credible, but the Top Six provide a cleaner combination of cost and qualification proof.

Screened-Out and Eliminated Firms

SCREENED OUT: Golden Five LLC; Katalyst; Asset Technology Group (SV); Nano Defense (SV); and SNS Technologies (SV).

RECOMMENDED ELIMINATION: WeldonPC; Automate IT; NetCertPRO (SV); Consultadd Public Services; and TRETEK Systems.

The "other notable" firms have meaningful positive attributes but carry capacity, qualification, CJIS, or scope-comparability risks that keep them below the Top Six. InterDev and CyberGarde are separated because their principal barrier is the City's cost/value screen. The "screened out" firms remain technically credible in some respects but fall outside the practical committee slate because of cost, capacity, qualification fit, or uncertainty. The "totally out" group presents a more fundamental mismatch with the City's required scope, continuity model, or value target. These are staff screening recommendations, not legal determinations of non-responsiveness.

Evaluation Method and Screening Rules

The RFP states that the City's objective is greatest overall value while demonstrating technical competence, operational understanding, financial responsibility, and commitment to long-term partnership. It specifically evaluates municipal-government understanding; experience with similar organizations, particularly municipalities and public-safety agencies; organizational stability; technical completeness and scalability; strategic advisory capacity; routine and emergency operational support; pricing/value; and references. The final Word scoring document applies a 0–4 scale and weights Technical Approach at 2.0 and Pricing at 2.5, with the remaining criteria weighted at 1.0.

For this report, staff used the published criteria first, then applied four management screens to convert a 21-firm field into a six-firm committee slate. First, recurring cost materially above approximately $15,000 per month is a screen-out factor unless the proposal presents a truly exceptional value case. Merit's $15,001.50 is treated as within tolerance. CyberGarde's $15,950 is treated as the nearest over-target strong alternate, while InterDev is recognized as highly qualified but materially over the cost screen. Second, a firm with 30 or fewer employees is flagged for continuity/scalability risk, with additional concern when the technical bench is materially smaller than the total headcount. Third, lack of demonstrated municipal MSP experience reduces confidence under Understanding, Qualifications and Operational Support. Fourth, no or limited CJIS experience reduces confidence in the ability to support Police/public-safety systems without transition delay.

Onboarding fees are not automatic disqualifiers. They are identified because they materially affect Year 1 value. Staff also considered whether a proposal could cause the City to pay twice for services that remain under separate VC3 agreements, particularly security-awareness/dark-web services and the existing backup platform. The City's addenda expressly instructed proposers to account for those continuing obligations and avoid unnecessary duplication.

Detailed Assessment – Recommended Top Six

VC3 (SITE VISIT COMPLETED) — ADVANCE – TOP TIER

Theme: Best-qualified continuity choice; unmatched municipal/CJIS depth, but the City must ensure VC3 makes good on improvements related to past shortfalls.

Commercial position. [redacted] including the propose [redacted] trategic-advisory component. No separate onboarding charge identified. The core managed-services price is comfortably below the $15K target. For purposes of this evaluation, staff reflects only VC3's proposed core managed-services price; separate existing VC3 agreements are not added to this figure.

Capacity. 600+ employees; 300+ engineering resources; 40+ strategic advisors; 100+ system engineers. No small-firm risk and local resources are well established.

VC3 remains the lowest-risk continuity choice. Its proposal demonstrates extensive municipal specialization, more than 800 municipal-government clients, direct South Carolina public-sector depth, comparable public-safety municipalities, and the strongest immediate knowledge of the City's environment. It also acknowledges prior service shortcomings and proposes specific account-management corrections.

Top strengths. Unmatched municipal scale and current City knowledge; proven CJIS/public-safety environment; deep technical and strategic bench; strong emergency continuity; recurring cost materially below the City target.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. The principal commercial issue is confirming the transition treatment of services covered by separate existing VC3 agreements. The City should verify that the [redacted] core managed-services price does not duplicate services already covered elsewhere and should document any credit, deferral, or service-boundary clarification required during transition. Staff should also confirm the escalation structure and exactly what strategic work is included in th [redacted] advisory component versus separately priced professional services.

Staff assessment. Advance and interview. VC3 should be considered a benchmark finalist: other proposers should be required to show a concrete advantage over VC3 in price, service quality, strategic value, or transition risk.

Source notes: VC3 proposal, Firm Qualifications and pricing/"Why can VC3 start right away?" sections; RFP Evaluation Process and Criteria; Addendum 7 existing-contract transition clarification.

Cantey Tech Consulting (SITE VISIT COMPLETED) — ADVANCE – TOP TIER

Theme: Best direct municipal/CJIS fit among the challengers; strong bench and SC footprint at a sub-$15K price, but commercial terms need cleanup.

Commercial position [redacted] onth headline. Approximatel [redacted] onth of that amount is an embedded Exchange Online Plan 1 license assumption; excluding that production-license cost for apples-to-apples MSP comparison produces approximately [redacted] No separate onboarding charge identified. **Capacity.** 126 employees; South Carolina offices in Charleston, Columbia and Spartanburg, with additional regional offices. No small-firm risk.

Cantey is the strongest direct municipal/CJIS challenger to VC3. It states 20+ municipal and critical-infrastructure clients, 300+ South Carolina public/private clients, a dedicated municipal/critical-infrastructure service model, CJIS-trained/vetted personnel, and a regional footprint built for public-safety continuity and hurricane response.

Top strengths. Direct municipal specialization; strong CJIS/SLED understanding; ample organizational depth; strong local/regional onsite capacity; clear SLAs and security governance; favorable recurring cost.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. The commercial structure needs normalization. The proposal embeds a generic 132-user Exchange Plan 1 configuration instead of treating the City's actual mixed Microsoft license portfolio as pass-through. It also proposes new BCDR/backup components that could overlap the existing Datto contract before April 2028. Staff should also require correction of any contract-term language that exceeds the City's intended 3+1+1 / five-year maximum.

Staff assessment. Advance and interview. Cantey is a legitimate top-tier alternative and may offer the best combination of municipal/CJIS specialization and competitive price if the license/backup transition is cleaned up.

Source notes: Cantey proposal pp. 3–4 (qualifications/CJIS) and detailed pricing; Addendum 7 licensing and existing-backup clarifications.

Merit Technologies — ADVANCE – TOP TIER

Theme: Best premium challenger at the target line; unusually strong security, continuity and executive-advisory depth, with a smaller bench than the largest finalists.

Commercial position. [redacted] Treated as within th [redacted] anagement target. No separate onboarding charge identified. **Capacity.** 35 employees. This is above the 30-person risk threshold but close enough that staffing depth and simultaneous-event coverage should still be confirmed.

Merit presents the strongest premium proposal that still lands on the City's cost line. The firm is South Carolina based, supports 50–130-user multi-site environments similar to IOP's size, has current CJIS-certified engineers across multiple South Carolina jurisdictions and SLED, and includes 50 hours of executive advisory/vCIO-vCISO capacity in its packaged service.

Top strengths. Strong CJIS readiness; robust cybersecurity and business-continuity design; unusually substantive executive advisory; transparent modular pricing; Lowcountry/SC engineering presence; no onboarding fee.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. The proposal's named public-sector evidence is stronger on counties/public-sector/compliance organizations than on directly documented municipal prime-MSP engagements. The 35-person company is materially smaller than VC3/Cantey/Corsica/SoftSages/Novatech. Its proposed BCDR architecture can overlap the City's existing paid backup platform unless staged or credited.

Staff assessment. Advance and interview. Merit should be tested on whether its added advisory/security depth produces enough value to justify paying roughly [redacted] more per month than VC3/Cantey.

Source notes: Merit proposal, Firm Qualifications and Attachment B pricing; Addendum 7 backup-transition clarification.

Corsica Technologies (SITE VISIT COMPLETED) — CONDITIONALLY ADVANCE – TOP TIER

Theme: Best simple-price/value proposition; exceptionally clean [redacted] unmetered structure, offset by missing references and unproven current CJIS personnel.

Commercial position. [redacted] fixed for a 36-month initial term, with no onboarding fee and no additional charge for added managed or email-only users under the submitted schedule. **Capacity.** Approximately 200 employees, mostly IT delivery roles. No small-firm risk.

Corsica is the clearest "simple value" proposal in the field. Its [redacted]t fee explicitly includes unmetered help desk, onsite/remote support, network/server operations, 24x7 SOC/MDR, tools and licensing used to deliver the service, M365 administration, backup/DR monitoring, quarterly reviews, vCIO/vCISO advisory, and standard emergency response. It also offers a detailed three-year roadmap and cost-optimization approach.

Top strengths. Best pricing simplicity; lowest clearly comparable full-scope recurring cost among the serious contenders; no onboarding; strong security and emergency support; strong executive-advisory model; sufficient organizational size.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. The proposal did not furnish the five required references; it instead stated that references would be provided upon selection. That is a material evaluation deficiency and merits a zero/very low References score. The proposal also says it is "prepared to meet" CJIS requirements rather than demonstrating an established currently qualified CJIS bench. Municipal/comparable clients are asserted but not named in the submitted qualifications section.

Staff assessment. Conditionally advance; interview only if shortfalls met. Corsica's price/value is too strong to ignore, but staff should not recommend award without complete reference validation and proof of current CJIS-ready staffing.

Source notes: Corsica proposal pp. 3, 7–8. Page 8 states references would be provided only upon selection and provides the $9,500 flat-fee structure.

SoftSages — CONDITIONALLY ADVANCE

Theme: Large technical bench with near-target pricing, but the proposed service-delivery model is generic and insufficiently tailored to IOP.

Commercial position. [redacted]h. No clearly separated onboarding charge was identified in the submitted pricing, so staff should confirm whether implementation is included or separately billable. **Capacity.** 350+ professionals across help desk, Microsoft, networking, cloud, cybersecurity, infrastructure, backup and DR. No small-firm risk.

SoftSages offers a large technical bench, multiple named municipal/public-sector engagements, explicit support for the City's managed-user versus email-only populations, and a broad service-delivery model covering onsite support, after-hours assistance, cybersecurity, emergency response and strategic advisory. The concern is not generic capability; it is tailoring. Beginning with the service-delivery section, much of the proposal reads like a standard enterprise MSP playbook rather than a delivery plan built around IOP's

Police/Fire operations, multiple facilities, hurricane/EOC requirements, onsite-response expectations, and lean internal IT structure. Its price remains under the management target.

Top strengths. Large delivery bench; public-sector/municipal work; clear 50-managed/82-email-only pricing; strong security and infrastructure capability; good cost position; five references provided.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. The named municipal examples are mostly much larger than IOP, so staff should validate experience with a small full-service municipality that has Police/Fire and limited internal IT depth. Current CJIS-qualified personnel are not demonstrated. The service-delivery section is comparatively generic and should be converted into an IOP-specific operating plan identifying assigned personnel, onsite response, escalation, hurricane/EOC staffing and executive-accountability roles. Onboarding, backup transition, storage assumptions and any "emergency support outside of base" fees also should be nailed down in writing.

Staff assessment. Conditionally advance; interview only if shortfalls met. Require the firm to translate its stock service-delivery model into a concrete IOP operating plan. SoftSages remains a useful large-bench comparator, but scale alone should not be mistaken for demonstrated understanding of how the City expects support to be delivered.

Source notes: SoftSages proposal pp. 4, 7 and 10.

Novatech (SITE VISIT COMPLETED) —ADVANCE

Theme: Best combination of enterprise scale and named municipalities close to IOP size; strong fit under $15K, but onboarding, CJIS and reference details remain open.

Commercial position. [redacted] plus a [redacted] one-time onboarding/transition fee. Production Microsoft licensing is described as pass-through/TBD. **Capacity.** 690 total employees, including 101 in the Managed IT division. No small-firm risk.

Novatech provides the best named evidence of municipalities near IOP's scale among the under-target large firms (though VC3 is assumed to be on par): City of Auburn (70 users), City of Portland (111 users), City of Lookout Mountain (29 users) and City of South Pittsburg (11 users). It also has 22 offices, including Charleston, Greenville and Columbia, and a broad managed-IT/security/cloud platform.

Top strengths. Excellent organizational scale; multiple named municipal customers close to IOP's size; South Carolina footprint; recurring price under target; mature transition methodology; broad technical capability.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. The [redacted] onboarding fee is material. The proposal does not demonstrate current CJIS-qualified personnel to the same standard as VC3/Cantey/Merit. The reference section lacks complete validated contact information and the submission contains several items stated as subject to finalization. Staff should require a final binding price/SLA/reference package before relying on the proposal.

Staff assessment. Advance and interview. Novatech is a strong "large firm / similar municipality" comparator and should be used to test whether the top four provide enough incremental value or lower risk.

Source notes: Novatech proposal pp. 3, 6–8 and activation attachment.

Detailed Assessment – Other Notable Proposals

CMIT Solutions of Charleston — CAPACITY / MUNICIPAL EXPERIENCE / CJIS RISK

Theme: Attractive local pricing and presence, but the 10-person prime team and reliance on outside CMIT resources create material continuity and qualification risk.

Commercial position. [redacted]. The pricing sheet shows [redacted] setup fees, waived with a three-year agreement. **Capacity.** 10 local employees — well below the City's 30-person risk threshold. The proposal cites a national CMIT network of 300+ offices and more than 1,000 technical resources, but those resources are not the local prime's employee bench.

CMIT's local presence and pricing are attractive, and several core technical staff bring prior City of Charleston experience. However, the proposal does not demonstrate a firm-level municipal MSP client history. More importantly, CMIT expressly relies on the wider franchise/network model and the ability to subcontract to outside CMIT resources to augment the 10-person local team. That is a legitimate scalability mechanism, but it is not equivalent to a large in-house bench under the prime contractor's direct control.

Top strengths. Strong Charleston-area presence; low recurring cost; setup fees waived with a three-year term; useful municipal knowledge among individual staff; favorable treatment of the existing backup environment; access to a broader CMIT network.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. Only 10 local employees; no demonstrated firm-level municipal MSP clients; broader delivery capacity depends on outside CMIT/franchise or subcontract resources; current CJIS-ready staffing is not proven; and the proposal's +50% "Emergency After Hours" rate must be reconciled with the City's required included critical-incident response. The City should distinguish former municipal employees' experience from the firm's own municipal managed-services past performance.

Staff assessment. Do not advance. CMIT offers attractive local value, but the combined risk from a 10-person prime, reliance on outside resources for surge capacity, no demonstrated firm-level municipal MSP record, and unproven CJIS depth is too high relative to the Top Six.

Source notes: CMIT proposal pp. 3–4 and p. 10 pricing.

AAITPRO – QUALIFICATION FIT

Theme: Strong corporate scale and acceptable price, but the experience profile is not sufficiently aligned with the City's municipal/public-safety requirements.

Commercial position. [redacted] Onboarding treatment is not sufficiently clear for staff to treat it as definitively [redacted]. **Capacity.** 268 employees. No capacity risk based on raw headcount.

AAITPRO clears the cost and scale screens and presents a technically competent general managed-services model. Its weakness is relevance: the proposal does not demonstrate a prior primary municipal managed-technology engagement, a meaningful South Carolina municipal portfolio, or current CJIS experience. That leaves more transition and public-safety learning risk than the Top Six.

Top strengths. Adequate organizational scale; recurring price below the City target; broad general managed-services capability; no obvious corporate-capacity concern.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. No demonstrated municipal prime-MSP record; no demonstrated current CJIS experience; weaker evidence of comparable Police/Fire/public-safety operations; onboarding treatment remains unclear. The proposal is affordable, but the City would be accepting more qualification risk without a compensating value advantage over the finalists.

Staff assessment. Do not advance. AAITPRO is large enough and priced competitively, but it does not demonstrate the municipal/public-safety and CJIS fit needed to displace one of the Top Six.

Source notes: AAITPRO proposal, firm profile, experience and pricing sections.

Portside Technology (SITE VISIT COMPLETED) – VALUE / CAPACITY RISK

Theme: Very low headline pricing and demonstrated interest through a site visit, but the small bench and non-comparable support model prevent advancement.

Commercial position. [redacted]month headline plus [redacted]onboarding; the headline price is not fully comparable to the City's required base scope because routine onsite and after-hours/emergency work can generate additional hourly/travel charges. **Capacity.** 15 employees — well below the City's 30-person risk threshold.

Portside deserves acknowledgement for its low stated price, site visit, and some local-government advisory exposure. The concern is that the economics change once the City adds the onsite and emergency-response work that other proposers include in Base Monthly Support. At the same time, Portside does not demonstrate a municipal prime-MSP record or current CJIS capability, so the City would be taking both scope-comparability and continuity/qualification risk.

Top strengths. Lowest headline price among the more complete proposals; completed a site visit; some local-government advisory exposure; potentially attractive if the service model were substantially restructured.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. 15-person capacity risk; no demonstrated municipal MSP/CJIS record; [redacted]onboarding; routine onsite and qualifying after-hours support can trigger additional hourly/travel costs; headline pricing therefore understates the cost of receiving the full required service.

Staff assessment. Other notable proposal, but not a near finalist, do not advance. Portside is worth noting because of price and demonstrated interest, yet the City should not treat the [redacted]figure as apples-to-apples with the Top Six, and the small-team/experience risks remain substantial.

Source notes: Portside proposal, pricing and service-delivery sections; Addendum 7 onsite/after-hours clarifications.

Detailed Assessment – Strong but Outside Cost Screen

InterDev (SITE VISIT COMPLETED) — STRONG BUT OUTSIDE COST SCREEN

Theme: One of the strongest qualification packages in the field; excluded because the cost structure is materially above the City's management target.

Commercial position. [redacted]e transition fee; effective three-year monthly cost is roughly [redacted] before other variables. **Capacity.** 52 employees, including 42 technical personnel. No small-firm flag.

InterDev has more than 30 municipal clients, meaningful South Carolina municipal experience, CJIS-trained personnel, strong SLAs, emergency operations support and a deep technical bench. On non-price criteria it is a top-tier proposal.

Top strengths. Excellent municipal/CJIS qualifications; strong operational and disaster support; clear staffing; strong strategic-advisory approach; conducted a site visit.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. Recurring cost exceeds the target by almost [redacted]n, and the onboarding fee adds anothe [redacted] in Year 1. The City would pay approximately [redacted] more per month than several finalists before considering startup cost, and staff does not see a sufficiently unique service advantage to justify that premium under the current value screen.

Staff assessment. Strong but outside the cost screen. InterDev is not unsuitable; it is one of the best-qualified firms in the competition. Retain in reserve only if the committee decides municipal/CJIS strength warrants relaxing the approximately [redacted] cost target.

Source notes: InterDev proposal, qualifications, staffing, service delivery and pricing sections.

CyberGarde — STRONG BUT OUTSIDE COST SCREEN – DEPTH QUESTIONS

Theme: Strong cyber/strategy model and only modestly above the cost target, but staffing depth and current CJIS readiness remain insufficiently proven.

Commercial position. [redacted] A [redacted] setup fee is waived with a 36-month term. **Capacity.** Total employee count is not conventionally disclosed; the proposal describes a lean core technical team plus a managed national field-services network of 25+ vetted technicians/specialists.

CyberGarde has a strong security-first model, active municipal/public-sector field-support experience, a thoughtful 90-day transition, and good senior accountability. Its recurring price is only [redacted] above the City's target, so it remains closer economically than most over-target firms.

Top strengths. Strong security governance; good strategic advisory; municipal/public-sector field-support evidence; setup fee waived with a 36-month term; recurring price only modestly over target.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. At [redacted] the proposal is above the cost target; conventional employee depth is not disclosed; current CJIS-qualified staffing is not proven; and the field-network model requires contractual proof regarding availability, onsite response and accountability.

Staff assessment. Strong but outside the cost screen. CyberGarde remains credible because its security/strategy model is strong and the price is close to target, but the Top Six provide a cleaner combination of cost, staffing transparency and qualification proof.

Source notes: CyberGarde proposal, transition, service-delivery and pricing sections.

Detailed Assessment – Screened-Out Firms

Golden Five LLC — SCREEN OUT – MUNICIPAL / CJIS / LOCAL-DELIVERY FIT

Theme: Attractive price and adequate corporate scale, but insufficient evidence of municipal, South Carolina, CJIS and local-delivery capability to justify advancement.

Commercial position. [redacted]; no separate onboarding fee identified. The stated three-year total is [redacted] or approximately $10,850/month averaged across the initial term. The proposal states a 10% annual escalation beginning in Year 3, which should be clarified for Years 4–5. **Capacity.** 66 employees — above the City's small-firm threshold, but the proposal does not establish an existing South Carolina technical bench.

Golden Five's general managed-services and security capability appears credible, and the starting price is excellent. The problem is fit. The named comparable engagements include federal/research, transit, insurance, community-college and regional justice organizations rather than a full-service municipality. The five references likewise do not demonstrate a municipal prime-MSP relationship. The proposal does not establish current CJIS-qualified personnel, a South Carolina municipal client base, or a clearly identified Charleston-area onsite team; Golden Five also did not conduct a site visit.

Top strengths. Very low recurring cost; adequate corporate headcount; no separate onboarding fee identified; broad managed IT/security capability; qualifying critical after-hours response appears included; Microsoft licensing treatment is generally favorable.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. No demonstrated municipal MSP client or municipal reference; no proven current CJIS-ready bench; no demonstrated South Carolina/local technical team; no site visit; 10% annual escalation language beginning in Year 3; and some ambiguity over which strategic-advisory services are included in base versus separately priced professional services.

Staff assessment. Screen out. Golden Five's price and 66-person corporate headcount are attractive, but price alone does not overcome the combined municipal, CJIS, South Carolina and local-delivery evidence gaps. Staff does not recommend forcing a seventh finalist when six firms present stronger overall cases.

Source notes: Golden Five proposal, comparable-experience, reference, service-delivery and pricing sections.

Katalyst — SCREEN OUT – COST

Theme: Strong municipal solution, but the economics are too far outside the target to carry forward.

Commercial position. [redacted]nboarding. **Capacity.** 55 employees. No small-firm flag.

Katalyst has multiple named municipal customers and a solid strategic/technical model. It understands the City's lean internal staffing and emergency context and provides a mature vCIO approach.

Top strengths. Good municipal experience; adequate scale; strong strategic planning; good technical completeness.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. The recurring price is more than [redacted] above target before onboarding. Current CJIS qualification is not demonstrated. The cost premium is too large to justify when lower-cost finalists satisfy the core needs.

Staff assessment. Screen out on cost/value, not on technical capability.

Asset Technology Group (SITE VISIT COMPLETED) — SCREEN OUT – COST / CAPACITY

Theme: Strongest small-firm municipal/CJIS credentials, but still a small-firm continuity risk and materially over target.

Commercial position. [redacted] onboarding is not sufficiently clear in the submitted materials to treat as definitively [redacted] **Capacity.** Approximately 25 employees — below the City's risk threshold.

ATG is a South Carolina firm with 14 municipal clients and current CJIS-certified personnel. It is therefore much more relevant than many larger competitors. The problem is the combination of price and bench depth.

Top strengths. Excellent South Carolina municipal experience; demonstrated CJIS; strong familiarity with public-sector operations; technically credible; conducted a site visit.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. Approximately 25 employees means hurricanes, cyber incidents, simultaneous outages and normal service demand can stress the same bench. The $17,955 recurring price also exceeds the target. Staff should not pay a premium while accepting more capacity risk.

Staff assessment. Screen out. If the City later values local municipal/CJIS specialization more than the $15K screen, ATG could be reconsidered, but not for the present Top Six.

Nano Defense (SITE VISIT COMPLETED) — SCREEN OUT – COST / UNCERTAINTY

Theme: Interesting personnel and security capability, but too expensive with too many firm-level facts still unclear.

Commercial position. [redacted] **Capacity.** Firm-level employee count is not clearly disclosed; delivery relies on a prime/team-partner/local-resource model.

Nano's proposed personnel bring relevant public-sector and municipal/public-safety experience, including experience under prior employers. The proposal also includes strong security concepts and the firm conducted a site visit.

Top strengths. Relevant individual experience; strong cybersecurity orientation; credible technical approach; site-visit diligence.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. Firm-level municipal past performance is less established than personnel résumés; current CJIS bench and organizational depth are not clear; recurring cost exceeds target and onboarding is [redacted]

Staff assessment. Screen out. The City has more transparent, lower-cost firms with clearer organizational depth.

SNS Technologies (SITE VISIT COMPLETED) — SCREEN OUT – MULTIPLE MATERIAL RISKS

Theme: Well written and tailored, but the risk stack is too high: small, no municipal prime-MSP history, unproven CJIS, above target, and a sizable startup fee.

Commercial position. [redacted] onboarding. **Capacity.** 11 employees — well below the City's 30-person risk threshold.

SNS understands the RFP and proposes a responsive service model. The issue is execution risk relative to other available firms, despite the proposal's tailoring and the company's site visit.

Top strengths. Thoughtful proposal; strong strategic content; local responsiveness; technically capable service design; conducted a site visit.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. Only 11 employees; proposal expressly lacks primary municipal [redacted] ience; current CJIS capability is not proven; recurring cost is above target; onboarding adds [redacted] oposed replacement backup also creates potential overlap with the City's existing paid backup [redacted] nt.

Staff assessment. Screen out. There is no compelling reason to accept both higher cost and higher continuity/experience risk when stronger alternatives are available.

Detailed Assessment – Firms Staff Recommends Eliminating

WeldonPC — TOTALLY OUT

Theme: Best commercial discipline, but an unacceptable single-point-of-failure structure for 24x7 municipal/public-safety operations.

Commercial position. [redacted] **Capacity.** 1 employee + 2 named 1099 subcontractors.

Commercially disciplined and transparent, but the prime contractor is one person. For a 24x7 public-safety municipality, the key-person/continuity exposure is too great; the proposal also does not demonstrate a municipal MSP record or current CJIS qualification.

Top strengths. Excellent pricing transparency; [redacted] sensible treatment of the existing backup platform; no hidden product markup identified.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. Severe single-point-of-failure risk; no demonstrated municipal MSP history; no current CJIS qualification; onsite/emergency continuity depends on a very small subcontractor structure.

Staff assessment. Eliminate from further consideration for the September 23 committee slate.

Automate IT — TOTALLY OUT

Theme: Lowest-looking price that is not actually comparable to the required base scope.

Commercial position. [redacted] headline; non-comparable. **Capacity.** 12 employees.

Poorly written proposal that illustrates a lack of attention to detail and care for the reader. The very low price does not represent the same base scope the City requested. The proposal combines a small bench, no demonstrated municipal MSP history, unproven CJIS capability, and separate charges for items the City expected in base support. The headline price is therefore not a meaningful value comparison.

Top strengths. Low headline price; generally responsive narrative; broad general managed-IT capabilities.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. Only 12 employees; no demonstrated municipal prime-MSP record; current CJIS capability unproven; required security and after-hours elements are not priced on the same all-in basis as stronger proposals, making the headline number non-comparable. Lack of readability makes this proposal feel like a block check or automated Hail Mary.

Staff assessment. Eliminate from further consideration for the September 23 committee slate.

NetCertPRO (SITE VISIT COMPLETED) — TOTALLY OUT

Theme: Excellent local/CJIS credentials undone by high total cost, a small bench and an emergency-request cap that conflicts with the City's operating requirement.

Commercial position. [redacted] onboarding. **Capacity.** 12 employees, including 8 engineering/support personnel.

NetCertPRO has excellent local-government and CJIS credibility and direct familiarity with portions of the City environment. The package, however, is materially over target, has a very small technical bench, and limits included emergency requests before high hourly charges. That emergency model conflicts with the City's requirement for included qualifying critical response.

Top strengths. Excellent local knowledge; strong municipal/public-sector and current CJIS credentials; direct familiarity with portions of the City environment; conducted a site visit.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. Recurring cost is well over target; [redacted] onboarding; only 8 engineering/support staff; included emergency requests are capped and additional emergency work is billed at a high rate, conflicting with the City's required critical-response model.

Staff assessment. Eliminate from further consideration for the September 23 committee slate.

Consultadd Public Services — TOTALLY OUT

Theme: Large and experienced, but economically and operationally misaligned with the City's right-sized model.

Commercial position. [redacted] onboarding. **Capacity.** 600+ employees.

The firm has scale and public-sector experience, but the price is far outside the target and its onsite structure does not align cleanly with the City's unlimited base-support expectation. There is no value case sufficient to overcome the commercial mismatch.

Top strengths. Very large organization; substantial public-sector experience; detailed transition and governance processes.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. Highest/near-highest total cost in the field; [redacted] onboarding; onsite support is limited by an included-hours structure rather than the City's unlimited base-support expectation; current CJIS proof is limited.

Staff assessment. Eliminate from further consideration for the September 23 committee slate.

TRETEK Systems — TOTALLY OUT

Theme: Strong regulated-environment experience, but high cost, markup structure and weak municipal evidence make it noncompetitive.

Commercial position. [redacted] **Capacity.** Not numerically disclosed.

Strong regulated/CJIS experience does not overcome the absence of demonstrated municipal MSP experience, very high recurring and startup cost, and a 10% management fee on hardware/software/third-party costs. It is not competitive for this procurement.

Top strengths. Strong regulated-state/federal and criminal-justice experience; demonstrated CJIS-related work; good strategic content.

Principal weaknesses / diligence items. No demonstrated municipal MSP client; recurring cost far above target; [redacted] numeric employee depth not disclosed; 10% management fee on hardware/software/third-party costs materially weakens long-term value.

Staff assessment. Eliminate from further consideration for the September 23 committee slate.

Questions for the Six Finalists – Apples-to-Apples Comparison

Staff should ask every finalist the same core questions in writing before, or as part of, the committee's next-stage review. The objective is to convert six different commercial models into one comparable operating picture.

The core questions should have a short preamble that explains the existing three VC3 agreements that address Managed Security (Security Awareness training & dark-web monitoring through August 31, 2027), Website Partnership Plan (website consulting, maintenance and hosting through January 31, 2028), and Managed backups (On-site 12TB backup appliance and data retention through April 16, 2028) with an aim at preventing duplication of effort and accidental overcharging.

1. Provide one all-in monthly recurring figure for 50 Managed Users, 82 Email-Only Users, approximately 90 workstations, nine servers, five City facilities, required cybersecurity, routine onsite support/travel,

required critical after-hours response, M365 administration, and management of the existing backup environment. Identify every mandatory recurring component not included in that number.

2. Describe the transition treatment of each continuing VC3 agreement from January 1, 2027 through expiration. Identify whether any service included in the proposed core managed-services package duplicates or supersedes Managed Security, Managed Backups, or Website services, and identify any credit, deferral, or exclusion needed to avoid unnecessary duplicate payment.
3. Confirm the exact treatment of Microsoft licensing: actual authorized subscription cost, any reseller discount, any markup or administrative fee, minimum commitments, and whether license administration itself is included in Base Monthly Support.
4. Regarding backups, would the proposer be able to manage the City's existing paid backup service after expiration, and would the steady-state backup price be after expiration? Identify any new appliance, storage, retention or per-server charge and when it would begin on April 28, 2028.
5. Confirm that qualifying after-hours critical incidents are included in Base Monthly Support without per-incident or hourly charges until restored or stabilized. State acknowledgment, qualified-engineer engagement and onsite targets.
6. State the one-time onboarding/transition charge, if any, and list exactly what is included. If the fee is waived based on contract term, state the condition. Identify any other startup fees, deployment fees or agent/tool charges.
7. Describe routine procurement economics. For City-purchased hardware, software and subscriptions, identify any markup, management fee, hourly procurement charge, shipping/handling fee or rebate retained by the proposer.
8. Explain how Managed Users and Email-Only Users are priced and reconciled. State per-user adjustment rates, minimum quantities and whether Email-Only Users can be added/removed without paying full managed-user rates.
9. State how many personnel are currently able to satisfy the City's CJIS/SLED personnel requirements, how many would be assigned/available to IOP, and the expected lead time to qualify additional staff if needed.
10. State the number of technical personnel — not total corporate headcount — available for help desk, network/server, cybersecurity, onsite response and emergency surge. Identify the continuity plan if primary assigned staff are unavailable during a hurricane or simultaneous cyber incident.
11. State the annual escalation for Years 1–5, including any minimum increase, cap, CPI linkage or renewal repricing right.
12. Distinguish routine executive advisory included in base from separately priced annual roadmap/greenfield/budget/capital planning. Provide the exact price and expected deliverables for a formal three-year roadmap if separately authorized.

Finalist-Specific Questions

VC3 (SITE VISIT COMPLETED)

- Confirm in writing how Managed Security, Managed Backups, and Website services will be treated at commencement and whether any portion of the [redacted] core managed-services price duplicates or supersedes services covered by those existing agreements.
- Confirm the minimum annual escalation and whether the City can negotiate a lower cap or fixed Years 1–3.
- Identify the specific changes already implemented to correct the service/communication shortcomings acknowledged in the proposal and the metrics the City will see quarterly.

Cantey (SITE VISIT COMPLETED)

- Re-price using the City's actual authorized Microsoft license mix as pass-through rather than 132 embedded Exchange Plan 1 licenses.

- Show a transition plan that avoids paying for replacement BCDR/backup components before the existing backup contract ex ires.
- Confirm the contract term a [redacted] ended three-year initial term plus up to two one-year renewals.

Merit [redacted]

- Identify two or three directly comparable municipal/public-safety MSP customers and the scope performed.
- Show how SecureCare3 BCDR pricing is deferred or credited until the City is ready to leave the existing backup platform.
- Explain how a 35-person company staffs simultaneous help desk, cyber incident and hurricane/EOC demands without degrading routine service.

Corsica (SITE VISIT COMPLETED)

- Provide the five references required by the RFP, including at least two municipalities comparable in size/complexity.
- Provide evidence of current CJIS-ready personnel and the number available to the City at transition.
- Confirm in writing that the [redacted] includes all mandatory base scope, ordinary onsite travel, and qualifying critical after-hours response with no onboarding fee.

SoftSages

- Identify at least two small or mid-size full-service municipal clients with Police/Fire operations comparable to IOP.
- Identify current CJIS-qualified personnel or provide a concrete qualification timeline before transition.
- Clarify onboarding, storage, backup, onsite response and any mandatory technology costs not included in the [redacted] monthly figure.
- Provide an IOP-specific service-delivery plan identifying the assigned account/technical leads, primary onsite responder, after-hours escalation path, hurricane/EOC staffing model, and how the standard SoftSages process would be adapted to the City.

Novatech (SITE VISIT COMPLETED)

- Provide final validated reference contacts and a binding final proposal removing “TBD/subject to finalization” items that affect price or service.
- Identify current CJIS-qualified personnel available to IOP and the expected transition staffing model.
- Explain the [redacted] onboarding fee and whether it can be reduced/waived for a multi-year term; confirm all mandatory recurring costs beyond the [redacted] base.

Appendix A – Disposition at a Glance

Weighted scores below are staff analytical scores using the City’s 0–4 rubric and published weights. A management screen can override raw score for shortlist purposes; for example, InterDev scores well technically but is excluded because of the [redacted] cost target. Scores are not intended to replace committee judgment.

Firm	Score /38	Recurring / Startup	Capacity	Disposition
VC3 (SV)	35.5	[redacted]	600+	Advance — Top 6
Cantey Tech Consulting (SV)	35.5	[redacted]	126	Advance — Top 6

Firm	Score /38	Recurring / Startup	Capacity	Disposition
Merit Technologies	33.5	[redacted]	35	Advance — Top 6
Corsica Technologies (SV)	33.0		~200	Advance — Top 6
SoftSages	30.0		350+	Advance — Top 6
Novatech (SV)	28.5		690 / 101 Managed IT	Advance — Top 6
CMIT Solutions of Charleston	30.0		10 local + outside CMIT/network resources	Other notable [redacted] 10-person prime / municipal / CJIS risk
AAITPRO	27.0		268	Other notable [redacted] strong scale, weak municipal/CJIS fit
Portside Technology (SV)	12.0		15	Other notable — [redacted] onboarding; 15-person / non-comparable scope
InterDev (SV)	30.5		52 / 42 technical	Strong but outside cost screen — [redacted] onboarding
CyberGarde	29.5		Not stated; lean core + 25+ field network	Strong but outside cost screen [redacted] depth/CJIS questions
Golden Five LLC	28.0		66	Screen out [redacted] municipal/CJIS/SC/local-delivery evidence gaps
Katalyst	28.5		55	Screen out — cost
Asset Technology Group (SV)	25.0		~25	Screen out — cost/capacity
Nano Defense (SV)	27.0		Not clearly disclosed	Screen out — cost/uncertainty
SNS Technologies (SV)	24.0		11	Screen out — multiple risks

Firm	Score /38	Recurring / Startup	Capacity	Disposition
WeldonPC	23.0	[redacted]	1 + 2 subcontractors	Totally out — continuity
NetCertPRO (SV)	19.0		12 / 8 technical	Totally out — cost/emergency model/capacity
Consultadd Public Services	20.0		600+	Totally out — value/scope
TRETEK Systems	21.0	g	Not disclosed	Totally out — cost/fit/markup
Automate IT	15.0		12	Totally out — non-comparable scope/capacity

Recapitulation:

Staff recommends presenting six firms to the committee on September 23: **VC3, Cantey Tech Consulting, Merit Technologies, Corsica Technologies, SoftSages, and Novatech**. From here, the committee can select which firms they want to interview, if any, at the October committee meeting. This being done, the committee will be able to make recommendation to Council on October 27th 2026.

Each earns a place for a distinct reason, and together they preserve meaningful competition across incumbent continuity, municipal/CJIS specialization, premium technical depth, simple low-cost pricing, large-enterprise scale, and directly comparable municipal experience.

Below the Top Six, three proposals merit notation as Other Notable Proposals should the committee find none of the top six acceptable. CMIT offers attractive local pricing at [redacted] but carries substantial risk from its 10-person prime team, reliance on outside CMIT/subcontract resources, no demonstrated firm-level municipal MSP record, and unproven CJIS depth. AAITPRO is much larger at 268 employees and remains under target at $[redacted], but does not demonstrate the municipal/public-safety or CJIS experience needed to displace a finalist. Portside conducted a site visit and offers a very low [redacted] headline price, but its 15-person bench, $[redacted] onboarding fee, lack of demonstrated municipal/CJIS experience, and separate hourly/travel treatment of required onsite and after-hours support make that price non-comparable to the Top Six.

InterDev and CyberGarde should be recognized separately as strong proposals outside the current cost screen. InterDev is exceptionally well qualified municipally and for CJIS, but costs $[redacted] [redacted] or roughly [redacted] effective over three years. CyberGarde is closer to the line at $[redacted]n, with its $[redacted] setup fee waived for a 36-month term, but staffing depth is not conventionally disclosed and current CJIS readiness is not proven. Golden Five should be screened out despite its $[redacted] starting price and 66-person corporate headcount because the proposal does not demonstrate municipal MSP references, current CJIS-qualified staffing, a South Carolina/local delivery bench, or sufficient City-specific familiarity; its 10% annual escalation language beginning in Year 3 also weakens long-term value.

The next step should not be another broad narrative review. The six finalists should be forced into the same commercial frame through the common questions above or a similar variation. Staff should seek one all-in recurring number, one transition/existing-contract reconciliation schedule, one after-hours commitment, one

CJIS staffing statement, one onboarding figure, one procurement-markup statement, and one five-year escalation schedule from each finalist. That will make the committee’s next comparison substantially closer to apples-to-apples.

City of Isle of Palms
Request for Proposals (RFP 2026-09)
“Managed Technology Services”

Requirement. The City of Isle of Palms ("City") is requesting proposals from qualified firms to provide comprehensive managed technology services that support the City's municipal day-to-day and crisis response operations, enhance cybersecurity, improve organizational resilience, and assist City leadership in making informed technology decisions.

The City seeks a long-term technology partner rather than a traditional managed services provider. While dependable technical support remains essential, the City also seeks a partner that understands municipal government, assists executive leadership with planning, budgeting, procurement, cybersecurity, and technology decision-making. Moreover, this partner participates in operational and emergency planning as needed and provides proactive recommendations that improve organizational effectiveness and resilience.

The City is seeking a right-sized approach in which it pays a predictable fee for routine operational support while retaining the flexibility to procure additional professional services, when needed, through clearly defined and transparent pricing and service level agreements.

The successful proposer shall demonstrate the ability to deliver reliable technical support, proactive technology management, sound strategic guidance and roadmaps that continuously improve the City's technology environment while balancing operational effectiveness, cybersecurity, fiscal responsibility, optimization and long-term sustainability.

Background. The City of Isle of Palms is a full-service coastal municipality serving approximately 4,500 residents and a substantially larger seasonal population. City operations include Police, Fire, Public Works, Recreation, Building, Administration, Finance, Municipal Court, and other municipal services. As a coastal community, the City is subject to natural disasters such as hurricanes which create operational challenges in planning for and executing continuity of operations of which IT is essential.

Technology plays a critical role in nearly every City function, including public safety communications, financial management, permitting, public works operations, citizen services, emergency response, and continuity of government.

The City currently operates multiple municipal facilities connected through a managed network environment utilizing Microsoft technologies, virtualization, cloud services, public safety applications, and numerous third-party business systems.

The City's objective is not simply to maintain this environment but to continually improve and optimize it through thoughtful planning, sound fiscal stewardship, disciplined cybersecurity practices, and dependable but right-sized operational support.

Desired Relationship. The City desires a technology partner that becomes familiar with its organization, understands departmental operations, anticipates technology needs, and participates in planning rather than simply responding to service requests. The City values firms

that communicate candidly, identify opportunities for improvement, and provide recommendations that support informed executive decision-making.

Current Technology Environment
The following information is provided solely to assist proposers in preparing realistic proposals. The City's primary legacy technology environment includes Microsoft 365, Hyper-V virtualization, public safety systems, enterprise financial software, cloud services, and multiple third-party municipal applications.

- 103 full-time employees
- Approximately 125 Microsoft 365 users
- Mix of Exchange Online Plans 1 and 2 with 137 total licenses
- 90 workstations
- 9 servers (2 being virtual)
- 8 multi-function networked printers
- Multiple additional items classified as network “gear”
- 1 business class backup device
- 2 firewalls
- Fiber/ internet provided by Segra
- Payroll, permitting, and accounting provided by BS&A Software
- Myriad additional software and services such as: Axon, Diverse (NCIC access), Geothinq, iWorks, Image Trend, Power DMS, and others

The successful proposer should assume responsibility for supporting the City's existing technology environment while recommending thoughtful modernization where appropriate.

SCOPE OF WORK AND SERVICES

The following descriptions identify minimum service expectations. Proposers should clearly identify services included within the base monthly fee and distinguish those requiring additional authorization or project pricing.

Base Monthly Support
- Unlimited help desk support (remote, phone, and onsite as required) for approximately 50 managed users and 82 email-only users
- Business-hours support with emergency after-hours response for critical incidents
- Network operations including monitoring, maintenance, firmware updates, configuration backup, and administration of switches, routers, firewalls, wireless infrastructure, Internet connectivity, and patch management
- Following initial procurement, conduct maintenance and management of all Microsoft licensing
- Server administration including preventative maintenance, configuration management, monitoring, operating system patching, storage management, virtualization support, and backup monitoring

- Maintain an accurate and current inventory of the City's technology assets, including identification of active and inactive assets
- Cybersecurity operations including endpoint detection and response (EDR), security monitoring, vulnerability detection and remediation, MFA administration, email protection, phishing response, and security event monitoring
- Microsoft 365 administration including Exchange Online, Teams, SharePoint, OneDrive, license management, and Entra ID routine administration
- Backup and disaster recovery monitoring, including periodic restore testing and an annual disaster recovery exercise
- Routine vendor coordination with third-party software, internet, telecommunications, and hardware providers for incident resolution
- Develop and maintain current documentation of the City's technology environment, including network diagrams, system configurations, administrative credentials, backup procedures, and recovery documentation
- Software and hardware recommendations with immediate operational impacts
- Provide operational support before, during, and after significant events such as hurricanes
- Standard monthly reporting:
    - Open and closed ticket summary
    - Average response and resolution times
    - Patch compliance status
    - Backup success/failure status
    - Critical vulnerabilities and remediation actions
    - Major incidents and root causes
    - Asset inventory updates
    - Recommendations for operational improvements
- Quarterly Operational Review at the executive level covering trends, recurring operational issues, infrastructure health, cybersecurity events, asset lifecycle concerns

Professional Services (Outside Base Monthly Support)

- Annual Strategic Planning:
    - Technology roadmap development / “Greenfield” look
    - Network redesign or architecture changes
    - Budget planning/ forecasting
    - Capital planning and replacement planning recommendations
    - Asset portfolio assessments to ensure City is right-sized, based on usage

- Major projects, implementations, migrations, and new system deployments
- Extended on-site operational support during declared emergencies, prolonged Emergency Operations Center activations, or multi-day disaster response operations beyond the base support services
- Server replacements or infrastructure refresh projects, as needed
- Wireless redesign or expansion projects
- ERP or enterprise application implementations
- Enterprise level security assessments, penetration testing, or vCISO services

- SharePoint development, workflow automation, and data conversions
- Procurement consulting and preparation of specifications unless specifically requested by the City

Modular Options/ Features
The City recognizes that technology needs evolve rapidly. Accordingly, a successful proposer will have the ability to scale technology services, including adding, modifying, or removing technology services, without requiring replacement of the entire agreement.

Potential add on services include but are not limited to:
- All services in the preceding section above
- Telecommunications
- GIS support
- Website management
- Cloud services
- Public safety technology
- Additional facilities
- Additional users
- Other mutually agreed technology services

PROPOSAL CONTENTS AND SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

Consistent with Chapter 10 *Purchasing Procedures*, Section 1-10-5 *Methods of Source Selection*, of the city code, the City is requesting information that speaks to a firm's track record of "professional and technical qualifications" and "demonstrated competence and qualification."

By 10:00 AM on **Friday August 28, 2026** please provide a hard copy proposal by courier or mail to:

Physical Address Instructions (Delivery by Courier, Mail Service (FEDEX, etc)):
C/o Douglas Kerr
City Administrator
City of Isle of Palms
1207 Palm Boulevard
Isle of Palms, South Carolina 29451

Mailing Instructions (US Mail):
C/o Douglas Kerr
City Administrator
City of Isle of Palms
Post Office Box 508
Isle of Palms, South Carolina 29451

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS
The proposal should demonstrate the firm's understanding of municipal government and clearly explain how the proposed services satisfy the City's objectives.

The narrative portion of the Proposals should not be more than ten pages.

At a minimum, proposals shall include/ address the following areas:

1. Cover Letter
Introduce the firm, summarize the firm's understanding of the City's objectives, and identify the individual authorized to negotiate on behalf of the proposer.

2. Firm Qualifications
Describe:

- Years in business
- Office locations
- Number of employees
- Municipal experience
- South Carolina experience
- Experience supporting organizations of similar size and complexity

3. Understanding of the City's Needs
Rather than simply describing services, proposers should explain their understanding of the City's operating environment and philosophy as described in this RFP.
The City is particularly interested in understanding how the proposer approaches long-term client relationships, strategic planning, operational support, cybersecurity, and technology leadership.

4. Proposed Service Delivery
Describe how services will be delivered including:

- Transition of current services/ data and new service implementation
- Help Desk operations
- On-site support
- Remote support
- Assigned personnel
- Escalation procedures
- After-hours support
- Emergency response
- Cybersecurity services
- Strategic advisory services

5. Strategic Advisory Approach
Describe how your firm assists executive leadership with:

- Technology planning
- Budget preparation
- Lifecycle and capital planning
- Cybersecurity governance
- Risk management
- Cost optimization

6. Emergency Operations Support

Describe how your firm supports clients during:

- Hurricanes/ severe weather events
- Cyber incidents
- Significant outages
- Emergency Operations Center activation

Include expected response capabilities and availability of senior technical personnel.

7. References
Provide at least five references from organizations of similar size.

8. Detailed Pricing Proposal.

- Base managed services fee
- Per managed user fee
- Per email only user fee
- Hourly rates for projects, engineering, consulting, project management, travel, after-hours support, and security consulting
- Pricing assumptions and any annual escalation provisions
- Identify any assumptions that materially affect the proposed pricing

EVALUATION PROCESS AND CRITERIA

The City's objective is to select the firm that provides the greatest overall value to the organization while demonstrating technical competence, operational understanding, financial responsibility, and a commitment to long-term partnership.

The City reserves the right to reject any or all proposals, waive minor irregularities, request additional information, interview proposers, negotiate modifications, or cancel this solicitation if determined to be in the City's best interest.

Proposals will be evaluated using, at minimum, the following criteria.

A. Understanding of the City's Needs
The proposer's understanding of the City's operational environment, organizational objectives, and philosophy of services.

The City will evaluate the extent to which the proposal demonstrates an understanding of municipal government operations rather than merely describing generic managed technology services.

B. Qualifications and Experience
The firm's experience supporting organizations of similar size and complexity, particularly municipalities and public safety agencies.
Consideration may include:

- Years in business
- Technical certifications
- Relevant experience

- Staff qualifications
- Organizational stability

C. Technical Approach
The quality and completeness of the proposed technical solution including:
- Infrastructure support
- Cybersecurity
- Help Desk
- Network administration
- Disaster recovery
- Documentation
- Technology planning
- Ability to scale and make any future contract vehicle “modular”

D. Strategic Advisory Services
The City places significant value on a firm's ability to assist executive leadership through high level strategic planning from inception to at least three years out, technology planning, budgeting, lifecycle management, procurement assistance, executive reporting, operational planning, and organizational improvement.

E. Operational Support
The City's technology partner should understand that technology supports municipal operations. The proposal should demonstrate an ability to support the City during routine operations as well as major incidents, emergency response, continuity of government activities, and significant community events.

F. Pricing
Cost savings is a major factor in this RFP and the City will preference proposers with dedicated processes that illustrate a bias toward cost optimization.

Additional consideration may include:
- Overall value
- Pricing transparency and clarity
- Long-term affordability
- Cost predictability
- Optional service pricing

G. References
The City may contact references and consider prior performance, responsiveness, professionalism, communication, and overall client satisfaction.

Deadline for Submissions: The deadline for submission is **10:00 AM Friday August, 28 2026**. Proposals will be received by mail or courier (see above) in a sealed envelope. Sealed envelopes must be clearly marked **“RFP 2026-09 – Managed Technology Services”** and include one (1) hard copy.

The deadline for questions is **5:00 PM, Friday August, 14 2026.** Questions will be answered in addendum format and posted on the City's RFP tab on the City's webpage.

Site visits are encouraged. To coordinate a visit please contact the Deputy City Administrator, Sean Kuester at skuester@isleofpalms.gov or at 843-886-6428. **All visits must be complete no later than Friday August 14, 2026.**

It will be the responsibility of the proposers to verify receipt by the City. Proposals may be delivered by hand or by mail, but no proposal shall be considered which is not actually received by the City at the place, date and time appointed by the City and the City shall not be responsible for any failure, misdirection, delay or error resulting from the selection by any proposer of any means of delivery. All proposals submitted shall include a current e-mail address.

Proprietary and/or Confidential Information: Your proposal is a public document under the South Carolina Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), except as to information that may be treated as confidential as an exception to disclosure under the FOIA as determined by the City. If you cannot agree to this standard, please do not submit your proposal. All information that is to be treated as confidential and/or proprietary must be clearly identified, and each page containing confidential and/or proprietary information, in whole or in part, must be stamped and/or denoted as CONFIDENTIAL, in bold, in a font of at least 12-point type, in the upper right-hand corner of the page. All information not so denoted and identified will be subject to disclosure by the City.

Proposers acknowledge and agree that the City will not be liable for any costs, expenses, losses, damages (including damages for loss of anticipated profit) or liabilities incurred by the respondent or any member of the respondent's organization as a result of, or arising out of, submitting a proposal, negotiating changes, or due to the City's acceptance or non-acceptance of the proposal or the rejection of any and all proposals.

Proposers are responsible for submission of accurate, adequate and clear descriptions of the information requests. Neither issuance of the RFP, preparation and submission of a response, nor the subsequent receipt and evaluation of any response by the City of Isle of Palms will commit the City to award a contract to any respondent even if all the requirements in the RFP have been met. Proposers must have or be able to procure an Isle of Palms Business License.