



Eric J. Holcomb, Governor

Indiana Government Center South  
402 West Washington Street, Room W462  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: August 30, 2022  
To: Erin Kellam, Deputy Commissioner,  
Indiana Department of Administration  
From: Arthur Sample IV, Procurement Specialist,  
Indiana Department of Administration  
Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-70670, Equipment Maintenance Management Program (EMMP)

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 22-70670, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Remi Holdings, LLC. (Remi) be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide an Equipment Maintenance Management Program to all state entities.

Remi has committed to subcontract the specified percent of the contract value to the subcontractors listed below:  
1. 8.0% to **Diverse Tech Services and Lee Computers, LLC** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE))

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 5-year Contract Value: \$1,038,541.29

- The evaluation team received three (3) proposals from:
1. Electronic Risks Consultants, Inc. (ERC)
  2. Remi Holdings, LLC. (Remi)
  3. Specialty Underwriters, LLC. (Specialty Underwriters)

The proposals were evaluated according to the following criteria established in the RFP:

Criteria	Points
1. Adherence to Mandatory Requirements	Pass/Fail
2. Management Assessment/Quality (Business and Technical Proposal)	45
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	35
4. Buy Indiana	5
5. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
6. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
7. Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)

Total: 100 (103 if bonus awarded)

The proposals were evaluated according to the process outlined in Section 3.2 ("Evaluation Criteria") of the RFP. Scoring was completed as follows:

**A. Adherence to Requirements**

Each proposal was reviewed for responsiveness and adherence to mandatory requirements. All three proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

**B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Consensus Scoring**

The Respondents' proposals were evaluated based on their respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

**Business Proposal (5 points)**

For the Business Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the information the Respondents provided in their Business Proposals. These areas were reviewed to assess the Respondents' ability to serve the State:

- General, Respondent's Company Structure, Company Financial Information, and Integrity of Company Structure and Financial Reporting
- References, Experience Serving State Governments, and Experience Serving Similar Clients
- All Other Business Proposal Sections

**Technical Proposal (40 Points)**

For the Technical Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondents' proposals in the following areas:

- Customer Service
- Equipment Inclusion, Coverage & Tracking
- General Requirements
- Service Requirements

The evaluation team's Round 1 scoring was based on a review of the Respondents' proposed approach to each section of the Business Proposal and Technical Proposal. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

**Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score 45 pts.</b>
ERC	33.00
Remi	35.00
Specialty Underwriters	36.75

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to all three vendors. Clarification questions were also issued to all three vendors.

**C. Management Assessment/Quality: Post Oral-Presentation Scores**

The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the responses to the clarification questions from the State, the Oral Presentation, and to questions asked during Oral Presentations. The scores for the Respondents after the Oral Presentations were as follows.

**Table 2: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score 45 pts.</b>
ERC	36.00
Remi	37.25
Specialty Underwriters	36.75

**D. Cost Scoring (35 Points)**

The price points on the Respondents' Costs were awarded as follows:

Each Respondent received a cost score for each equipment category using the relative scoring equation (lowest cost proposal within the equipment category receives maximum category cost points).

Minimum Discount % Cost Score = X possible points \* (Respondent Offered Minimum Discount % / Most Advantageous Minimum Discount %)

Total Minimum Discount % Cost Score = Sum of OEM & All Other Service Type Scenario Scores

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents' cost proposals is as follows:

**Table 3: Initial Cost Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 35 pts.</b>
ERC	33.97
Remi	30.18
Specialty Underwriters	27.84

**E. Combined Round 2 MAQ and Initial Cost Scores**

The combined Round 2 MAQ and Initial Cost scores are listed below.

**Table 4: Combined Round 2 MAQ and Initial Cost Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Total Score 80 pts.</b>
ERC	69.97
Remi	67.43
Specialty Underwriters	64.59

After reviewing the combined Round 2 MAQ and Initial Cost Scores, no short-list was developed. All Respondents were issued a Best and Final Offer.

**F. Post Best and Final Offer – Final Round Cost Scores**

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents' BAFO Cost Proposals was as follows:

**Table 5: BAFO Cost Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 35 pts.</b>
ERC	32.72
Remi	32.48
Specialty Underwriters	26.22

**G. Combined Final MAQ and Cost Scores**

The combined final scores for the Respondents, based on Round 2 MAQ and BAFO Cost Scores are listed below.

**Table 6: Final MAQ and Cost Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score (45)</b>	<b>Cost Score (35)</b>	<b>Total Score (80)</b>
ERC	36.00	32.72	68.72
Remi	37.25	32.48	69.73
Specialty Underwriters	36.75	26.22	62.97

**H. IDOA Scoring**

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: Buy Indiana (5 points), MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. The total scores out of 103 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

**Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>Buy Indiana</b>	<b>MBE*</b>	<b>WBE*</b>	<b>IVOSB*</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>100 (+3 bonus pt.)</b>
ERC	36.00	32.72	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	65.72
Remi	37.25	32.48	0.00	5.00	-1.00	-1.00	72.73
Specialty Underwriters	36.75	26.22	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	59.97

\*See Sections 3.2.5 to 3.2.7 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE and IVOSB bonus points.

**Award Summary**

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized the proposals to determine the viability of the proposed business solutions to meet the goals of the program and needs of the State. The team evaluated the proposals based on the stipulated criteria outlined in the RFP document.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of three (3) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of five (5) years at the State’s option.