



STATE OF INDIANA

Eric J. Holcomb, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
Commissioner's Office

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

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: November 17, 2022
To: Erin Kellam, Deputy Commissioner,
Indiana Department of Administration
From: Teresa Deaton- Reese, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration
Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 23-72023, Operational Verification and Validation Services

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 23-72023, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that First Data Government Solutions, LP be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide Operational Verification and Validation Services to the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA), Office of Medicaid Policy and Planning (OMPP).

First Data Government Solutions, LP has committed to subcontract:

- 12.3% of the contract value to Hypesmith, Inc (which is a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)),
11.6% of the contract value to eSense Incorporated (which is certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), and
11.6% of the contract value to M.R.C. Inc. (which is certified Indiana Veteran-owned Small Business (IVOSB)).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated Contract Value: \$4,833,120.00

The evaluation team received one (1) proposal from:
1. First Data Government Solutions, LP

The proposals were evaluated by FSSA and IDOA according to the following criteria established in the RFP:

Table with 2 columns: Criteria and Points. Rows include Adherence to Mandatory Requirements (Pass/Fail), Management Assessment/Quality (50), Cost (30), Buy Indiana (5), Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment (5), and Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment (5).

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 of the Respondents were deemed responsive as they met the mandatory requirements listed in the RFP.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Consensus Scoring

The one (1) responsive Respondent proposal was evaluated based on the respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

Business Proposal (3 Points)

For the Business Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the information the Respondent provided in the Business Proposal. These areas were reviewed to assess the Respondent’s ability to serve the State:

- Company Information
- References

Technical Proposal (47 Points)

For the Technical Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondent’s proposal in the following areas:

- Overview of Project and Mandatory Requirements (Sections 3 and 4 of the Scope of Work)
- Oversight, Validation and Related Duties Pertaining to the CoreMMIS Vendor (Section 5 of the Scope of Work)
- Reporting (Section 6 of the Scope of Work)
- Offices and Project Management (Sections 7 and 8 of the Scope of Work)
- Staffing (Section 9 of the Scope of Work)
- State Resources, Security/Risk Mitigation, and Service Levels/Performance Management (Sections 10, 11, and 12 of the Scope of Work)

The evaluation team’s scoring is based on a review of the Respondent’s proposed approach to each section of the Business Proposal and Technical Proposal. The results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

Table 1: Management Assessment/Quality (MAQ) Scores

| Respondent | MAQ Score 50 pts. |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| First Data Government Solutions, LP | 34.00 |

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points) and Shortlisting

Price points were awarded on the Respondents’ Costs as follows:

Score =

{

- If Respondent’s Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 30.
- If Respondent’s Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:

$$30 * \frac{\text{(Lowest Respondent's Cost amount)}}{\text{(Respondent's Cost amount)}}$$

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

Table 2: Cost Scores

| Respondent | Cost Score 30 pts. |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| First Data Government Solutions, LP | 30.00 |

The combined MAQ and Cost scores from the evaluations are listed below.

Table 3: Combined MAQ and Cost Scores

| Respondent | Combined Score 80 pts. |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| First Data Government Solutions, LP | 64.00 |

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team issued clarification questions and a request for a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) from the Respondent.

D. BAFO Evaluations and IDOA Scoring

The Respondent's cost score was updated based on their BAFO. IDOA scored the Respondent in the following areas: 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. When necessary, IDOA clarifies certain M/WBE/IVOSB information with Respondents. Once the final M/WBE/IVOSB forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 103 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 4: Final Evaluation Scores

| Respondent | MAQ Score | Cost Score | Buy Indiana | MBE* | WBE* | IVOSB* | Total Score |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Points Possible | 50 | 30 | 5 | 5 (+1 bonus pt.) | 5 (+1 bonus pt.) | 5 (+1 bonus pt.) | 100 (+3 bonus pts.) |
| First Data Government Solutions, LP | 34.00 | 30.00 | 0.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 76.00 |

* See Section 3.2.5/6/7 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE/IVOSB bonus points.

Award Summary

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

The term of the contract shall be for a period of four (4) years from the date of the contract execution. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.