



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: January 25, 2024

To: L. Erin Kellam, Deputy Commissioner
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Syed Mohammad, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 24-76229
Data Harvest Spatial Validation Platform

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 24-76229, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **Michael Baker International Inc** (dba DATAMARK) be selected to begin contract negotiations to manage Data Harvest Spatial Validation Platform for Indiana Geographic Information Office (IGIO) division within the Indiana Office of Technology (IOT).

DATAMARK has committed to subcontract the specified percent of the contract value to the vendors listed below:

1. 8.99% to **geoConvergence LLC** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE))
2. 12.00% to **ROI Search Group** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE))
3. 4.00% to **Axon Advisors LLC** (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB))

The details of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Three (3) year initial term with an estimated contract value of \$811,923.00.

The evaluation team received Four (4) proposals from:

1. 1Spatial Inc (1Spatial)
2. Geo-Comm, Inc (Geo-Comm)
3. Michael Baker International Inc (DATAMARK)
4. Taro Engineering LLC (Taro)

The proposals were evaluated by IOT and IDOA 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)	50
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	30
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)

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. The proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

Taro Engineering LLC was disqualified due to little clarity and detail on how the proposed solution validates either mandatory or optional requirements. Proposed implementation timeline is substantially longer than what State wants.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Consensus Scoring (50 Points)

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

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

- Company Information
- References
- Experience

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

- Proposed Solution
- Implementation Approach
- Project Management and Maintenance
- Staffing
- Overall Ability to Meet State's Needs

The evaluation team's Initial Scoring is based on a review of the Respondents' proposed approaches to each section of the Business Proposals and Technical Proposals. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

Table 1: Initial Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
1Spatial	46.88
Geo-Comm	33.19
DATAMARK	42.81

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

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

Score =

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
 \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 30.} \\
 \bullet \text{ If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:} \\
 30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}
 \end{array} \right.$$

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

Table 2: Initial Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
1Spatial	30.00
Geo-Comm	16.62
DATAMARK	28.94

D. Initial Combined Scores

The Initial Combined Scoring as a result of the Respondents' business, technical, and cost proposals is as follows:

Table 3: Initial Combined Scores

Respondent	Combined Score 80 pts.
1Spatial	76.88
Geo-Comm	49.11
DATAMARK	71.75

Based on the Initial Combined Scores, with IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist 1Spatial and DATAMARK.

E. Clarifications and Oral Presentations – Post-Clarification and Oral Presentation MAQ Scores

Clarifications were issued after the shortlist, followed by Oral Presentations. The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the responses to the clarification questions from the State and the Respondents' oral presentations. The scores for the Respondents after evaluation of the clarification question responses and oral presentations were as follows:

Table 4: Post-Clarification and Oral Presentation Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
1Spatial	47.50
DATAMARK	39.81

F. Post-Best and Final Offer (BAFO) Opportunity – Cost Scores

The State elected to issue a BAFO opportunity to the shortlisted Respondents. The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents' BAFO Cost Proposals is as follows:

Table 5: Post-BAFO Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
1Spatial	30.00
DATAMARK	29.45

G. Post-BAFO Scores

The combined scores for the Respondents' post-Clarification and Oral Presentation Management Assessment/Quality Scores and post-BAFO Cost Scores are listed below.

Table 6: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (50)	Cost Score (30)	Combined Score (80)
1Spatial	47.50	30.00	77.50
DATAMARK	39.81	29.45	69.26

H. Preference 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 score out of 103 possible points was tabulated and is as follows:

Table 7: 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 pt.)
1Spatial	47.50	30.00	0.00	-1.00	5.00	-1.00	80.50
DATAMARK	39.81	29.45	0.00	5.00	6.00	6.00	86.26

*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 to meet the goals of the program and the 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 three (3) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.