



STATE OF INDIANA
Eric Holcomb, Governor

Department of Administration
Procurement Division
402 W Washington Street, Room W468
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
317.232.3053

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: March 10, 2021(revised March 22, 2021)

To: Roxie Coble, IDOA Director of Strategic Sourcing
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Arthur L. Sample IV, Strategic Sourcing Analyst
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 21-1179, Online Learning Management System

Roxie Coble
Digitally signed by Roxie
Coble
Date: 2021.03.10 09:38:26
-05'00'

The state has determined it to be in their best interest to recommend that 360 Waters Inc. be the respondent to begin contract negotiations to provide Online Learning Management System for the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission.

360Water, Inc., has no commitments to any certified Minority (MBE), Woman (WBE), or Veteran (IVOSB) owned Business.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated Contract Value: \$201,760.00

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. 360Water, Inc.
2. The Consultants Consortium Inc.

The proposals were evaluated by 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) | 55 |
| 3. Cost (Cost Proposal) | 25 |
| 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 Respondents were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements and were moved forward for evaluation.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Scoring (55 Points)

The two (2) responsive Respondents’ proposals were each evaluated based on their respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

These areas were reviewed to assess the Respondent’s ability to serve the State:

- Respondent Information and Financial Stability
- References
- Proposed Subcontractors and Team Structure
- Industry and Subject Matter Experience
- Account Management & Reporting
- Integration, Information Technology, and Security

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 initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

Table 1: Management Assessment/Quality Scores

| Respondent | MAQ Score 55 pts. |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| 360Water, Inc. | 36.58 |
| The Consultants Consortium Inc. | 39.75 |

C. Cost Proposal (25 Points)

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

Score =

{

- If Respondent’s Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 25.
- If Respondent’s Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:

$$25 * \frac{\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost amount}}{\text{Respondent's Cost amount}}$$

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

Table 2: Cost Scores

| Respondent | Cost Score 25 pts. |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 360Water, Inc. | 19.12 |
| The Consultants Consortium Inc. | 25.00 |

D. First Round Total Scores

The combined Round 1 MAQ and Cost scores from the initial evaluations are listed below.

Table 3: Total Scores

| Respondent | Total Score 80 pts. |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| 360Water, Inc. | 55.70 |
| The Consultants Consortium Inc. | 64.75 |

E. Post Oral Presentations, BAFO Evaluations, and Clarification Questions

The Respondents' cost scores were updated based on their BAFOs. The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed based on the oral presentations and the responses to the clarification questions. The scores for the Respondents after the oral presentations, BAFOs, and clarification questions were as follows:

Table 4: BAFO, and Clarification Questions - Evaluation Scores

| Respondent | MAQ Score (55) | Cost Score (25) |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 360Water, Inc. | 36.58 | 17.47 |
| The Consultants Consortium Inc. | 39.75 | 25.00 |

F. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the short-listed 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. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain M/WBE and IVOSB information with the Respondents. Once the final M/WBE and IVOSB forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 103 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 5: Final Evaluation Scores

| Respondent | MAQ Score | Cost Score | Buy Indiana | MBE* | WBE* | IVOSB* | Total Score |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Points Possible | 55 | 25 | 5 | 5 (+1 bonus pt.) | 5 (+1 bonus pt.) | 5 (+1 bonus pt.) | 100 (+3 bonus pt.) |
| 360Water, Inc. | 36.58 | 17.47 | 0.00 | -1.00 | -1.00 | -1.00 | 51.05 |
| The Consultants Consortium Inc. | 39.75 | 25.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 84.75 |

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

Award Summary

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

The State intends to sign a contract with one or more Respondent(s) to fulfill the requirements in this RFP.

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