



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: January 22, 2021

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

From: Emily Cranfill, CPPB; Senior Account Manager,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 21-2355,
Fraud and Abuse Detection System (FADS)

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 21-2355, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Deloitte Transactions and Business Analytics LLP (Deloitte) be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide a Fraud and Abuse Detection System for the Office of Medicaid Policy and Planning (OMPP) of Indiana Family & Social Services Administration.

*Deloitte has committed to subcontract 15.2% of the contract value to **Sahasra Technology d/b/a STLogics** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 13.5% of the contract value to **Briljent LLC** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), and 6.8% to **Vespa Group** (a certified Indiana Veteran-Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$15,575,533.92

The evaluation team received five (5) proposals from:

1. Deloitte Transactions and Business Analytics LLP (Deloitte)
2. Gainwell Technologies LLC (Gainwell)
3. International Business Machines (IBM) Watson Health
4. MTX Group Inc
5. Public Consulting Group – Indiana (PCG Indiana)

The proposals were evaluated by OMPP 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)
7. Indiana Veteran 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 five (5) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Consensus Scoring

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

Business Proposal (4 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 (46 Points)

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

- Overview
- Provider Peer Comparison Tool
- Case Management System + Reporting
- Other Considerations (Contractor Systems and Technology Overview, M&O, System Training)
- Fraud and Abuse Detection
- Audits and Investigations + Overpayment Recovery
- Pre-Payment Review
- Provider Education
- MCE Plan Oversight, Call Center, and Calculating ROI
- Contractor Staff
- Administrative Duties, Transition Activities, and SLA Performance Management

The evaluation team’s Round 1 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: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Deloitte	35.25
Gainwell	31.75
IBM	33.00

MTX Group	3.50
PCG Indiana	40.50

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

The price points on the Respondent's Costs were awarded 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: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Deloitte	24.52
Gainwell	22.18
IBM	23.08
MTX Group	30.00
PCG Indiana	23.22

D. First Round Total Scores and Shortlisting

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

Table 3: Round 1 – Total Scores

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Deloitte	59.77 ¹
Gainwell	53.93 ¹
IBM	56.08 ¹

¹ Score figures on this Award Recommendation Letter have been rounded to two decimal places, but the scores used for decision-making purposes have been calculated without a limit to the decimal places. Accordingly, arithmetic-using score figures in this letter may not precisely account for the actual scores.

MTX Group	33.50 ¹
PCG Indiana	63.72 ¹

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist Deloitte, Gainwell, IBM, and PCG Indiana based on Round 1 Total Scores.

The evaluation team elected to issue Clarifications Questions and invitations for Oral Presentations to the four shortlisted Respondents.

E. Post Oral Presentations and Clarification Questions – Second Round MAQ Scores

The Respondents' (who were shortlisted after the First Round) MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentations and the responses to the Clarification Questions. The scores for the Respondents (who were shortlisted after the First Round) after the Oral Presentations and Clarification Questions were as follows.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Deloitte	36.25
Gainwell	31.75
IBM	33.00
PCG Indiana	40.50

The evaluation team issued a request to submit Best and Final Offers (BAFO) to improve their pricing.

F. Post BAFO – Second Round Cost Scores

The Respondents' (who were shortlisted after the First Round) Cost Scores were re-calculated based on the BAFO pricing if submitted, or original pricing if the vendor elected not to submit a BAFO. The cost scores for the Respondents (who were shortlisted after the First Round) after the BAFO request are listed below.

Table 5: Round 2 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Deloitte	30.00
Gainwell	26.45
IBM	27.51
PCG Indiana	28.23

G. Second Round Total Scores and Shortlisting

The combined Round 2 MAQ and Cost scores from evaluation of the Oral Presentations, responses Clarification Questions, and responses to the BAFO request are listed below.

Table 6: Round 2 – Total Scores

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Deloitte	66.25
Gainwell	58.20
IBM	60.51
PCG Indiana	68.73

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. IDOA requested updated M/WBE and IVOSB information from the Respondents who submitted Revised Cost Proposals (stemming from the BAFO request). 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 9: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy IN	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.)
Gainwell	31.75	26.45	0.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	73.20
IBM	33.00	27.51	0.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	75.51
PCG Indiana	40.50	28.23	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	88.73
Deloitte	36.25	30.00	5.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	89.25

* See Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE and IVOSB bonus points.

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed ability to meet the goals of the program and the needs of the State. The team evaluated proposals 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 contract execution, with two (2) optional one-year renewals.

Emily J. Cranfill

Emily Cranfill, CPPB; Senior Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration