

November 13, 2020

Emily Cranfill, Strategic Sourcing Analyst
Indiana Department of Administration
Procurement Division
402 West Washington Street, Room W468
Indianapolis, IN 46204

RE: Response to RFP Number 21-2355 for Fraud and Abuse Detection System (FADS)

Dear Ms. Cranfill:

In accordance with Sections 1.15 and 2.2.5 (Confidential Information) of the above-referenced Request for Proposal issued by the State of Indiana Department of Administration on behalf of the Office of Medicaid Policy and Planning (the "State"), this letter serves to identify the information contained in Deloitte Transactions and Business Analytics LLP's proposal (the "Deloitte Proposal") which it claims to be confidential and exempt from public disclosure pursuant to the Indiana Access to Public Records Act ("APRA"). Deloitte Transactions and Business Analytics LLP ("DTBA") requests the State maintain the confidentiality of the specific items identified herein, as required under applicable Indiana law.

DTBA provides professional services to government entities and companies around the world. This services market is a dynamic market with many participants vying for a limited universe of clients. In this regard, DTBA objects to the release of certain information included in the Deloitte Proposal on the basis, among other things, that it will cause competitive harm to DTBA if it is released by the State.

The Indiana Access to Public Records Act provides the following mandatory exemptions from public disclosure:

- (a) The following public records are excepted from section 3 [IC 5-14-3-3] of this chapter and may not be disclosed by a public agency, unless access to the records is specifically required by a state or federal statute or is ordered by a court under the rules of discovery:

* * *

- (4) Records containing trade secrets.
- (5) Confidential financial information obtained, upon request, from a person. However, this does not include information that is filed with or received by a public agency pursuant to state statute.

Ind. Code Ann. §5-14-3-4(a).

The definition of "trade secret" contained in the Indiana Uniform Trade Secrets Act applies for purposes of the Access to Public Records Act. *See* Ind. Code Ann. §5-14-3-2(t). That definition is as follows:

"Trade secret" means information, including a formula, pattern, compilation, program, device, method, technique, or process, that:

- (1) Derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable by proper means by, other persons who can obtain economic value from its disclosure or use; and
- (2) Is the subject of efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy.

Ind. Code Ann. §24-2-3-2.

“Thus, a protectable trade secret has four characteristics: (1) information, (2) which derives independent economic value, (3) is not generally known, or readily ascertainable by proper means by other persons who can obtain economic value from its disclosure or use, and (4) the subject of efforts reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy.” *Hydraulic Exch. & Repair, Inc. v. KM Specialty Pumps, Inc.*, 690 N.E.2d 782, 785-86 (Ind. Ct. App. 1998). Indiana Courts have held that “the threshold factors [to be considered] are the extent to which the information is known by others and the ease by which the information could be duplicated by legitimate means.” *Franke v. Honeywell, Inc.*, 516 N.E.2d 1090, 1093 (Ind. App. 1987). Importantly, Indiana Courts have found trade secrets to include “customer lists, pricing, labor rates, overhead costs, suppliers, designs, blueprints, and specific needs of customers.” *Infinity Prods. v. Quandt*, 810 N.E.2d 1028, 1032 (Ind. 2004).

As set forth below, the Protected Information is exempt from disclosure under the APRA which permits an agency to withhold trade secrets and confidential financial information if disclosure would cause substantial harm to the competitive position of a company. The Protected Information falls within the meaning of said exemption and is therefore exempt from disclosure for two independent reasons. *First*, the Protected Information is *not* the kind of information that DTBA customarily discloses to the public and was provided voluntarily to the State with the reasonable expectation that such information would not be released. *Second*, disclosure of the Protected Information would cause substantial harm to DTBA’s competitive position by permitting its competitors to leverage DTBA’s innovative business strategies, methodologies and approaches, all of which have significant commercial value and represent the investment of substantial time, effort and money.

I. Identity and Qualifications of Personnel and Subcontractors.

The Deloitte Proposal includes confidential information and protected trade secrets concerning the identity and qualifications of individual DTBA personnel and its proposed subcontractors, the compilation of which DTBA deems trade secret. *See* 1 MILGRAM ON TRADE SECRETS, § 109[8][g] (“Information which can be protected under a trade secret theory [includes the] effectiveness and good performance of key sales personnel and other personnel”). DTBA holds the identity of its personnel and proposed subcontractors in the strictest confidence.

Disclosure of this Protected Information would injure DTBA’s competitive position by providing competitors with insight into the manner in which DTBA assembles individuals with particular types of education, experience and talents into project teams. DTBA’s competitors could use this Protected Information to free ride on its years of experience by assembling project teams virtually identical to those of DTBA in terms of composition and qualifications. Providing competitors with the identification of our firm’s resources not only would result in placing DTBA in a less competitive position in the future but could also compromise our ability to perform in the present, should those resources be pirated by competitors.

Because DTBA considers its staffing strategy and proposed team to be trade secrets, DTBA does not customarily release its staffing arrangements to third parties. Further, in order to protect the confidentiality of certain information, not all team members are provided access to all sections of DTBA’s proposals. To the extent DTBA must disclose information to its subcontractors and/or teaming partners, prior to doing so, DTBA ensures that all subcontracts and/or teaming agreements to which DTBA is a party contain restrictions on the release of information between DTBA and its subcontractors and/or team members.

Accordingly, Protected Information regarding the identity and qualifications of DTBA personnel and the composition of DTBA's project teams, including its proposed subcontractors, is exempt from disclosure under the APRA. *See Prof'l Review Org. of Fla., Inc. v. Dep't of Health and Human Servs.*, 607 F. Supp. 423, 425 (D.D.C. 1985) (information regarding contractor's organizational structure and staffing was exempt from disclosure under the FOIA); *Audio Technical Services LTD. v. Department of the Army*, 487 F. Supp. 779, 782 (D.D.C. 1979) (same for "biographical data on key . . . employees").

Based upon this Section, the provisions contained in the Deloitte Proposal listed on Attachment A to this letter and as set forth in the attached redactions should be withheld from disclosure by the State.

II. Proprietary Tools, Methodology and Approach.

The Protected Information in this category reflects confidential and proprietary patterns, methods, techniques and technical data, the confidentiality and proprietary status of which DTBA makes every effort to maintain.¹

In developing the Deloitte Proposal, DTBA was required to use its ingenuity and originality to determine how best to accomplish the State's objectives of securing a Fraud Abuse and Detection System (FADS). For example, the Deloitte Proposal reflects DTBA's overall proprietary and coherent approach to satisfying the State's objectives, including details regarding its proprietary fraud and abuse detection system solution and the implementation of such solution. The Deloitte Proposal includes an overview of the various solution components, features, and capabilities, including details regarding its provider peer comparison tool, case management system functionalities, and its reporting capabilities. The Deloitte Proposal also reveals DTBA's unique approach to conducting maintenance and operations services, system training and support, audits and investigations, and recovery of overpayments. In addition, the Deloitte Proposal includes proprietary details revealing DTBA's project management approach, project management plan, and proposed timeline. The Deloitte Proposal also contains DTBA's proprietary graphics, artwork sample reports, and sample dashboards. It also provides key details regarding DTBA's leading practices and past experience assisting other public sector client effectively manage data and improve programs across Medicaid systems through analytics, reviews, and investigations. These details have not been disclosed outside of DTBA's team except on a limited basis and only for the limited purpose of furthering the development of the underlying strategic approach.

Much of the substantive discussion throughout the Deloitte Proposal refers to DTBA's methodologies for this project. DTBA's methodologies and approaches are proprietary and are used repeatedly in its work. DTBA developed and continues to enhance and maintain these methodologies at considerable expense. The methodologies facilitate both efficiency and enhanced service quality, which give DTBA a significant competitive advantage in bidding on projects, both in the public sector and commercial arenas. The release of this information would do considerable harm to DTBA's competitive position. Finally, because these methodologies reflect the expertise and experience of DTBA, it is not easily replicated by a competitor, except through improper means. Accordingly, it is protected trade secret information and cannot be released.

This information has application well beyond the instant procurement and reflects DTBA's experience with similar projects. Accordingly, its disclosure would seriously undermine DTBA's competitive advantage by allowing competitors to have access to DTBA's ideas, processes, and methodologies that they would not have had or would have had to spend considerable funds to develop on their own. *See SMS Data Prods. Group, Inc. v. Dep't of the Air Force*, 1989 WL 201031 at *3-4 (D.D.C. 1989) ("proprietary technical information" in successful offeror's technical proposal is exempt from disclosure under the FOIA); *Landfair v. Dep't of the Army*, 645 F. Supp. 325, 328-29 (D.D.C. 1986) (same for "technical designs"); *Prof'l Review Org. of Fla., Inc. v. Dep't of Health and Human Servs.*, 607 F. Supp. 423 (D.D.C. 1985) (same for "review process with an outline of data capability and processes"); *Audio Technical Services LTD. v. Department of the Army*, 487 F. Supp. 779, 782 (D.D.C. 1979) (same for "design recommendations" and "design concepts including methods and procedures"). Accordingly, disclosure of this Protected Information would

¹ For example, DTBA routinely requires its personnel, teaming partners and subcontractors to: (a) sign non-disclosure agreements; (b) implement reasonable security measures to protect information at their offices and in their computer systems; and (c) limit disclosure of sensitive marketing and proposal materials to a select group of individuals on a strict need-to-know basis.

impair DTBA's ability to successfully compete for future work by relinquishing our approach to our competitors who may then fashion future proposals to utilize a similar strategy.

Based upon this Section, the provisions contained in the Deloitte Proposal listed on Attachment A to this letter and as set forth in the attached redactions should be withheld from disclosure by the State.

III. Past and Present Clients/Customers.

The Deloitte Proposal reveals several of DTBA's and its proposed subcontractors' clients, as well as provides contact information and details about the work performed for those clients. The identities of clients (and the information about the projects completed for those clients) and contact information are protected, confidential trade secret information. The release of the past performance material in the various documents would cause substantial competitive harm to DTBA, and is also, therefore, exempt from disclosure. Past performance information necessarily discloses the identity of a contractor's clients/customers, both in the private and public sectors. Indiana and many other jurisdictions have found customer lists to constitute protectable trade secret information. See *Ackerman v. Kimball Int'l*, 634 N.E.2d 778 (Ind. App. 1994) (customer lists and pricing information constitute trade secrets); see also *Infinity Prods. v. Quandt*, 810 N.E.2d 1028 (Ind. 2004); *Titus v. Rheitone, Inc.*, 758 N.E.2d 85, 95, LEXIS 1959, *22, 18 I.E.R. Cas. (BNA) 133 (Ind. Ct. App. 2001). Information relating to a company's customers is exempt from disclosure, because "disclosure of this type of information would threaten the competitive position of the submitter." *Audio Technical Services LTD. v. Department of the Army*, 487 F. Supp. 779 at 782 (D.D.C. 1979); see also *Fund for Constitutional Government v. Federal Trade Commission*, No. CA 79-0250, 1981 WL 2117, at *2 (D.D.C., July 10, 1981) (identity of customers and information concerning contracts with customers exempt). Further, this information contains technical details and methodologies employed by DTBA in performing other contracts, and, as discussed above, such information is exempt from disclosure.

The client information in the Deloitte Proposal contains a trove of valuable information. The clients' identities themselves are valuable, trade secret data. Additionally, the client contact information and the descriptions of the work performed for DTBA's clients constitute trade secret data. The client lists in these materials is not simply information related to a single or ephemeral event in the conduct of DTBA's business. Many of these clients are repeat customers of DTBA's services, and DTBA seeks to engage these customers for more business opportunities in the future. DTBA is actively working on ongoing business for some of these clients. Likewise, the descriptions of the work performed for these clients is not simply information about single, completed projects. DTBA often applies similar methodologies in projects for the same client or for different clients. The descriptions (coupled with the client identities and contact information) are a crucial part of DTBA's business formula. DTBA is seeking to protect traditional trade secret information: the client identities, contact information and descriptions of work processes that may be used repeatedly in DTBA's business of delivering quality services.

The client information that DTBA seeks to protect is confidential information that is not widely known outside of DTBA. These clients are not identified in documents that are disseminated widely nor are they made known on DTBA's internet website. Further, these clients and the details about the work performed for them are not known by all DTBA employees or others involved in DTBA's business.

The identity of DTBA's clients is very valuable information to DTBA and its competitors. DTBA is in the business of providing services to the particular clients that DTBA manages. The identity of these clients reveals important information about DTBA's capacities. DTBA's competitors can use such information to undermine DTBA's future efforts to develop business with new clients as well as maintain business relationships with their past clients. For example, if the client information discussed above was obtained by DTBA's competitors, then the competitors could make targeted "pitches" that highlight the competitor's differences with DTBA to those businesses and government agencies.

There are many other ways in which DTBA's competitors could make use of the valuable client and project information. For example, DTBA's competitors could use the client identities and contact information to attempt to obtain negative reviews of DTBA's work for those clients; such negative reviews could then be used against DTBA when the competitors submit proposals in competition with DTBA on future private and public projects.

DTBA has expended a substantial amount of time, effort and money to develop their relationships with the clients revealed in the Deloitte Proposal to the State. Without access to the client information contained in the Deloitte Proposal, DTBA's competitors would be unable to "properly acquire" that information. Therefore, as such client information would give DTBA's competitors an advantage, such information is protected from disclosure as a trade secret.

Additionally, the compilation of client names, contract information, project descriptions, and lessons learned constitute DTBA's demonstrated competence and qualifications to perform the services requested by the State. This collection of information, as a whole, would take DTBA's competitors significant time and effort to collect, and therefore disclosure of this information would certainly provide competitors with valuable insight on how to structure their qualifications for future bids.

Based upon this Section, the provisions contained in the Deloitte Proposal listed on Attachment A to this letter and as set forth in the attached redactions should be withheld from disclosure by the State.

IV. Pricing.

The Cost Proposal contained in the Deloitte Proposal reflects DTBA's costs to "manufacture" its product. DTBA does not sell goods; DTBA's product is the knowledge of its employees and their knowledge services. This information is not specific to the Deloitte Proposal; this information goes to the heart of DTBA's business of providing services. This "compilation of information" regarding the rates DTBA charges for the knowledge of its employees is used in every DTBA proposal, which includes proposals for jobs at private entities as well as government agencies.

This information—especially coupled with information available in the Deloitte Proposal regarding how DTBA staffs projects like the State project—constitutes the direct "formula" for DTBA's approach to staffing many different projects. This is not merely information as to what overall price DTBA would charge for the State's project, or what levels of staff it would utilize. This information would reveal DTBA's measured, focused approach for providing exceptional client services while maximizing revenue for DTBA. This information would be extremely valuable to a competitor and should be withheld as trade secret information and is clearly protected from disclosure as a trade secret. *See Ackerman v. Kimball Int'l*, 634 N.E.2d 778 (Ind. App. 1994) (customer lists and pricing information constitute trade secrets); *Orbitz v. Ind. Dep't of State Revenue*, 997 N.E.2d 98, LEXIS 25, 2013 WL 5630987 (Ind. Tax 2013) (if competitors have access to pricing information, they could possibly gain a competitive advantage by negotiating better rates with clients; and as such pricing is protected from public disclosure pursuant as a trade secret under the APRA).

While the public may have an interest in the aggregate price of a bid proposed to a government agency, there is no similar public interest in the hourly billing rates for particular employees or the specific fixed price for system design, development and implementation, technology, and maintenance and operations services. Similarly, there is no public interest in the estimated project or FTE hours. The aggregate price may reflect the costs to the government, but the hourly rates and specific fixed prices are actually costs incurred by DTBA in "manufacturing" its services and include staff time, travel costs, overhead, and other costs, including software, hardware, and contractor-hosted solution costs. The release of even one element of a cost structure has been found to result in substantial competitive harm, because release of such "separate pieces of this financial puzzle would enable competitors, who may somehow have gathered other pieces, to complete the picture." *Braintree Electric Light State v. DOE*, 494 F. Supp. 287, 290 (D.D.C 1980); *see also Sterling Drug, Inc. v. Federal Trade Commission*, 450 F.2d 698, 708-709 (D.C. Cir. 1971); *Timken Co. v. Customs Service*, 531 F. Supp. 194 (D.D.C. 1981); *Timken Co. v. Customs Service*, 491 F. Supp. 557 (D.D.C. 1980).

DTBA's costs and pricing information is very valuable to the company, and it would be very valuable to its competitors. The costs and pricing information in the Deloitte Proposal reveals a roadmap for successful staffing on projects. If a competitor was given access to the details of DTBA's costs and pricing used to calculate the bid submitted in the Deloitte Proposal, the competitor could "reverse engineer" DTBA's time and work estimates for each piece of the overall service package that DTBA has offered the State. By combining the employee hourly rate data with the information about the duration of each step of the whole project and the price for each step, an informed competitive company could calculate estimates of the type and duration of staffing used for each step of the project. These estimates would reveal the formula that DTBA employs when designing its consultation projects. This is not information that is limited to a single proposal; it is information that is ubiquitous throughout DTBA's operations. The Supreme Court of Indiana found in *Amoco Prod. Co. v. Laird*, 622 N.E.2d 912 at *918, LEXIS 152, 30 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1515 at *1519, 62 U.S.L.W. 2294, 128 Oil & Gas Rep. 484 (Ind. 1993) that "... information which can be duplicated only by an expensive and time-consuming method of reverse engineering, for instance, could be secret."

DTBA has invested considerable sums of money and amounts of time to develop its pricing and staffing expertise. Without access to the types of information about costs and pricing, DTBA's competitors would not be able to acquire or duplicate the expertise that DTBA has built. DTBA's pricing methodology is not known outside of the company except to those who are party to its agreements. The agreements are available and known inside the company on a need-to-know basis. Hard copies are maintained in restricted access files. Electronic copies are likewise restricted. Hence, this Protected Information amounts to trade secret information. See *Infinity Prods. v. Quandt, supra*.

Based upon this Section, the provisions contained in the Deloitte Proposal listed on Attachment A to this letter and as set forth in the attached redactions should be withheld from disclosure by the State.

V. Confidential Commercial and Financial Information.

In accordance with Ind. Code Ann. §5-14-3-4(a)(5), the Protected Information in this category reflects records that are "confidential financial information obtained, upon request, from a person. However, this does not include information that is filed with or received by a public agency pursuant to state statute." The term "confidential financial information" is not defined. However, in analyzing this exemption, Indiana has used the ordinary meaning of the term, finding that it excludes "information that is secret relating to finance." *Advisory Opinion 03-FC-59; Alleged Denial of Access to Public Records* by the Indiana Department of Administration. That Advisory Opinion went on to analyze the exemption in light of the similar Federal exemption holding that "... financial information that the submitting person would not customarily release to the public may be withheld from disclosure ... pursuant to Indiana Code section 5-14-3-4(a)(5)." *Id.*; see also 2003 Ind. PUC LEXIS 171, *8-9 ("Our Order recognized a distinction between the term "confidential financial information" found in Indiana Code 5-14-3-4(a)(5) and, effectively, the same term used in the federal Freedom of Information Act, at 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4). The distinction we noted was that 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(4) exempts both trade secrets and confidential financial information from public disclosure, while Indiana Code 5-14-3-4(a)(5) provides an exemption for confidential financial information only to the extent that the information is not required to be submitted to a public agency pursuant to state statute.").

The Deloitte Proposal contains information regarding DTBA's internal organizational structure, headcount figures, revenues, working capital, and assets and liabilities for the years 2018-2020. Such information constitutes DTBA's internal, confidential financial information. This information is not publicly reported and is not publicly disclosed. DTBA provided this information so that the State could evaluate its responsibility and its ability to perform the work required. Because this information is not publicly disclosed, DTBA would be disadvantaged if its competitors were made aware of this information.

Based upon this Section, the provisions contained in the Deloitte Proposal listed on Attachment A to this letter and as set forth in the attached redactions should be withheld from disclosure by the State.

VI. Conclusion.

For the reasons stated above, DTBA respectfully requests that the State protect from disclosure the categories of information discussed herein and as further identified on the enclosed Attachment A and the attached redactions, including its personnel and subcontractors, its proprietary methodology and technical approach, its customers/clients, its pricing, and its confidential commercial and financial information. Release of DTBA's Protected Information would impair DTBA's competitive position, undermine the integrity of the procurement process and may discourage DTBA and other qualified firms from submitting proposals in the future.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. In the event that the State disagrees with the information that DTBA has identified as confidential and exempt from public disclosure, please contact me in advance of the release of any such DTBA related information so that we can discuss the matter.

Sincerely,

DELOITTE TRANSACTIONS AND BUSINESS ANALYTICS LLP

By: 
Kevin Lane, Principal

Enclosures:

- 1) Attachment A
- 2) Redacted Deloitte Proposal

ATTACHMENT A
Confidential Information Designation

Deloitte Transactions and Business Analytics LLP requests the following provisions of the Deloitte Proposal be withheld from disclosure by the State pursuant to §§5-14-3-4(a)(4), 5-14-3-4(a)(5), and 5-14-3-2(t) of the Indiana Access to Public Records Act (APRA) and Burns Ind. Code Ann. §24-2-3-2. We have organized our list in accordance with the five (5) key elements as outlined in our letter dated November 13, 2020.

I. Identity and Qualifications of Personnel and Subcontractors

Section # / Page #	Description of Confidential/Trade Secret Material
2.2_Transmittal Letter Pages 1-3	Identity of Deloitte personnel, including names, email address, telephone number, fax number, and signature
2.3_Business Proposal_Attachment E Pages 1, 4-5, 8-11, 20, 40, 44-45, 47-49, 63	Identity and contact information of Deloitte personnel and its proposed subcontractors, including names and photos
2.3.9 Attachment A MBE/WBE Certifications Pages 1-8	Description of Deloitte’s proposed subcontractors, including names, contact information, signatures, qualifications, and percentage of subcontract. This section also contains the name, contact information, and signature of Deloitte personnel.
2.3.9 Attachment A.1 IVOSB Certifications Pages 1-4	Description of Deloitte’s proposed subcontractors, including names, contact information, signatures, qualifications, and percentage of subcontract. This section also contains the name, contact information, and signature of Deloitte personnel.
2.3.9 Subcontractor Letters Pages 1-2	Description of Deloitte’s proposed subcontractors, including names, contact information, signatures, qualifications, and percentage of subcontract. This section also contains the name, contact information, and signature of Deloitte personnel.
2.4_Overview Pages 3, 5 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16	Identity and experience of Deloitte personnel and proposed subcontractors, including photos and a proprietary organizational chart
2.4_05.1 Fraud and Abuse Detection Page 79, 91	Identity and experience of Deloitte’s proposed subcontractors
2.4_05.2 Audits and Investigations Pages 99-102, 113	Identity and contact information of Deloitte personnel and its proposed subcontractors, including names and photos
2.4_05.3 Overpayment and Recovery Pages 116, 124	Identity of Deloitte proposed subcontractors
2.4_05.4 Pre-payment Review Pages 127-130, 131-32	Identity and qualifications of Deloitte personnel and proposed subcontractors
2.4_05.5 Provider Education Pages 134, 136, 137, 138	Identity of Deloitte personnel and proposed subcontractors
2.4_05.6 MCE Plan Oversight Pages 144	Identity of Deloitte personnel and proposed subcontractors
2.4_05.7 Call Center Pages 149-150	Identity and qualifications of Deloitte’s proposed subcontractors

Section # / Page #	Description of Confidential/Trade Secret Material
2.4_06.0_Contractor Staff Pages 157-165	Identity, qualifications, and experience of Deloitte personnel and its proposed subcontractors, including names, contact information, photos, and a proprietary graphic depicting the proposed organizational chart
2.4_06.2 Additional Staff Pages 160-163	Identity and qualifications of Deloitte personnel, including photos
2.4_07.2_Project Management and Other Documentation Pages 174-180	Identity of Deloitte personnel
2.4_07.5 Security and Risk Mitigation Pages 198-199	Identity of Deloitte's proposed subcontractors/teaming partners
2.4_09 Service Levels and Performance Incentives Page 217	Identity of Deloitte's proposed subcontractors/teaming partners
Appendix B Vital Positions Resumes Pages 2-14	Identity, qualifications, and experience of Deloitte personnel and its proposed subcontractors, including names, photos, and contact information.
Appendix C Additional Staff Resumes Pages 2-13	Identity, qualifications, and experience of Deloitte personnel and its proposed subcontractors, including names, photos, and contact information.
Attachment C, Indiana Economic Impact Form Pages 1-4	Identity of Deloitte personal and proposed subcontractors

II. Proprietary Methodology and Approach

Section # / Page #	Description of Confidential/Trade Secret Material
2.3_Business Proposal_Attachment E Pages 2-3, 6-7, 17, 58	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach
2.3.5_Contractor/Terms Clauses Pages 2-25	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach
2.4_Overview Pages 3--9, 12-18	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach, including proprietary graphics and screenshots and the key features and benefits of the Deloitte approach,
2.4_04_Contractor Systems and Technology Pages 20-27	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach, including proprietary graphics and screenshots and the key features and benefits of the Deloitte approach,
2.4_04.1_Provider Peer Comparison Tool Pages 29-49	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach, including proprietary graphics and screenshots and the key features and benefits of the Deloitte approach, and dashboards
2.4_04.2_Case Management System Pages 51-58	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach, including proprietary graphics and screenshots and the key features and benefits of the Deloitte approach, and dashboards
2.4_04.3_Reporting Pages 60-65	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach, including proprietary graphics and screenshots and the key features and benefits of the Deloitte approach, and dashboards
2.4_04.4_Maintenance and Operations of Systems Pages 67-69	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach, including proprietary graphics and screenshots and the key features and benefits of the Deloitte approach, and dashboards
2.4_05.1_Fraud and Abuse Detection Pages 75-92, 94-96	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach, including proprietary graphics and screenshots and the key features and benefits of the Deloitte approach, and dashboards
2.4_05.2_Audits and Investigations Pages 99-113	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach, including proprietary graphics and screenshots and the key features and benefits of the Deloitte approach, and dashboards
2.4_05.3_Overpayment and Recovery Pages 116-124	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach, including proprietary graphics and screenshots and the key features and benefits of the Deloitte approach, and dashboards
2.4_05.4_Pre-payment Review Pages 127-132	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach, including proprietary graphics and screenshots and the key features and benefits of the Deloitte approach, and dashboards
2.4_05.5 Provider Education Pages 135-138	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach
2.4_05.6_Plan Oversight Pages 141-146	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach, including proprietary graphics and screenshots and the key features and benefits of the Deloitte approach, and dashboards
2.4_05.7_Call Center Pages 149-151	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach, including proprietary graphics and screenshots and the key features and benefits of the Deloitte approach, and dashboards

Section # / Page #	Description of Confidential/Trade Secret Material
2.4_05.8_Calculating Return on Investment Pages 153-155	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach
2.4_07.0_Contractor Administrative Duties Page 171	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach
2.4_07.1_Offices Page 172-173	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach
2.4_07.2_Project Management and other Documentation Page 175-184	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach
2.4_7.3_Meeting Requirements Page 186	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach
2.4_7.4_End of Contract Duties Page 188	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach
2.4_07.5_Security and Risk Mitigation Page 190-194, 196-199	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach
2.4_08.0_Transition from Current Solution Pages 201-213	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach
2.4_09.0_Service Level and Performance Incentives Pages 215-218	Deloitte's proprietary methodology and approach

III. Past and Present Clients/Customers and Experience

Section # / Page #	Description of Confidential/Trade Secret Material
2.3_Business Proposal_Attachment E Pages 2, 4, 8, 41-42, 52-56, 58-62	References to past and current Deloitte clients, including name of client organization, name of client contact, title, telephone number, email address, and a description of the services provided
2.4_Overview Page 4-5, 9, 12-16	References to past and current Deloitte clients, including name of client organization and a description of the services provided and other engagement-specific details Select project qualifications and references to past and current Deloitte clients, including a description of the services provided which showcases the breadth and depth of Deloitte's experience serving customers of similar size and with similar scope objectives.
2.4_04_Contractor Systems and Technology Pages 22-22, 25	Select project qualifications and references to past and current Deloitte clients, including a description of the services provided which showcases the breadth and depth of Deloitte's experience serving customers of similar size and with similar scope objectives.
2.4_04.1 Provider Peer Comparison Tool Pages 36, 43, 48	References to past and current Deloitte clients and project details
2.4_04.2 Case Management System Page 54, 55	Select project qualifications and references to past and current Deloitte clients, including a description of the services provided which

Section # / Page #	Description of Confidential/Trade Secret Material
	showcases the breadth and depth of Deloitte’s experience serving customers of similar size and with similar scope objectives.
2.4_04.3_Reporting Pages 63-64	Select project qualifications and references to past and current Deloitte clients, including a description of the services provided which showcases the breadth and depth of Deloitte’s experience serving customers of similar size and with similar scope objectives.
2.4_04.4_Maintenance and Operations of Systems Page 68	Select project qualifications and references to past and current Deloitte clients, including a description of the services provided which showcases the breadth and depth of Deloitte’s experience serving customers of similar size and with similar scope objectives.
2.4_05 Systems Training and Support Page 72	Reference to past and current client projects
2.4_05.1_Fraud and Abuse Detection Pages 79, 88	Select project qualifications and references to past and current Deloitte clients, including a description of the services provided which showcases the breadth and depth of Deloitte’s experience serving customers of similar size and with similar scope objectives.
2.4_05.2_Audits and Investigations Pages 100-101, 103, 105, 113	Select project qualifications and references to past and current Deloitte clients, including a description of the services provided which showcases the breadth and depth of Deloitte’s experience serving customers of similar size and with similar scope objectives.
2.4_05.3_Overpayment and Recovery Pages 116, 117, 122-123	Select project qualifications and references to past and current Deloitte clients, including a description of the services provided which showcases the breadth and depth of Deloitte’s experience serving customers of similar size and with similar scope objectives.
2.4_05.4_Pre-payment Review Page 129, 131-132	Select project qualifications and references to past and current Deloitte clients, including a description of the services provided which showcases the breadth and depth of Deloitte’s experience serving customers of similar size and with similar scope objectives.
2.4_05.5_Provider Education Pages 134	Select project qualifications and references to past and current Deloitte clients, including a description of the services provided which showcases the breadth and depth of Deloitte’s experience serving customers of similar size and with similar scope objectives.
2.4_05.6_Plan Oversight Pages 144	Select project qualifications and references to past and current Deloitte clients, including a description of the services provided which showcases the breadth and depth of Deloitte’s experience serving customers of similar size and with similar scope objectives.
2.4_05.8 Calculating Return on Investment Page 153	References to past and current Deloitte clients and project details
2.4_06.1 Vital Positions Page 158	References to past and current Deloitte clients and project details
2.4_07.5 Security and Risk Mitigation Page 192	References to past and current Deloitte clients and project details
2.4_09 Service Levels and Performance Incentives Page 215	References to past and current Deloitte clients and project details

IV. Pricing

Section # / Page #	Description of Confidential/Trade Secret Material
2.3.9_Attachment A MBE/WBE Certifications Pages 1-8	Details of proposal pricing as it relates to our scope of work including subcontractors
2.3.9_Attachment A.1 IVOSB Certifications Pages 1-4	Details of proposal pricing as it relates to our scope of work including subcontractors
2.3.9_Subcontractor Letters Pages 1-2	Details of proposal pricing as it relates to our scope of work including subcontractors
2.5_Attachment D Cost Proposal Pages 3-31	Details regarding our professional fees, including hourly rates and estimated hours that Deloitte deems trade secret.
2.5_Cost Assumptions Conditions and Constraints Pages 1-2	Details of Deloitte's pricing approach, including its cost assumptions
2.5_Cost Proposal Narrative Pages 1-3	Details of Deloitte's pricing approach
2.6_Attachment C, Indiana Economic Impact Form Pages 1-4	Details of proposal pricing as it relates to our scope of work including subcontractors

V. Confidential Commercial and Financial Information

Section # / Page #	Description of Confidential/Trade Secret Material
2.3_Business Proposal_Attachment E Pages 20, 49	Confidential Deloitte Financial Information
2.4_Overview Page 15	Confidential commercial information
2.6_Attachment C, Indiana Economic Impact Form Pages 1-4	Confidential Deloitte Commercial and Financial Information, including payroll figures, headcount, and FTE details.