



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 15, 2023

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

From: Syed Mohammad, Procurement Consultant,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 23-74658, IN.gov Web Portal

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 23-74658, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Indiana Interactive, LLC dba Tyler Indiana be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide IN.gov Web Portal Services to all State entities.

Tyler has committed to subcontract the specified percent of the contract value to the subcontractors listed below:

1. 8.0% to **Engaging Solutions LLC** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE))
2. 5.0% to **Bravia Services** (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB))
3. 5.0% to **netlogx** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE))
4. 3.0% to **Roeing IT Solutions** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE))
5. 3.0% to **DSN** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE))

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$22,715,850.00

The evaluation team received three (3) proposals from:

1. Deloitte Consulting, LLP (Deloitte)
2. Indiana Interactive, LLC dba Tyler Indiana (Tyler)
3. Sapient Corporation dba Publicis Sapient (Sapient)

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

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Consensus Scoring

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

Business Proposal (5 points)

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

- All Business Proposal Sections

Technical Proposal (45 Points)

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

- Administrative
- Contract Transitions
- Foundational Requirements
- Project Management
- Web Portal
- Application Management
- Data Management & Sales

The evaluation team’s Round 1 scoring was based on a review of the Respondents’ 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 Consulting, LLP	34.00
Sapient Corporation dba Publicis Sapient	21.00
Indiana Interactive, LLC dba Tyler Indiana	37.50

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to all three vendors. Clarification questions were also issued to all three vendors.

C. Cost Scoring (30 Points)

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

$$\text{Score} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} [(20 \text{ possible points} * (\text{Lowest Total Bid Amount for Baseline Services Price} \\ / \text{ Total Bid Amount for Baseline Services})) + (5 \text{ possible points} * (\text{Total \# of} \\ \text{ Web Portal Support Elements} / \text{ Highest \# of Web Portal Support} \\ \text{ Elements}))] \\ \\ (5 \text{ possible points} * (\text{Lowest Total Bid Amount for Rate Card for Future} \\ \text{ Work} / \text{ Total Bid Amount for Rate Card for Future Work})) \end{array} \right.$$

The cost scoring results of the Respondents' cost proposals were as follows:

Table 2: Initial Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Deloitte Consulting, LLP	10.74
Sapient Corporation dba Publicis Sapient	14.27
Indiana Interactive, LLC dba Tyler Indiana	30.00

D. Combined Round 1 MAQ and Initial Cost Scores

The combined Round 1 MAQ and Initial Cost scores are listed below.

Table 3: Combined Round 1 MAQ and Initial Cost Scores

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Deloitte Consulting, LLP	44.74
Sapient Corporation dba Publicis Sapient	35.27
Indiana Interactive, LLC dba Tyler Indiana	67.50

After reviewing the combined Round 1 MAQ and Initial Cost Scores, no short-list was developed. All Respondents were issued a Best and Final Offer and invited to Oral Presentations.

E. Management Assessment/Quality: Post Oral-Presentation Scores

The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the responses to the clarification questions from the State, the Oral Presentations, and the written responses to questions asked during Oral Presentations. The scores for the Respondents after the Oral Presentations were as follows.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Deloitte Consulting, LLP	34.00
Sapient Corporation dba Publicis Sapient	22.25
Indiana Interactive, LLC dba Tyler Indiana	37.50

F. Pre-Oral Presentation Best and Final Offer – Cost Scores

The cost scoring results of the Respondents' pre-Oral Presentation BAFO Cost Proposals were as follows:

Table 5: Pre-Orals BAFO Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Deloitte Consulting, LLP	10.95
Sapient Corporation dba Publicis Sapient	14.37
Indiana Interactive, LLC dba Tyler Indiana	30.00

G. Post-Oral Presentation Best and Final Offer – Cost Scores

Following oral presentations, the state elected to request a second round of Best and Final Offers. The cost scoring results of the Respondents' post-Oral Presentation BAFO Cost Proposals were as follows:

Table 5: Post-Orals BAFO Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Deloitte Consulting, LLP	11.08

Sapient Corporation dba Publicis Sapient	16.24
Indiana Interactive, LLC dba Tyler Indiana	30.00

H. Combined Final MAQ and Cost Scores

The combined final scores for the Respondents, based on Round 2 MAQ and post-Oral Presentation BAFO Cost Scores are listed below.

Table 6: Final MAQ and Cost Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (50)	Cost Score (30)	Total Score (80)
Deloitte Consulting, LLP	34.00	11.08	45.08
Sapient Corporation dba Publicis Sapient	22.25	16.24	38.49
Indiana Interactive, LLC dba Tyler Indiana	37.50	30.00	67.50

I. 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. The total scores out of 103 possible points were tabulated and are 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.)
Deloitte Consulting, LLP	34.00	11.08	5.00	5.00	4.50	5.00	64.58
Sapient Corporation dba Publicis Sapient	22.25	16.24	0.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	53.49
Indiana Interactive, LLC dba Tyler Indiana	37.50	30.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	6.00	88.50

*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 evaluation, the State scrutinized the proposals to determine the viability of the proposed business solutions to meet the goals of the program and 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 four (4) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2) two-year renewals for a total of eight (8) years at the State's option.