



Michael R. Pence, Governor

Indiana Government Center South
402 West Washington Street, Room W469
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: January 20, 2015

To: Debra Walker, Deputy Commissioner Procurement
Indiana Department of Administration

From: John E. Helmer IV, IT Strategic Sourcing Analyst
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Selection Recommendation for Request for Proposal 15-23
Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT)

Estimated Six Year Contract: \$5,046,164.89

Based on the evaluation of responses to Request for Proposal (RFP) 15-23, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc. be selected to begin contract negotiations for the implementing of an online Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) system for the delivery of supplemental food benefits to eligible participants for the Indiana State Department of Health/Women, Infants, and Children (WIC).

Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc. is committed to subcontracting 11.01 % of the total contract value to CFA, Inc. (a certified Woman-Owned Business), 0.01 % of the total contract value to Fineline Graphics, Inc. (a certified Minority-Owned Business), 3.18 % of the total contract value to Koehler Partners, Inc. (a certified Woman-Owned Business) and 2.35 % of the total contract value to RCR Technology Corporation (a certified Minority-Owned Business).

Terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received proposals from two (2) vendors:

- Fidelity Information Services, LLC (FIS)
- Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc.

According to the following criteria, which were published in Section 3, "Proposal Evaluation", of the RFP, proposals were evaluated by the Indiana Department of Administration (IDOA) and scored by the evaluation team:

- Adherence to Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality (50 points)
- Price (40 points)
- Minority Business Participation (5 points plus 1 bonus point if certain criteria are met)
- Women Business Participation (5 points plus 1 bonus point if certain criteria are met)

The proposals were evaluated according to the published process outlined in Section 3.2, "Evaluation Criteria", of the RFP. Scoring was completed as follows:

A. Adherence to Requirements

The proposals were reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements. The respondents met these requirements and were then evaluated based on the business proposal, technical proposal, and cost proposal.

B. Management Assessment/Quality (MAQ)

Business Proposal

For the business proposal evaluation, IDOA and the evaluation team considered the respondent's ability to serve the State regarding the following sections of the business proposal: respondent information, financial stability, references, proposed subcontractors and team structure.

Technical Proposal

For the technical proposal evaluation, the team considered the following:

Compliance with key standards, operational specifications, and FNS requirements, project deliverables and expectations, project management, coordination with MIS contractor/interface with MIS system, hosting services/data operations center, customer support services, user acceptance testing (UAT), pilot testing, statewide implementation, system training, system change order process, system reports, vendor management, enablement and certification, UPC data collection activities, settlement and reconciliation, administrative functionality, card production and management, transaction processing, system operations and maintenance post-implementation, provision of carder readers to agencies/clinics, provision of stand beside POS devices to vendors, project close-out procedures, escrow and state responsibilities.

The evaluation team's scores were based on a review of the respondent's proposed approach to each section of the technical proposal and subsequent clarifications.

Results of the management assessment/quality evaluation are shown below:

Table 1: Initial MAQ Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (50 Max)
Fidelity Information Services, LLC (FIS)	39.25
Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc.	33.69

C. Cost Proposal

Cost scores were normalized based on the lowest cost proposal evaluated. The lowest cost proposal, relative to their total cost, received a total of 40 points. Other proposals received scores based on the following normalization formula where the total cost of the proposal remains the respondent's total cost:

$$\text{Respondent's Cost Score} = (\text{Lowest Cost Proposal} / \text{Total Cost of Proposal}) \times 40 \text{ points}$$

The cost scoring is as follows:

Table 2: Initial Cost Score

Respondent	Cost Score (40 Max)
Fidelity Information Services, LLC (FIS)	31.57
Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc.	40.00

D. Initial Round Total Scores

The Cost Score was then combined with the Management Assessment and Quality Score to generate the total score for this step of the evaluation process as described in the RFP. The combined scores out of a maximum possible 90 points are tabulated in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Initial MAQ + Cost Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (50 Max)	Cost Score (40 Max)	Total Score (90 max)
Fidelity Information Services, LLC (FIS)	39.25	31.57	70.82
Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc.	33.69	40.00	73.69

The candidates were deemed viable for contract award and moved forward to the final evaluation step. Prior to further evaluation, IDOA dispatched an updated Cost Proposal to account for a longer single contract term. The updated scoring is reflected in Table 4 below.

E. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the respondents in the following areas using criteria published in the RFP: Minority and Women Business Participation (5 points each). When necessary, IDOA clarified certain Minority and Women Business Participation information with the respondents.

Table 4: Final Overall Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (50 Max)	Cost Score (40 Max)	MBE (5 max + 1 bonus)	WBE (5 max + 1 bonus)	Total Score (100 max + 2 bonus)
Fidelity Information Services, LLC (FIS)	39.25	31.94	-1.00	-1.00	69.19
Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc.	33.69	40.00	1.25	5.00	79.94

Award Summary

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

The term of the contract shall be for a period not to exceed six years from the date of contract execution.

John E. Helmer IV
IT Strategic Sourcing Analyst
Indiana Department of Administration