



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

Confidential and Deliberative

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: May, 23, 2023

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

From: Robert Cohen, Procurement Specialist
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 23-72117
Case Management and Labor Exchange System

[Handwritten signature: RK 5/23/23]

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 23-72117, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Geographic Solutions, Inc. (Geographic Solutions) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Case Management and Labor Exchange System for the Indiana Department of Workforce Development (IDWD).

*Geographic Solutions has committed to subcontract 8% of the contract value to **Bucher + Christian Consulting, Inc. dba BCforward** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 11% of the contract value to **GuideSoft, Inc., dba Knowledge Services** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$3,900,000.00

The evaluation team received twelve (12) proposals from:

1. Accenture LLP (Accenture)
2. America's Job Link Alliance - Technical Support (AJLA-TS)
3. Atos IT Solutions and Services, Inc. (Atos IT)
4. Carahsoft Technology Corp. (Carahsoft)
5. Cloud SynApps Inc. (Cloud SynApps)
6. Deloitte Consulting LLP (Deloitte)
7. FutureFit AI (FutureFit AI)
8. Futures Inc. (Futures)
9. Geographic Solutions, Inc. (Geographic Solutions)
10. Incapsulate, LLC (Incapsulate)
11. Monster Government Solutions, LLC (Monster)
12. PAIRIN, Inc. (PAIRIN)

The proposals were evaluated by IDWD 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. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
5. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
Total: 90 (92 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 twelve (12) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Scoring

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

Business Proposal

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:

- References
- Experience Serving State Governments
- Financials
- Ability to Serve the State

Technical Proposal

For the Technical Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondent's proposal for Case Management in the following areas:

- Section 1.1 - Minimum Requirements
- Section 2.1 & 2.2 - Usability | Help Desk
- Section 3.1 & 3.2 - User: The Customer | User: The Staff
- Section 5.1 & 5.2 - System Architecture | Infrastructure and Database
- Section 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 11.0 - System Administration | Integrations and Interfaces | System Configuration | Data Conversion
- Section 5.7, 5.8, 8.0 - Security | System Auditing
- Section 5.9 - Reporting and Ad Hoc Querying
- Section 5.10 - System Upgrades, Ongoing Support, Maintenance
- Section 5.11 & 7.0 - Environments for State of Use | Solution Overview
- Section 9.0, 10.0, 12.0 - Implementation, Staffing, and Support | Testing Plan | Training Plan

For the Technical Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondent's proposal for Labor Exchange in the following areas:

- Section 1.1 - Minimum Requirements
- Section 2.1 & 2.2 - Usability | Help Desk
- Section 3.1 & 3.2 - User: Employer | User: The Staff
- Section 5.1 & 5.2 - System Architecture | Infrastructure and Database
- Section 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 11.0 - System Administration | Integrations and Interfaces | System Configuration | Data Conversion
- Section 5.7, 5.8, 8.0 - Security | System Auditing
- Section 5.9 - Reporting and Ad Hoc Querying
- Section 5.10 - System Upgrades, Ongoing Support, Maintenance
- Section 5.11 & 7.0 - Environments for State of Use | Solution Overview
- Section 9.0, 10.0, 12.0 - Implementation, Staffing, and Support | Testing Plan | Training Plan

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 evaluation team issued Clarifications to all Respondents prior to finalizing Round 1 scores. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores (Case Management)

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Accenture	31.75
AJLA-TS	23.65
Cloud SynApps	25.80
Deloitte	33.65
Futures	21.40
Geographic Solutions	36.30
Incapsulate	24.50
Monster	29.85
PAIRIN	25.95

Table 1A: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores (Labor Exchange)

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Accenture	31.45
AJLA-TS	24.80
Atos IT	19.15
Carahsoft	20.40
Cloud SynApps	24.75
Deloitte	31.25
FutureFit AI	23.70
Futures	23.05
Geographic Solutions	34.90
Incapsulate	23.95
Monster	30.30

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

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

- 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:
- $$30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}$$

(Lowest Respondent's TPC)

Score =

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores (Case Management)

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Accenture	6.64
AJLA-TS	24.67
Cloud SynApps	13.70
Deloitte	7.44
Futures	17.81
Geographic Solutions	30.00
Incapsulate	23.78
Monster	16.21
PAIRIN	18.45

Table 2A: Round 1 – Cost Scores (Labor Exchange)

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Accenture	4.89
AJLA-TS	10.53
Atos IT	3.55
Carahsoft	6.40
Cloud SynApps	5.77
Deloitte	6.85
FutureFit AI	20.57
Futures	30.00
Geographic Solutions	18.50
Incapsulate	15.54

Monster	8.34
---------	------

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 (MAQ + Cost) (Case Management)

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Accenture	38.39
AJLA-TS	48.32
Cloud SynApps	39.50
Deloitte	41.09
Futures	39.21
Geographic Solutions	66.30
Incapsulate	48.28
Monster	46.06
PAIRIN	44.40

Table 3A: Round 1 – Total Scores (MAQ + Cost) (Labor Exchange)

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Accenture	36.34
AJLA-TS	35.33
Atos IT	22.70
Carahsoft	26.80
Cloud SynApps	30.52
Deloitte	38.10
FutureFit AI	44.27
Futures	53.05
Geographic Solutions	53.40
Incapsulate	39.49
Monster	38.64

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist Geographic Solutions for Case Management based on Round 1 Total Scores. Futures and Geographic Solutions were both shortlisted for Labor Exchange based on Round 1 Total Scores.

E. Post Best and Final Offer Opportunity – Final Round Cost Scores

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the two shortlisted Respondents.

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents' BAFO Cost Proposals is as follows:

Table 4: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores (Case Management)

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Geographic Solutions	30.00

Table 4A: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores (Labor Exchange)

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Futures	30.00
Geographic Solutions	25.22

F. Total Scores

The combined final scores for the Respondents, based on Round 1 Management Assessment/Quality and BAFO Cost Scores are listed below.

Table 5: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores (Case Management)

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	80
Geographic Solutions	36.30	30.00	66.30

Table 5A: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores (Labor Exchange)

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	80
Futures	23.05	30.00	53.05
Geographic Solutions	34.90	25.22	60.12

G. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) and WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. IDOA requested updated M/WBE commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE forms were received from the Respondent, the total scores out of 90 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 6: Final Evaluation Scores (Case Management)

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	MBE*	WBE*	Total Score
------------	--------------	---------------	------	------	----------------

Points Possible	50	30	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	90 (+2 bonus pt.)
Geographic Solutions	36.30	30.00	5.00	5.00	76.30

Table 6A: Final Evaluation Scores (Labor Exchange)

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	MBE*	WBE*	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	90 (+2 bonus pt.)
Futures	23.05	30.00	-1.00	-1.00	51.05
Geographic Solutions	34.90	25.22	5.00	5.00	70.12

* See Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 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 viability 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. There may be four (4) one-year renewals for a total of eight (8) years at the State's option