



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: August 24, 2023

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

From: Mark Hempel, Director of Account Management
Angie Alexander, Procurement Specialist
Kevin March, Procurement Specialist
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 24-75439
Security Audit Services

Estimated Contract Amount: \$78,050.00

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 24-75439, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that RubinBrown be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Security Audit Services for the State Lottery Commission of Indiana.

*RubinBrown has committed to subcontract 8% of the contract value to **Moore Accounting, LLC** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 11% of the contract value to **Axon Advisors** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), and 5% of the contract value to **Bravia Services, LLC** (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received seven (7) proposals from:

1. Bulletproof
2. CBTS Technology Solutions
3. JANUS Associates
4. MGT Technology
5. Plante Moran
6. Roeing IT Solutions
7. RubinBrown

The proposals were evaluated by the State Lottery Commission, 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 Owned Small 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. Six (6) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. One (1) proposal was disqualified.

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:

- General, Company Structure, DEI Information, Financial Information
- References
- Proposed Subcontractors
- Experience Serving State Governments, Similar Clients

Technical Proposal

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

- General Information
- Project Team Experience
- Project Plan/Approach
- Project Timeline
- Project Closeout/Completion

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.
Bulletproof	46.58
CBTS Technology Solutions	29.92
JANUS Associates	44.08
Plante Moran	28.33
Roeing IT Solutions	29.83

RubinBrown	40.92
------------	-------

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

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

The cost scoring :

- 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:

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Bulletproof	30
CBTS Technology Solutions	20.18
JANUS Associates	21.42
Plante Moran	22.8
Roeing IT Solutions	15.55
RubinBrown	21.91

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)

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Bulletproof	76.58
CBTS Technology Solutions	50.09
JANUS Associates	65.50
Plante Moran	51.13
Roeing IT Solutions	45.38
RubinBrown	62.83

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist Bulletproof, JANUS Associates, and RubinBrown based on Round 1 Total Scores.

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

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents' BAFO Cost Proposals is shown in Table 4.

E. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Buy Indiana (5 points) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. IDOA requested updated M/WBE and IVOSB commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE and IVOSB forms were received from the Respondent, the total scores out of 100 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 4: 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.)
Bulletproof	46.58	30	0	-1	-1	-1	73.58
JANUS Associates	44.08	22.49	0	2.5	-1	-1	67.07
RubinBrown	40.92	21.56	0	5	5	6	78.48

* See Sections 3.2.5, 3.2.6, and 3.2.7 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 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.

