



# STATE OF INDIANA

## DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Commissioner's Office

Mike Braun, Governor

Indiana Government Center South  
402 West Washington Street, Room W462  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

### Award Recommendation Letter

Date: September 25, 2026

To: Muneer Alam, Category Director – Professional Services  
Indiana Department of Administration

Signed by:

*Muneer Alam*

393756D3FC774B4...

From: Jonathan Huth, Category Director – Health and Human Services  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-87448, Medical Operations Coordination Center

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-87448, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that the following vendors be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Medical Operations Coordination Center for the Indiana Department of Health (IDOH):

Patient Flow Innovations  
Collaborative Fusion, Inc  
Communicare Technology

**This award recommendation is conditioned upon successful finalization of a contract between the State and Patient Flow Innovations, Collaborative Fusion, Inc, and Communicare Technology within fifteen (15) calendar days. If the State and Patient Flow Innovations, Collaborative Fusion, Inc, and Communicare Technology fail to reach an agreement on contract terms in a timely manner, the State may choose to withdraw this award recommendation and may select alternative respondents.**

*Patient Flow Innovations has committed to subcontract 52% of the contract value to Bravia Services (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Maximum five (5)-year contract value:

Patient Flow Innovations: \$26,362,844.00

Collaborative Fusion, Inc: \$3,698,932.00

Communicare Technology: \$11,629,000.00

The evaluation team received nine (9) proposals from:

1. Ambulance Management Services LTD
2. Collaborative Fusion, Inc.

3. Communicare Technology
4. Parkview Hospital Inc
5. Patient Flow Innovations
6. Professional Management Enterprises
7. Regenstrief
8. Syra Health
9. Teletracking Technologies

The proposals were evaluated by IDOH 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. Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment | 5 (1 bonus pt. available) |
| Total: 90 (91 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. Nine (9) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. No proposals were 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 Respondent's proposal in the following areas:

- References
- Company Financials
- Experience Serving State Governments

## **Technical Proposal**

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

Services:

- Minimum Requirements
- General Requirements and Definitions
- Executive Summary
- Background and Experience
- MOCC Advisory Committee
- Workforce and Staffing
- IT/Equipment Advances
- Appropriate Care Availability
- Care Continuum Expansion
- Data and Reporting
- Collaboration and Engagement
- Implementation
- Training
- Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery
- Project Management
- Key Performance Indicators
- Contract Turnover and Sustainability
- Scope of Work Synergy

System:

- Experience
- General Requirements and Definitions
- Executive Summary
- Project Management and Staffing
- System Implementation
- Maintenance and Operations

- Essential Elements of Information
- User Experience and Functional Requirements
- Security and Compliance
- Testing and Quality Assurance
- Application Programming Interface (API) and Integration Capabilities
- Data Submission and Governance
- Offline Functionality and Extended Downtime
- User Support and Training
- Additional Considerations
- StateRAMP and GovRAMP
- Issue Resolution
- System Transition and Turnover
- Key Performance Indicators
- Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery

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

**Table 1a: Round 1 – Services Management Assessment/Quality Scores**

| <b>Respondent</b>                   | <b>MAQ Score<br/>50 pts.</b> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Ambulance Management Services LTD   | 17.11                        |
| Parkview Hospital Inc               | 30.44                        |
| Patient Flow Innovations            | 36.44                        |
| Professional Management Enterprises | 19.78                        |
| Regenstrief                         | 30.67                        |
| Syra Health                         | 15.11                        |

**Table 1b: Round 1 – System Management Assessment/Quality Scores**

| <b>Respondent</b>                 | <b>MAQ Score<br/>50 pts.</b> |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Ambulance Management Services LTD | 10.67                        |
| Collaborative Fusion, Inc         | 27.89                        |
| Communicare Technology            | 29.44                        |
| Parkview Hospital, Inc            | 21.56                        |
| Regenstrief                       | 18.67                        |
| Teletracking Technologies         | 18.67                        |

**C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)**

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

Score =

- 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:

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

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

**Table 2a: Round 1 – Services Cost Scores**

| <b>Respondent</b>                   | <b>Cost Score<br/>30 pts.</b> |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Ambulance Management Services LTD   | 30.00                         |
| Parkview Hospital Inc               | 12.37                         |
| Patient Flow Innovations            | 13.97                         |
| Professional Management Enterprises | 29.68                         |

|             |       |
|-------------|-------|
| Regenstrief | 16.07 |
| Syra Health | 14.49 |

**Table 2b: Round 1 – System Cost Scores**

| <b>Respondent</b>                 | <b>Cost Score<br/>30 pts.</b> |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Ambulance Management Services LTD | 6.46                          |
| Collaborative Fusion, Inc         | 30.00                         |
| Communicare Technology            | 9.54                          |
| Parkview Hospital, Inc            | 5.50                          |
| Regenstrief                       | 2.73                          |
| Teletracking Technologies         | 2.80                          |

**D. First Round Total Scores and Shortlisting**

The combined Round 1 MAQ and Cost scores from the initial evaluations are listed below.

**Table 3a: Round 1 – Services Total Scores (MAQ + Cost)**

| <b>Respondent</b>                   | <b>Total Score<br/>80 pts.</b> |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Ambulance Management Services LTD   | 47.11                          |
| Parkview Hospital Inc               | 42.81                          |
| Patient Flow Innovations            | 50.41                          |
| Professional Management Enterprises | 49.46                          |
| Regenstrief                         | 46.74                          |
| Syra Health                         | 29.60                          |

**Table 3b: Round 1 – System Total Scores (MAQ + Cost)**

| <b>Respondent</b>                 | <b>Total Score<br/>80 pts.</b> |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Ambulance Management Services LTD | 17.13                          |
| Collaborative Fusion, Inc         | 57.89                          |
| Communicare Technology            | 38.98                          |
| Parkview Hospital, Inc            | 27.06                          |
| Regenstrief                       | 21.40                          |
| Teletracking Technologies         | 21.47                          |

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist the following vendors based on Round 1 Total Scores:

- Parkview Hospital Inc
- Patient Flow Innovations
- Regenstrief
- Collaborative Fusion, Inc
- Communicare Technology

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the five (5) shortlisted Respondents.

#### **E. Post Oral Presentations – Second Round MAQ Scores**

The Respondents' (who were shortlisted after the First Round) MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentations and the written responses to questions asked during Oral Presentations. The scores for the Respondents (who were shortlisted after the First Round) after the Oral Presentations were as follows.

**Table 4a: Round 2 – Services Management Assessment/Quality Scores**

| <b>Respondent</b>        | <b>MAQ Score<br/>50 pts.</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Parkview Hospital Inc    | 30.44                        |
| Patient Flow Innovations | 36.44                        |
| Regenstrief              | 30.67                        |

**Table 4b: Round 2 – System Management Assessment/Quality Scores**

| <b>Respondent</b>         | <b>MAQ Score<br/>50 pts.</b> |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Collaborative Fusion, Inc | 27.89                        |
| Communicare Technology    | 29.44                        |
| Parkview Hospital, Inc    | 21.56                        |
| Regenstrief               | 18.67                        |

**F. Post Best and Final Offer Opportunity – Final Round Cost Scores**

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

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

**Table 5a: Round 2 – Services BAFO Cost Scores**

| <b>Respondent</b>        | <b>Cost Score<br/>30 pts.</b> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Parkview Hospital Inc    | 23.10                         |
| Patient Flow Innovations | 26.08                         |
| Regenstrief              | 30.00                         |

**Table 5b: Round 2 – System BAFO Cost Scores**

| <b>Respondent</b>         | <b>Cost Score<br/>30 pts.</b> |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Collaborative Fusion, Inc | 30.00                         |
| Communicare Technology    | 9.54                          |
| Parkview Hospital, Inc    | 5.50                          |
| Regenstrief               | 2.73                          |

## G. Round 2 - Total Scores

The combined final scores for the Respondents, based on Round 2 Management Assessment/Quality and BAFO Cost Scores are listed below.

**Table 6a: Round 2 – Services Evaluation Scores**

| <b>Respondent</b>        | <b>MAQ Score</b> | <b>Cost Score</b> | <b>Total Score</b> |
|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Points Possible</b>   | <b>50</b>        | <b>30</b>         | <b>80</b>          |
| Parkview Hospital Inc    | 30.44            | 23.10             | 53.54              |
| Patient Flow Innovations | 36.44            | 26.08             | 62.52              |
| Regenstrief              | 30.67            | 30.00             | 60.67              |

**Table 6b: Round 2 – System Evaluation Scores**

| <b>Respondent</b>         | <b>MAQ Score</b> | <b>Cost Score</b> | <b>Total Score</b> |
|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Points Possible</b>    | <b>50</b>        | <b>30</b>         | <b>80</b>          |
| Collaborative Fusion, Inc | 27.89            | 30.00             | 57.89              |
| Communicare Technology    | 29.44            | 9.54              | 38.98              |
| Parkview Hospital, Inc    | 21.56            | 5.50              | 27.06              |
| Regenstrief               | 18.67            | 2.73              | 21.40              |

## H. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) and Buy Indiana (5 points) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. IDOA requested updated IVOSB commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final IVOSB forms were received from the Respondent, the total scores out of 90 possible points (91 with bonus) were tabulated and are as follows:

**Table 7a: Services Final Evaluation Scores**

| <b>Respondent</b>        | <b>MAQ Score</b> | <b>Cost Score</b> | <b>Buy Indiana*</b> | <b>IVOSB*</b>           | <b>Total Score</b>       |
|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Points Possible</b>   | <b>50</b>        | <b>30</b>         | <b>5</b>            | <b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b> | <b>90 (+1 bonus pt.)</b> |
| Parkview Hospital Inc    | 30.44            | 23.10             | 5.00                | -1.00                   | 57.54                    |
| Patient Flow Innovations | 36.44            | 26.08             | 0.00                | 6.00                    | 68.52                    |
| Regenstrief              | 30.67            | 30.00             | 0.00                | -1.00                   | 59.67                    |

**Table 7b: System Final Evaluation Scores**

| <b>Respondent</b>         | <b>MAQ Score</b> | <b>Cost Score</b> | <b>Buy Indiana*</b> | <b>IVOSB*</b>           | <b>Total Score</b>       |
|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Points Possible</b>    | <b>50</b>        | <b>30</b>         | <b>5</b>            | <b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b> | <b>90 (+1 bonus pt.)</b> |
| Collaborative Fusion, Inc | 27.89            | 30.00             | 0.00                | -1.00                   | 56.89                    |
| Communicare Technology    | 29.44            | 9.54              | 0.00                | -1.00                   | 37.98                    |
| Parkview Hospital, Inc    | 21.56            | 5.50              | 5.00                | -1.00                   | 31.06                    |
| Regenstrief               | 18.67            | 2.73              | 0.00                | 6.00                    | 27.40                    |

\* See Sections 3.2.5 of the RFP for information on available 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.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of five (5) years from the date of contract execution.