



STATE OF INDIANA

ERIC J. HOLCOMB, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
Commissioner's Office

402 West Washington Street, Room W469
Indiana Government Center – South
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2746

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: April 7, 2021

To: Mark Hempel, Director of Account Management
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Abigail Chittenden, Senior Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Selection Recommendation for RFP 100-21-66665; Body Worn Camera Solution

Estimated Five (5) Year Contract: \$13,457,579.80

Based on the evaluation of responses to Request for Proposal (“RFP”) 100-21-66665, it is the evaluation team’s recommendation that **Axon Enterprise, Inc.** be selected to begin contract negotiations for the implementing of a Body Worn Camera Solution for the Indiana State Police (ISP).

Axon Enterprise, Inc. is committed to subcontracting 9.3% of the total contract value to **RCR Technology Corporation** (a certified Minority-Owned Business), 7.64% of the total contract value to **Certified Fraud & Forensic Investigations** (a certified Woman-Owned Business) and 3.02% of the total contract value to **Javit Consulting LLC, DBA under Chucks Construction Co LLC** (a certified Veteran-Owned Business).

Terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received proposals from three (3) vendors:

- Axon Enterprise, Inc.
- Digital Ally, Inc
- Utility Associates, 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 (30 points)
- Buy Indiana/Indiana Company (5 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)
- Indiana Veteran Owned Small 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. Digital Ally, Inc did not meet the mandatory requirements and was eliminated from further consideration. Axon Enterprise, Inc. and Utility Associates, Inc. met the mandatory 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:

- Attachment E, Sections 2.3.1 – 2.3.4 – Company Information and Financial Stability
- Attachment E, Sections 2.3.6 – References
- Attachment E, Sections 2.3.9 – Proposed Subcontractors and Team Structure
- Attachment E, Sections 2.3.12 – 2.3.13 – Experience Serving State Governments and Similar Clients

Technical Proposal

For the technical proposal evaluation, the team considered the respondent’s ability to serve the State regarding the following sections of the technical proposal:

- Attachment F, Sections 2.4.1.2 – Business Requirements
- Attachment F, Sections 2.4.1.3 – Technical Requirements
- Attachment F, Sections 2.4.1.3 – Software
- Attachment F, Sections 2.4.1.3 – Recording Storage and Management
- Attachment F, Sections 2.4.1.3 – In-Car Cameras
- Attachment F, Sections 2.4.2.1 – Service Program
- Attachment F, Sections 2.4.2.2 – Basic Plan
- Attachment F, Sections 2.4.2.3 – Warranty and Maintenance Requirements
- Attachment F, Sections 2.4.2.4 – Repairs and Maintenance
- Attachment F, Sections 2.4.3 – Training
- Attachment F, Sections 2.4.4 – Installation
- Attachment F, Sections 2.4.4 – Uniform Mounting and Alterations
- Attachment F, Sections 2.4.5 – Contract Administration

The evaluation team’s scores were based on a review of the respondents’ proposed approach to each section of the business proposal, technical proposal, and subsequent clarifications.

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

Table 1: Initial MAQ Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (50 Max)
Axon Enterprise, Inc.	34.50
Utility Associates, Inc.	32.50

C. Cost Proposal

Cost scores were normalized, based on the lowest clarified cost proposal evaluated. The lowest clarified cost proposal, relative to their total cost, received a total of 30 points. Other proposals received scores based on the following normalization formula where the total cost of the proposal remains the respondent’s total cost:

$$\text{Respondent's Cost Score} = (\text{Lowest Cost Proposal} / \text{Total Cost of Proposal}) \times 30 \text{ points}$$

The cost scoring is as follows:

Table 2: Initial Cost Score

Respondent	Cost Score (30 Max)
Axon Enterprise, Inc.	28.85
Utility Associates, Inc.	30.00

D. Initial Round Total Scores

The clarified 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 80 points are tabulated in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Initial MAQ + Cost Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (50 Max)	Cost Score (30 max)	Total Score (80 max)
Axon Enterprise, Inc.	34.50	28.85	63.35
Utility Associates, Inc.	32.50	30.00	62.50

The candidates were deemed viable for contract award and moved forward to the next evaluation step.

E. Oral Presentations and Clarifications

Respondents were instructed to address specific topics, display their proposed solution, and answer questions based on a uniform agenda. Respondents were encouraged to send representatives who would participate on the project team as well as any key subcontractors.

The evaluation team's scores were based on a review of the Respondents' proposed approach to each section of the business proposal, technical proposal, oral presentation, and answers to subsequent clarifications.

Results of the Round 2 management assessment/quality evaluation are shown below:

Table 4: Round 2 MAQ Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (50 Max)
Axon Enterprise, Inc.	43.50
Utility Associates, Inc.	31.75

The respondents were deemed viable for contract award and advanced to the final cost evaluation.

F. Price Reduction Opportunity – Final Round Cost Scores

Prior to further evaluation, IDOA dispatched a request for the Best and Final Offer ("BAFO"). The Respondents' Cost Scores were re-calculated based on this Price Reduction Opportunity. The cost scores for the Respondents, after the Price Reduction Opportunity, are listed in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Final Round Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score (30 max)
Axon Enterprise, Inc.	28.70
Utility Associates, Inc.	30.00

The respondents were deemed viable for contract award and advanced to the final evaluation. The final scoring is reflected in Table 6 below.

G. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the respondents in the following areas using criteria published in the RFP: Buy Indiana (5 points); Minority and Women Business Participation (5 points each); and Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Participation (5 points). When necessary, IDOA clarified certain Buy Indiana, Indiana Economic Impact, Minority and Women Business Participation, and Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Participation information with the respondents.

Table 6: Final Overall Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (50 Max)	Cost Score (30 Max)	Buy Indiana (5 max)	MBE* (5 max + 1 bonus)	WBE* (5 max + 1 bonus)	IVOSB* (5 max + 1 bonus)	Total Score ¹ (100 max + 3 bonus)
Axon Enterprise, Inc.	43.50	28.70	0.00	6.00	5.00	6.00	89.20
Utility Associates, Inc.	31.75	30.00	0.00	3.13	3.13	-1.00	67.01

*M/WBE and IVOSB points were awarded based on the criteria set forth in RFP Sections 1.21 & 1.22.

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 of five (5) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of seven (7) years at the State's option.

Abigail Chittenden, CPPB
Senior Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration

¹ Totals may not foot due to rounding differences.