



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: January 24, 2022

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

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

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-68650,
Contact Center as a Service (CCaaS)

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 22-68650, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Avtex Solutions, LLC (Avtex) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Contact Center as a Service for the Indiana Office of Technology (IOT).

*Avtex has committed to subcontract 1.5% of the contract value to **Bucher + Christian Consulting, Inc. dba BCforward** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 0.33% of the contract value to **aFit Staffing, Inc.** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), and 1.21% of the contract value to **3DGS, LLC.** (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$35,988,736.39

The evaluation team received twelve (12) proposals from:

1. AT&T Corp. (AT&T)
2. Avtex Solutions, LLC (Avtex)
3. Cincinnati Bell Any Distance Inc., dba CBTS Technology Solutions (CBTS)
4. Connex Services US Inc. (Connex)
5. ConvergeOne, Inc. (ConvergeOne)
6. Deloitte Consulting LLP (Deloitte)
7. Integration Partners Corporation (IPC)
8. Lumen Technologies, Inc. (Lumen)
9. Presidio Networked Solutions Group, LLC (Presidio)
10. Talkdesk Inc. (Talkdesk)
11. Ujet, Inc. (Ujet)
12. Voxai Solutions, Inc. (Voxai)

The proposals were evaluated by IOT, Key Stakeholder State Agencies, 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. Ten (10) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. Two (2) proposals were disqualified.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Consensus 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:

- Company Information
- References

Technical Proposal

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

- Scope of Work Section 2 and 3 – Proposed Approach
- Scope of Work Section 4.1, 4.4, and 4.5 – Solution Specifications and Requirements
- Scope of Work Section 4.2 and 4.3 – Functional and Technical Requirements
- Scope of Work Section 5 and 6 – Project Management, Staffing, and Training
- Scope of Work Section 7.1 to 7.7 – System Maintenance & Operation (M&O)
- Scope of Work Section 7.8 and 10 – Business Continuity, Disaster Recovery, and Performance Management
- Scope of Work Section 8 – Agency Upgrades and Enhancements
- Scope of Work Section 9 – Billing and Invoicing
- Overall Ability to Meet State Needs

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, Technical Proposal, and Pricing Questions – Attachment O. 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 and Pricing Questions are shown below:

Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
AT&T	22.00
Avtex	46.50
CBTS	24.75
Connex	30.00

ConvergeOne	40.50
Deloitte	28.75
IPC	25.25
Presidio	10.25
Talkdesk	19.25
Voxai	29.00

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 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
AT&T	30.00
Avtex	24.14
CBTS	11.41
Connex	23.32
ConvergeOne	23.07
Deloitte	24.67
IPC	10.24
Presidio	20.68
Talkdesk	26.11
Voxai	25.60

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.
AT&T	52.00
Avtex	70.64
CBTS	36.16
Connex	53.32
ConvergeOne	63.57
Deloitte	53.42
IPC	35.49
Presidio	30.93
Talkdesk	45.36
Voxai	54.60

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist Avtex Solutions and ConvergeOne based on Round 1 Total Scores.

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the two (2) 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 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Avtex	46.50
ConvergeOne	44.50

F. 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 5: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Avtex	30.00
ConvergeOne	27.25

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 6: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	80
Avtex	46.50	30.00	76.50
ConvergeOne	44.50	27.25	71.75

H. 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 7: 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.)
Avtex	46.50	30.00	0.00	1.25	0.00	1.00	78.75
ConvergeOne	44.50	27.25	0.00	0.63	0.45	1.00	73.82

* 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.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of four (4) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.