



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: June 15, 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 22-70376,
Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) Maintenance and Operations (M&O) and Medicaid
Business Operations

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 22-70376, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Gainwell Technologies LLC (Gainwell) be selected to begin contract negotiations to manage Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) Maintenance and Operations (M&O) and Medicaid Business Operations for the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA), Office of Medicaid Planning and Policy (OMPP).

Gainwell has committed to subcontract the specified percent of the contract value to the subcontractors listed below:

1. 1.60% to **aFit (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE))**
2. 4.26% to **Briljent, LLC (WBE)**
3. 0.65% to **Critical Skills, Inc. d/b/a CSpring (WBE)**
4. 0.19% to **Mailing Solutions, Inc., d/b/a Midwest Presort (WBE)**
5. 4.42% to **Sahasra Technologies Corp d/b/a STLogics (WBE)**
6. 6.84% to **Bucher + Christian Consulting, Inc. d/b/a BCforward (a certified Minority-owned Business MBE)**
7. 0.64% to **Seven Seas Technologies, Inc. d/b/a S2Tech (MBE)**
8. 0.74% to **The Consultants Consortium, Inc. d/b/a TCC (MBE)**
9. 2.27% to **Esource Resources (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB))**
10. 0.84% to **Professional Management Enterprises, Inc. (PME) (IVOSB)**

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Proposed 5-year Contract Value: \$290,013,032.75

The evaluation team received one (1) proposal from:

1. Gainwell Technologies LLC (Gainwell)

The proposal was evaluated by OMPP 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 Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
Total: 100 (103 if bonus awarded)	

The proposal was 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. The proposal was deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Consensus Scoring

The Respondent’s proposal was evaluated based on their respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

Business Proposal (5 points)

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 (45 Points)

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

- Background (Overview and Section 5)
- Project Management (Section 6)
- Systems M&O, Data Management (Section 7 and 8)
- Reimbursement and Claims Processing (Section 9)
- Fiscal Agent and Accounting Responsibilities (Section 10)
- Member Services (Section 11)
- Provider Services (Section 12)
- Electronic Visit Verification (Section 13)
- Call Center and Service Desk (Sections 14 and 15)
- Billing and Invoicing, Corrective Action & Sanctions, End of Contract Turnover (Sections 16, 17, and 18)

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.
Gainwell	30.00

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

The price points on the Respondent’s Cost 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 Respondent's cost proposal is as follows:

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Gainwell	30.00

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

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Gainwell	60.00

The evaluation team elected to issue an invite to Oral Presentations to Gainwell. Cost and MAQ clarification questions were issued to Gainwell. The State also issued a target pricing exercise.

E. Post Oral Presentations – Second Round MAQ Scores

The Respondent's MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the responses to the clarification questions from the State, the Oral Presentation, and the written responses to questions asked during Oral Presentations. The scores for the Respondent after the Oral Presentation were as follows.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Gainwell	26.50

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

Gainwell did not reduce pricing after the target pricing exercise. The State then elected to issue a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) to the Respondent. Gainwell, again did not reduce pricing after the BAFO.

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondent's BAFO Cost Proposal is as follows:

Table 5: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Gainwell	30.00

G. Round 2 - Total Scores

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

Table 6: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (50)	Cost Score (30)	Total Score (80)
Gainwell	26.50	30.00	56.50

H. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondent in the following areas: Buy Indiana (5 points), MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. The total score out of 103 possible points was tabulated and is 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.)
Gainwell	26.50	30.00	0.00	5.00	5.00	6.00	72.50

*See Sections 3.2.5 to 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 the proposal to determine the viability to meet the goals of the program and the needs of the State. The team evaluated the proposal based on the stipulated criteria outlined in the RFP document.

If a contract agreement is reached, the term of the contract shall be for a period of five (5) years from the date of contract execution. The term of the contract shall include an implementation period of twelve (12) months followed by an operational period of four (4) years for a total of five (5) years. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of seven (7) years at the State's option.