



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: September 19, 2024

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

From: Teresa Deaton-Reese, CPPB, CPPO, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 24-78424, Enterprise Decision Support Solutions (EDSS) –
Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW) Scope

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 24-78424, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **Optum Government Solutions, Inc.** be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW) for the Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA).

Optum Government Solutions, Inc. has committed to subcontract 4.80% of the contract value to **eSense Incorporated** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)).

Optum Government Solutions, Inc. has committed to subcontract 8.20% of the contract value to **IT Transformers, Inc., (DBA Metamor Systems)** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)).

Optum Government Solutions, Inc. has committed to subcontract 5.20% of the contract value to **RCR Technology Corporation** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)).

Optum Government Solutions, Inc. has committed to subcontract 13.00% of the contract value to **Critical Skills, Inc., (DBA CSpring)** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)).

The initial term of four (4) years has an estimated contract value of \$61,780,724.88. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years, at the State's option.

The evaluation team received four (4) proposals from:

1. Deloitte Consulting LLP (Deloitte)
2. Gainwell Technologies LLC (Gainwell)
3. NTT DATA Americas, Inc. (NTT)
4. Optum Government Solutions, Inc. (Optum)

The proposals were evaluated by FSSA 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 Proposal and Technical Proposal)	50
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	30
4. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)

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. Four (4) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. None 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 and Technical Proposal (50 points)

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

- Company Information
- Experience
- References
- Proposed M&O Approach
- Enhancements and SDLC
- Project Management
- Training and Staffing
- Transition and Turnover
- Overall Ability to Meet the State's 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 and Technical Proposal. The evaluation team issued clarifications prior to finalizing Round 1 scores. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation Questions are shown below:

Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Deloitte	25.75
Gainwell	22.00
NTT	14.00
Optum	42.50

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

Price points on the Respondents' Costs were awarded as follows:

$$\text{Score} = \begin{cases} \text{If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among Respondents, then score is 30.} \\ \text{If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among Respondents, then score is:} \\ 30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})} \end{cases}$$

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.
Deloitte	28.84
Gainwell	29.98
NTT	30.00
Optum	26.31

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.
Deloitte	54.59
Gainwell	51.98
NTT	44.00
Optum	68.81

The evaluation team elected to invite the four (4) Respondents to give oral presentations: Deloitte, Gainwell, NTT, and Optum. Additionally, the evaluation team issued clarification questions and a request for Best and Final Offers (BAFOs).

E. Post Oral Presentations and Clarifications – Second Round MAQ Scores

The evaluation team issued clarifications to Respondents prior to finalizing Round 2 scores. Additionally, Respondents were invited to give oral presentations to the evaluation team. The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on oral presentations and the written responses to clarification questions. The scores for the Respondents after the second round of MAQ scoring are listed below.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Deloitte	25.75
Gainwell	22.00
NTT	14.00
Optum	37.75

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

The State elected to issue a request for Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the four 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.
Deloitte	28.58
Gainwell	29.35
NTT	30.00
Optum	25.96

G. Round 2 - Total Scores

The combined final scores for the Respondents, based on Round 2 Management Assessment/Quality Scores 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
Deloitte	25.75	28.58	54.33
Gainwell	22.00	29.35	51.35
NTT	14.00	30.00	44.00
Optum	37.75	25.96	63.71

H. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) and WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. IDOA requested updated M/WBE from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE commitment forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 92 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores*

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	MBE*	WBE*	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	90 (+2 bonus pts.)
Deloitte	25.75	28.58	5	6	65.33
Gainwell	22.00	29.35	5	5	61.35
NTT	14.00	30.00	5	5	54.00
Optum	37.75	25.96	6	5	74.71

* See Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE points.

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the ability of the proposed solutions to meet the goals of the program and the needs of the State. The evaluation 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. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.