Award Recommendation Letter

Date: March 31, 2017

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

From: John E. Helmer IV, Senior Account Manager
      Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Selection Recommendation for Request for Proposal 17-027
         State of Indiana Web Portal

Based on the evaluation of responses to Request for Proposal (“RFP”) 17-027, it is the evaluation team’s recommendation that Indiana Interactive, LLC be selected to begin contract negotiations to manage and enhance the State of Indiana Web Portal for the Indiana Office of Technology’s (“IOT”) IN.gov program.

Indiana Interactive, LLC is committed to subcontracting 8% of the total contract value to The Consultants Consortium (a certified Minority-Owned Business), 8% of the total contract value to Critical Skills, Inc. (dba C|Spring) (a certified Woman-Owned Business) and 3% of the total contract value to Rivera Group, Inc. (a certified Veteran-Owned Business).

Terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The State issued the RFP in two phases: RFP Phase One and RFP Phase Two. The goals of this approach were to:

- Ensure that the Respondent community had the opportunity to communicate and comment on IOT’s expectations and requirements;
- Allow potential Respondents adequate time to review IOT’s documentation in advance; and
- Ensure that the written requirements were clear so that potential Respondents had as much information as possible to submit pertinent business, technical, and cost proposals in RFP Phase Two.

RFP Phase One
An initial draft of the State of Indiana Web Portal RFP was posted on August 18, 2106, in which the State asked for responses consisting of comments, feedback and recommendations on the requirements.

RFP Phase Two
The final version of the State of Indiana Web Portal RFP was subsequently issued on October 04, 2016, requesting proposals to the decided requirements and used to initiate the respondent selection process.

The evaluation team received proposals from three (3) vendors for RFP Phase Two:
- CityBase, Inc. (“CityBase”)
- Indiana Interactive, LLC (“Indiana Interactive”)
- STLogics, Corp (“STLogics”)
According to the following criterions, 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 (40 points)
- Cost (35 points)
- Indiana Economic Impact (5 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 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. STLogics did not pass all minimum requirements and was eliminated from further consideration.

The remaining respondents met these requirements and were then evaluated based on their business proposals, technical proposals, and cost proposals.

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: respondent’s references and experience serving 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: Web Design and Marketing, Enterprise Web Content Management, Application Management, Web Technology Integration, Payment Processing, Project Management and Business Analysis, Quality Assurance and Testing, Security and Privacy, Infrastructure Technology and Services Background, and Program Management.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>MAQ Score (40 Max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CityBase</td>
<td>19.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Interactive</td>
<td>31.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Initial MAQ Score
C. Cost Proposal

Each section of the Cost Proposal was given a portion of the total cost points. Those sections were evaluated according to the Baseline or Relative cost scoring methodology, outlined below:

**Baseline Scoring (Total of -20 to +20 Available Points)**
Price for Base Services and Time and Material Engagements were measured against the State’s baseline cost for this scope of work. The respondents were measured only against the baseline for the total cost proposed in their respective cost proposal. Cost scoring points were assigned as follows:
- Respondents who met the State’s current baseline cost received zero (0) cost points.
- Respondents who proposed a decrease to the State’s current costs received positive points at the same rate as bid increasing cost.
- Respondents who proposed an increase to the State’s current cost received negative points at the same rate as bid lowering cost.
- Respondents who proposed a 10% decrease to the State’s current baseline cost received all of the available cost points.

**Relative Scoring (Total of 15 Available Points)**
Cost scores for Payment Processing were normalized, based on the lowest cost proposal evaluated. The lowest cost proposal received a total of 15 points. Other proposals received scores based on the following normalization formula where the total cost of the proposal remains the respondent’s total cost:

\[
\text{Respondent's Cost Score} = \left( \frac{\text{Lowest Cost Proposal}}{\text{Total Cost of Proposal}} \right) \times 15
\]

Once the evaluation of each area was complete, the composite were added together in order to determine the total amount of Cost points received for all combined sections.

The cost scoring is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Cost Score (35 Max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CityBase</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Interactive</td>
<td>14.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Initial Round Total Scores

The Cost Score was then combined with the MAQ 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 75 points are tabulated in Table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>MAQ Score (40 Max)</th>
<th>Cost Score (35 Max)</th>
<th>Total Score (75 max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CityBase</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>20.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Interactive</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>46.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were deemed viable for contract award and advanced to Oral Presentations.
E. Oral Presentation and Target Pricing

The Respondents were instructed to address specific topics, display their proposed solution and answer questions based on a uniform agenda. In doing so, respondents were asked to send knowledgeable representatives to discuss their proposals specific to proposal overviews, web design and marketing, dedicated staff, application management, payment processing - monthly invoicing, project management and business analysis as outlined in their proposals. 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 Respondent’s proposed approach to each section of the business proposal, technical proposal, oral presentation and answers to subsequent clarifications.

Prior to further evaluation, IDOA dispatched a round of target pricing, where Respondents were given the opportunity to improve pricing. The updated scoring from Oral Presentation and Target Pricing is reflected in Table 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>MAQ Score (40 Max)</th>
<th>Cost Score (35 Max)</th>
<th>Total Score (75 max)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CityBase</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>53.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Interactive</td>
<td>30.92</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>45.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were deemed viable for contract award and advanced to the final evaluation. Prior to further evaluation, IDOA dispatched a request for the Best and Final Offer (“BAFO”). The updated scoring is reflected in Table 5 below.

F. IDOA Scoring

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>MAQ Score (40 Max)</th>
<th>Cost Score (35 Max)</th>
<th>Buy Indiana (5 max)</th>
<th>Indiana Economic Impact (5 max)</th>
<th>MBE (5 max + 1 bonus)</th>
<th>WBE (5 max + 1 bonus)</th>
<th>IVBE (5 max + 1 bonus)</th>
<th>Total Score (100 max + 3 bonus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CityBase</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>62.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Interactive</td>
<td>30.92</td>
<td>17.38</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>73.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 four years (4) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two, two (2) year renewals for a total of eight (8) years at the State’s option.

John E. Helmer IV
Senior Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration