



STATE OF INDIANA

Eric Holcomb, Governor

Department of Administration
Procurement Division

402 W Washington Street, Room W468

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

317.232.3053

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: November 6, 2020

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

DocuSigned by:

Lisa Erin Kellam-00061

39E1E85C2FF54BA...

From: Mark Hempel, Account Management,
Indiana Department of AdministrationSubject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 0000000748 (20-748),
Offender Management System (OMS)

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 20-748, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Business and Decision North America (PA), Inc. ("Business and Decision") be selected to begin contract negotiations to implement an Offender Management System for the Indiana Department of Correction (IDOC).

*Business and Decision has committed to subcontract 10% of the contract value to **BCforward** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 10% of the contract value to **aFit Staffing** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), and 4% to **Javit Consulting** (a certified Indiana Veteran-Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 5-year Contract Value: \$17,308,179

The evaluation team received seven (3) proposals from:

1. Abilis Solutions Corp. (Abilis)
2. Business and Decision North America (PA), Inc. (Business and Decision)
3. UXC Eclipse d/b/a DXC Technology Company (DXC)

The proposals were evaluated by IDOC 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 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. Those that adhered to the mandatory requirements were deemed responsive and moved to the next step in the evaluation process.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Consensus Scoring

The Respondents’ proposals were each 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:

- Attachment E, Sections 2.3.1 – 2.3.4 – Company Information and Financial Stability
- Attachment E, Section 2.3.6 – Respondent and Subcontractor References
- Attachment E, Section 2.3.9 – Proposed Subcontractors and Team Structure
- Attachment E, All Other Sections – Ability to Meet the Needs of the State

Technical Proposal (45 Points)

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

- Attachment F, Section 2 – Background and Experience
- Attachment F, Section 3 – General Understanding
- Attachment F, Section 4 – High Level Functional Requirements
- Attachment F, Section 5 – High Level Technical Requirements
- Attachment F, Section 6 – Development and Implementation
- Attachment F, Section 7 – Post-Implementation
- Attachment F, Section 8 – Maintenance and Operations (M & O)
- Attachment F, Section 9 – Project Management
- Attachment F, Section 10 – Staffing
- Attachment F, Section 11 – End of Contract Turnover
- Attachment F, Section 12 – Performance Measures, Corrective Action, and Payment Withholds

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 as well as responses to Clarification Questions. 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.
Abilis	27.46
Business and Decision	36.08
DXC	22.25

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, as clarified, is as follows:

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Abilis	12.51
Business and Decision	21.22
DXC	30.00

D. First Round Total Scores

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.
Abilis	39.97
Business and Decision	57.30
DXC	52.25

The evaluation team elected not to shortlist any of the Respondents based on Round 1 Total Scores.

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations/Demonstrations to the Respondents.

E. Post Oral Presentations/Demonstrations and Clarification Questions – Second Round MAQ Scores

The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentations/Demonstrations and the responses to the Clarification Questions. The scores for the Respondents after the Oral Presentations/Demonstrations and Clarification Questions were as follows.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Abilis	29.00

Business and Decision	40.38
DXC	19.96

The evaluation team issued a Cost Clarification, where the Respondents were instructed to revise their Cost Proposal to reflect the total costs of implementation and maintenance costs across the five contract years (base and renewals) as outlined in the RFP. Coupled with that request, the evaluation team elected to issue a Price Reduction Opportunity, where the Respondents were instructed to provide a Revised Cost Proposal based on the updated template.

F. Post Cost Clarifications and Price Reduction Opportunity – Final Round Cost Scores

The Respondents' Cost Scores were re-calculated based on the Cost Clarification and Price Reduction Opportunity. The cost scores for the Respondents after the Cost Clarification and Price Reduction Opportunity are listed below.

Table 5: Round 2 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Abilis	14.81
Business and Decision	22.57
DXC	30.00

G. Post Price Reduction Opportunity – Final Round Total Scores

The combined final scores for the Respondents (who were shortlisted after the Second Round) after the Price Reduction Opportunity are listed below.

Table 6: Post Price Reduction Opportunity - Final Round Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (50)	Cost Score (30)	Total Score (80)
Abilis	29.00	14.81	43.81
Business and Decision	40.38	22.57	62.95
DXC	19.96	30.00	49.96

H. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents 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. IDOA requested updated M/WBE and IVOSB information from the Respondents who submitted Revised Cost Proposals (stemming from the Price Reduction Opportunity). Once the final M/WBE and IVOSB forms were received from the Respondent, the total scores out of 103 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy IN	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.)
Abilis	29.00	14.81	0.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	58.81
Business and Decision	40.38	22.57	0.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	80.95
DXC	19.96	30.00	0.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	64.96

* See Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 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 of the proposed ability 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 two (2) years from the date of contract execution, with three (3) optional one-year renewals for a total of five (5) years.