



STATE OF INDIANA

Eric J. Holcomb, Governor

Department of Administration
Procurement Division

402 W Washington Street, Room W468
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
317.232.3053

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: March 8, 2021

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

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

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 21-1950,
Statewide Victim Notification System (VNS)

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 21-1950, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Information Strategies, Inc., a division of Serenic Software, be selected to begin contract negotiations to implement a Statewide Victim Notification System for the Indiana Department of Correction (IDOC).

*Information Strategies, Inc. has committed to subcontract 3.81% of the contract value to **BCforward** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), and 2.20% of the contract value to **Roeing Corporation d/b/a Roeing IT Solutions** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 8-year Contract Value: \$4,562,261.03

The evaluation team received four (4) proposals from:

1. Appriss, Inc. (Appriss)
2. Business and Decision North America (PA), Inc. (Business and Decision)
3. Electronic Knowledge Interchange Company d/b/a EKI-Digital (EKI-Digital)
4. Information Strategies, Inc. (InfoStrat)

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. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment | 5 (1 bonus pt. available) |
| 5. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment | 5 (1 bonus pt. available) |
| Total: 90 (92 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 – References
- Attachment E, Section 2.3.9 – Subcontractors and Team Structure
- Attachment E, All Other Sections

Technical Proposal (45 Points)

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

- Attachment F, Section 2.4.1 – Key Proposed Project Personnel and Project Team Organization
- Attachment F, Section 2.4.2; Attachment F1 – Software Solution, System and Application Architecture, Software Hosting
- Attachment F, Section 2.4.3 – Project Approach
- Attachment F, Section 2.4.4 – Project Management
- Attachment F, Section 2.4.5 – Project Schedule, Milestones, and Deliverables
- Attachment F, Section 2.4.6 – Implementation Project Plan
- Attachment F, Section 2.4.7 – Testing and Quality Assurance
- Attachment F, Section 2.4.8 – Training Plan
- Attachment F2, General Tab; Attachment F3 Use Cases 1-5
- Attachment F2, Functional Tab; Attachment F3 Use Cases 6-17
- Attachment F2, Technical Tab

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. |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Appriss | 25.25 |
| Business and Decision | 29.25 |
| EKI-Digital | 27.90 |
| InfoStrat | 42.15 |

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. |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Appriss | 30.00 |
| Business and Decision | 5.40 |
| EKI-Digital | 12.30 |
| InfoStrat | 8.56 |

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. |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Appriss | 55.25 |
| Business and Decision | 34.65 |
| EKI-Digital | 40.20 |
| InfoStrat | 50.71 |

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. 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. |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Appriss | 20.40 |
| Business and Decision | 32.70 |
| EKI-Digital | 27.10 |
| InfoStrat | 45.15 |

Appriss was not deemed viable to move forward in the evaluation process and was eliminated from further consideration.

The evaluation team elected to issue a Price Reduction Opportunity, where the remaining Respondents were given the opportunity to improve their initial pricing proposal submitted with the RFP.

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

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

Table 5: Round 2 – Cost Scores

| Respondent | Cost Score 30 pts. |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Business and Decision | 13.08 |
| EKI-Digital | 30.00 |
| InfoStrat | 20.59 |

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) |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Business and Decision | 32.70 | 13.08 | 45.78 |
| EKI-Digital | 27.10 | 30.00 | 57.10 |
| InfoStrat | 45.15 | 20.59 | 65.74 |

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 forms from the Respondents who submitted Revised Cost Proposals (stemming from the Price Reduction Opportunity). Once the final M/WBE forms were received from the Respondent, 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 pt.) |
| Business and Decision | 32.70 | 13.08 | 1.25 | 1.25 | 48.28 |
| EKI-Digital | 27.10 | 30.00 | -1.00 | 5.00 | 61.10 |
| InfoStrat | 45.15 | 20.59 | 2.50 | 1.25 | 69.49 |

* See Section 3.2.5 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE 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 five (5) years from the date of contract execution, with three (3) optional one-year renewals for a total of eight (8) years.