



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: October 4, 2022

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

From: Teresa Deaton-Reese, Senior Account Manager,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-71455,
Fee for Service (FFS) Prior Authorization (PA) & Utilization Management (UM) Services

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 22-71455, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Keystone Peer Review Organization, Inc. (Kepro) be selected to begin contract negotiations to manage Fee for Service (FFS) Prior Authorization (PA) & Utilization Management (UM) services for the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA), Office of Medicaid Planning and Policy (OMPP).

Kepro has committed to subcontract the specified percent of the contract value to the vendors listed below:

1. 10.66% to **RepuCare, Inc. (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE))**
2. 8.17% to **Morales Group, Inc. (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE))**
3. 3.0% to **Axon Advisors LLC (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB))**

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$29,998,484.52

The evaluation team received four (4) proposals from:

1. Gainwell Technologies LLC (Gainwell)
2. Keystone Peer Review Organization, Inc. (Kepro)
3. Maximus US Services, Inc. (Maximus)
4. Telligen, Inc. (Telligen)

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)	45
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	35
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)

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 Respondents provided in the Business Proposal. These areas were reviewed to assess the Respondent's ability to serve the State:

- Company Information
- References

Technical Proposal (40 Points)

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

- Executive Summary (Sections 1.1-1.6)
- Contractor PA Responsibilities (Sections 2.1-2.4)
- PA Coordination Activities (Section 2.5)
- PA Implementation (Section 2.6)
- Utilization Management Functions (Section 2.7)
- Right Choices Program and Care Coordination Services (Sections 2.8-2.9)
- Unique Cases (Section 2.10)
- Contractor Requirements and Administrative Structure (Sections 2.11-2.12)
- Staffing (Section 2.13)
- Information Technology (Sections 2.14-2.16)
- Reporting (Sections 2.17-2.18)

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: Initial Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.
Gainwell	14.0
Kepto	41.0
Maximus	16.8
Telligen	16.8

C. Cost Proposal (35 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 35.
- If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:

$$35 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}$$

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondent's cost proposal is as follows:

Table 2: Initial Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 35 pts.
Gainwell	19.9
Kepto	18.9
Maximus	8.7
Telligen	35.0

D. Round 1 Clarifications – Post-Clarification MAQ Scores

Initial cost and MAQ clarification questions were issued to all four bidders. Scores did not change.

Table 3: Post-Round 1 Clarification Management Assessment/ Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.
Gainwell	14.0
Kepto	41.0
Maximus	16.8
Telligen	16.8

E. Round 1 Clarifications – Total Scores and Shortlisting

The combined Round 1 MAQ and Cost scores from the initial evaluations are listed below.

Table 4: Post-Round 1 Clarification Total Scores

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Gainwell	33.9

Kepto	59.9
Maximus	25.5
Telligen	51.8

Based on the Round 1 Total Scores, with IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist Kepto and Telligen. A second round of cost and MAQ clarification questions were issued to Kepto and Telligen.

F. Round 2 Clarifications – Post-Clarification MAQ Scores

A second round of clarifications was issued after the shortlist. The Respondent's MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the responses to the clarification questions from the State. The scores for the Respondents after evaluation of the clarification question responses were as follows:

Table 5: Post-Round 2 Clarification Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.
Kepto	43.5
Telligen	15.8

G. Post Best and Final Offer Opportunity – Final Cost Scores

The State elected to issue a Best and Final Offer (BAFO) opportunity to the shortlisted Respondents. Telligen lowered their price, while Kepto did not.

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

Table 6: Post-BAFO Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 35 pts.
Kepto	18.8
Telligen	35.0

H. Final Total Scores

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

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (45)	Cost Score (35)	Total Score (80)
Kepto	43.5	18.8	62.3
Telligen	15.8	35.0	50.8

I. 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. The total score out of 103 possible points was tabulated and is as follows:

Table 8: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy Indiana	MBE*	WBE*	IVOSB*	Total Score
Points Possible	45	35	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pt.)
Kepro	43.5	18.8	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	77.3
Telligen	15.8	35.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	6.0	66.8

*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.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of four (4) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.