



STATE OF INDIANA

Mike Braun, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Commissioner's Office

Indiana Government Center South
402 West Washington Street, Room W462
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date:

To: Robert Cohen, Category Director – Major Procurements
Indiana Department of Administration

Signed by:

Robert Cohen
57B1B8F1A26C4DB...

From: Angie Alexander, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-86658
DHS Oncology Data Specialist

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-86658, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Registry Partners, Inc. be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the DHS Oncology Data Specialist for the Indiana Dept of Health (IDOH).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 5-year Contract Value: \$1,222,287.50

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. R.A.M. Healthcare Consulting Group, Inc. (R.A.M.)
2. Registry Partners, Inc.

The proposals were evaluated by IDOH 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 Owned Small 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. Both proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Scoring

The Respondents’ proposals were each evaluated based on their respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

Business Proposal

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:

- References
- Experience Serving State Governments
- Company Financials

Technical Proposal

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

- Services Scope for Data Quality Assurance, Data Quality Control in SEER/DMS
- Services Scope for Abstracting & Casefinding
- Services Scope for Education and Training Coordinator (ETC) services
- Project Timeline
- Security & Confidentiality
- Documenting and Reporting

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: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
R.A.M.	42.75
Registry Partners, Inc.	45.75

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

*

(Lowest Respondent’s Cost Amount)

(Respondent’s Cost Amount)

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.
R.A.M.	26.70
Registry Partners, Inc.	30.00

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.
R.A.M.	69.45
Registry Partners, Inc.	75.75

E. Post Clarification Responses – Second Round MAQ Scores

The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Clarification Responses. The scores for the Respondents after Clarifications remained unchanged and are as follows:

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
R.A.M.	42.75
Registry Partners, Inc.	45.75

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to both Respondents.

The cost scoring because of the Respondents' BAFO Cost Proposals is as follows:

Table 5: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
R.A.M.	25.79
Registry Partners, Inc.	30.00

G. Round 2 - Total Scores

The combined final scores for the Respondents, based on Round 2 Management Assessment/Quality 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
R.A.M.	42.75	25.79	68.54
Registry Partners, Inc.	45.75	30.00	75.75

H. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Buy Indiana (5 points) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. IDOA requested updated M/WBE and IVOSB commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE and IVOSB forms were received from the Respondent, the total scores out of 100 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy Indiana*	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.)
R.A.M.	42.75	25.79	0.00	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	65.54
Registry Partners, Inc.	45.75	30.00	0.00	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0	72.75

* See Sections 3.2.5, 3.2.6, and 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 all proposals to determine the viability 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. There may be one (1) one-year renewal for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.