



STATE OF INDIANA
Eric Holcomb, Governor

Department of Administration
Procurement Division
Indiana Government Center South
402 W. Washington Street, Room W462
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: May 16, 2022

To: Erin Kellam, Deputy Commissioner
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Teresa Deaton-Reese, CPPB, CPPO, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-69462; Parent Locator Services for the Department of Child Services (DCS)

Parent Locator Services – Child Support

Based on the evaluation of responses to RFP 22-69462, it is the evaluation team's recommendation to selected LexisNexis Risk Solutions FL, Inc. to begin contract negotiations to provide the Parent Locator Services for the Department of Child Services – Child Support Division.

Parent Locator Services – Child Welfare

Based on the evaluation of responses to RFP-22-69462, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that West Publishing Corporation be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide Parent Locator Services for the Department of Child Services – Child Welfare Division.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated One (1) Year Contract Value:

- Child Support – \$277,720.00
- Child Welfare – \$38,634.00

The evaluation team received three (3) RFP responses for both Child Support and Child Welfare:

1. LexisNexis Risk Solutions FL Inc. (LexisNexis)
2. TransUnion Risk and Alternative Data Solutions, Inc (TransUnion)
3. West Publishing Corporation

The proposals were evaluated by the Department of Child Services and Department of Administration (IDOA) according to the following in the RFP:

Criteria

Points

1. Adherence to Mandatory Requirements	Pass/Fail
2. Management Assessment/Quality (Business and Technical Proposal)	45 points
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	35 points (plus 5 bonus pts)
4. Buy Indiana	5 points
5. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus point available)
6. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus point available)
7. Indiana Veterans Owned Small Business Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus point available)
Total: 100 (108 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. All respondents adhered to the mandatory requirements and were moved to the next step in the evaluation process.

B. Management Assessment/Quality (45 points)

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

Business Proposal (5 points)

For the Business Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondents organizational structure and financial stability as defined in Section 2.3 of the RFP. The evaluation teams scores were based on a review of the Respondents Business Proposal, Attachment E.

Technical Proposal (40 points)

For the Technical Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondents ability to effectively perform the scope of work in Section 2.4 of the RFP. The evaluation teams scores were based on a review of the Respondents Technical Proposal, Attachment F.

The evaluation teams Round 1 scoring was based on a review of the Respondents proposed approach to each section of the Business Proposal, Technical Proposal, and responses to clarification questions. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

Table 1a – MAQ – Child Support

Respondents Name	MAQ Score
LexisNexis	38.63
TransUnion	37.13
West Publishing Corporation	40.63

Table 1b – MAQ – Child Welfare

Respondents Name	MAQ Score
LexisNexis	38.63
Thomas Reuters	36.88
West Publishing Corporation	40.38

C. Cost Proposal (35 + 5 bonus pts)

Price will be measured against the State's baseline cost for this scope of work. The cost that the State is currently paying or its best estimate will constitute the baseline cost. Cost scoring points will be assigned as follows:

- Respondents who meet the State's current baseline cost will receive zero (0) cost points.
- Respondents who propose a decrease to the State's current costs will receive positive points at the same rate as bid increasing cost.
- Respondents who propose an increase to the State's current cost will receive negative points at the same rate as bid lowering cost.
- Respondents who propose a 10% decrease to the State's current baseline cost will receive all the available cost points.

If multiple Respondents decrease costs below 10% of the current baseline, an additional 5 points will be added to the Respondent proposing the lowest cost to the State.

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents cost areas follows:

Table 2a – Cost – Child Support

Respondents Name	Cost Score
LexisNexis	35.00
TransUnion	35.00
West Publishing Corporation	35.00

Table 2b – Cost – Child Welfare

Respondent	Cost Score
LexisNexis	-35.00
TransUnion	16.06
West Publishing Corporation	35.00

D. Initial (Round 1) Total Scores and Shortlisting

The initial Management Assessment and Quality (MAQ) Score in Table 1 were combined with the initial Cost Score in Table 2 to generate the combined initial scores in Table 3. The combined initial MAQ and Cost Scores from the initial evaluations are listed below.

Table 3a: Round 1 – Child Support - Total Scores

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.(+5 bonus pts)
LexisNexis	73.63
TransUnion	72.13
West Publishing Corporation	75.63

Table 3b: Round 1 – Child Welfare – Total Scores

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.(+5 bonus pts)
LexisNexis	3.63
TransUnion	52.93
West Publishing Corporation	75.38

E. Second Round Scores – Clarifications and BAFO Responses

The Respondents MAQ and Cost Scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on clarification and BAFO responses. The Round 2 scores for the Respondents after clarification and the BAFO responses were as follows:

Table 4a: BAFO Responses – Child Support

Respondent	MAQ Score (45)	Cost Score (35 +5 bonus Pts)	Total Score (85)
LexisNexis	37.69	40.00	77.69
TransUnion	36.19	35.00	71.19
West Publishing Corporation	39.56	35.00	74.56

Table 4b: BAFO Responses –Child Welfare

Respondent	MAQ Score (45)	Cost Score (35 +5 bonus Pts.)	Total Score (85)
LexisNexis	37.69	-30.86	6.83
TransUnion	35.94	16.06	51.99
West Publishing Corporation	39.44	35.00	74.44

F. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondent in the following areas: Buy Indiana (5 pts.), MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Indiana Veterans Owned Small Business Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. The total scores out of 108 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 5a: Final Overall Evaluation Scores – Child Support

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy Indiana	MBE	WBE	IVOSB	Total Score
Points Possible	45	35 (+5 bonus Pts.)	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+8 bonus pts.)
LexisNexis	37.69	40.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	74.69
TransUnion	36.19	35.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	68.19
West Publishing Corporation	39.69	35.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	71.69

Table 5b: Final Overall Evaluation Scores – Child Welfare

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 (+5 bonus pts.)
LexisNexis	37.69	-30.86	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	3.83
TransUnion	36.88	16.06	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	48.99
West Publishing Corporation	39.44	35.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	71.44

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed solutions 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 two (2) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of four (4) years at the State's option.