



# STATE OF INDIANA

ERIC J. HOLCOMB, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Commissioner's Office

402 West Washington Street, Room W469  
Indiana Government Center – South  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2746

## Award Recommendation Letter

Date: March 4, 2022

To: Roxie Coble, Director Strategic Sourcing  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Traci Davidson, Sr. Account Manager  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: RFS 22-67238 Procurement and Travel Card

Roxie Coble

Digitally signed by Roxie Coble  
Date: 2022.03.04 12:07:45 -05'00'

**Estimated 4-year Contract/Rebate Value: \$1,064,418.28 (Revenue generating contract)**

Based on the evaluation of our team, we recommend **JPMorgan Chase Bank.** as the successful respondent of the RFS process for Procurement and Travel Card.

Minority, Women, or Veteran business participation was removed from this solicitation.

The evaluation team received proposals from two (2) vendors:

- U.S. Bank National Association
- JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.

The proposal was evaluated by IDOA and the evaluation team according to the following criteria established in the RFP:

- Adherence to Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality (50 points)
- Cost (30 points)
- Buy Indiana (5 points)

The proposal was evaluated according to the published process outlined in Section 3.2, "Evaluation Criteria, of the RFS. Scoring was completed as follows:

### A. Adherence to Requirements

All proposals were reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements. The Respondents adhered to the mandatory requirements and was then evaluated based on their Business Proposal, Technical Proposal, and Cost Proposal.

### B. Management Assessment/Quality ("MAQ")

#### Business Proposal

For the business proposal evaluation, IDOA and the evaluation team considered the respondent's ability to serve the State regarding the sections of the business proposal including:

- Respondent's Company Structure
- Contract Terms/Clauses

- References
- Experience Serving State Governments
- Experience Serving Similar Client

## Technical Proposal

For the technical proposal evaluation, the team considered the respondent's ability to serve the State regarding the following sections of the technical proposal:

- Card Program Requirements
- Card Set-up & Delivery
- Statements & Billing
- Payments
- Customer Service
- Training
- Reporting Requirements
- Online Platform System Requirements
- Data Privacy Security Specifications
- Implementation & Transition
- Rebates, Incentives, & Fees
- Marketing & Growth Program

The evaluation team's scores were based on a review of the Respondents' Business Proposal, Section 2.3, and the Respondents' proposed approaches to each section of the Technical Proposal, Section 2.4, as well as responses to proposal clarifications.

Results of the initial management assessment/quality evaluation are shown below:

**Table 1: Initial MAQ Score**

| Respondent | MAQ Score<br>(50 pts Max) |
|------------|---------------------------|
| US Bank    | <b>34.41</b>              |
| JPMC       | <b>33.50</b>              |

## C. Cost Proposal

Cost scores were normalized, based on the lowest cost proposal evaluated. The lowest cost proposal, relative to their total cost, received a total of 30 points. Other proposals received scores based on the following normalization formula shown below.

$$\text{Respondent's Cost Score} = (\text{Lowest Cost Proposal} / \text{Total Cost of Proposal}) \times 30 \text{ points}$$

The cost scoring is as follows:

**Table 2: Initial Cost Score**

| Respondent | Cost Score<br>(30 pts Max) |
|------------|----------------------------|
| US Bank    | <b>20</b>                  |
| JPMC       | <b>28.62</b>               |

## D. Short List

The initial Management Assessment and Quality Score in Table 1 (above) were combined with the Initial Cost Scores in Table 2 (above) to generate the total scores in Table 3. This was utilized to create a "short-list", as described in the RFP: (Section 3.2), to move forward for Oral Presentations. Since there were only two (2) respondents, both continued to be evaluated.

**Table 3: Pre-Short Scores**

| Respondent | MAQ Score<br>(50 Max) | Cost Score<br>(30 max) | Total Score<br>(80 max) |
|------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| US Bank    | 34.41                 | 20                     | 54.41                   |
| JPMC       | 33.50                 | 28.62                  | 62.12                   |
|            |                       |                        |                         |

Both respondents were asked to provide clarifications, an oral presentation to the evaluation team, and a best and final pricing offer.

The updated MAQ and cost scores after clarifications, oral presentations, and BAFO are reflective in Table 4 (below).

#### **E. IDOA Scoring**

IDOA then scored the respondent in the following areas –Buy Indiana (5pts) using the criteria outlined in the RFS, the total scores out of 85 possible points were tabulated, and are as follows:

**Table 4: Final Overall Evaluation Scores**

| Respondent | MAQ Score<br>(50 Max) | Cost Score<br>(30 Max) | Buy Indiana<br>(5) | Total Score <sup>1</sup><br>(85 max) |
|------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|
| US Bank    | 35.16                 | 20                     | 0                  | 55.16                                |
| JPMC       | 34.59                 | 30                     | 5                  | 69.59                                |

#### **Award Summary**

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized the proposals to determine the viability of the proposed business solutions to meet the goals of the program and to meet the needs of the State. The team evaluated the proposals based on the stipulated criteria outlined in the RFP.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of four (4) years from the date of contract execution. There may be 3 (2) two-year renewals for a total of ten (10) years at the State's option.

*Traci Davidson*

Traci Davidson  
Sr. Account Manager  
Indiana Department of Administration

<sup>1</sup> Totals may not foot due to rounding differences.