



Michael R. Pence, Governor

Indiana Government Center South
402 West Washington Street, Room W469
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: December 8, 2015

To: Mark Hempel, Director of Account Management
Indiana Department of Administration

From: John E. Helmer IV, Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Selection Recommendation for Request for Proposal 15-17
Mail and Print/Copy Services

Estimated Annual Contract: \$20,105,083.72

The evaluation team received proposals from four (4) vendors:

- Novitex Enterprise Solutions (“Novitex”)
- Post Masters, a division of Anthony Wayne Rehabilitation Center (“Post Masters”)
- Ricoh USA, Inc. (“Ricoh”)
- Xerox Corporation (“Xerox”)

Based on the evaluation of responses to Request for Proposal (“RFP”) 15-17, it is the evaluation team’s recommendation that Post Masters be selected to begin contract negotiations for the implementation of Mail and Print/Copy Services for the Indiana Department of Administration.

Terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

According to the following criteria, which were published in Section 3, Proposal Evaluation, of the RFP, proposals were evaluated by the Indiana Department of Administration (“IDOA”) and scored by the evaluation team:

- Adherence to Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality (40 points)
- Price (35 points)
- Indiana Economic Impact (5 points)
- Buy Indiana/Indiana Company (5 points)
- Minority Business Participation (5 points plus 1 bonus point if certain criteria are met)
- Women Business Participation (5 points plus 1 bonus point if certain criteria are met)
- Indiana Veteran Business Participation (5 points plus 1 bonus point if certain criteria are met)

The proposals were evaluated according to the published process outlined in Section 3.2, “Evaluation Criteria”, of the RFP. Scoring was completed as follows:

A. Adherence to Requirements

The proposals were reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements. The Respondents met these requirements and were then evaluated based on the 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, financial stability, and team structure to support scope of work for this project.

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:

Billing, Reporting, Quality and Performance Factors, Technology and Equipment – General, Customer Service, Postage Factors and Cost Reductions, Escalators, Architecture Requirements, Technology and Equipment – Mail, Correspondence Mail Services, Courier Services, Inbound Mail Screening, Technology and Equipment – Print, Delivery Factors, Vended Print Management, Inventory Capabilities and Site Floor Plan

The evaluation team’s scores were based on a review of the Respondent’s proposed approach to each section of the business proposal, technical proposal and answers to subsequent clarifications.

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

Table 1: MAQ Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (40 Max)
Novitex	26.21
Post Masters	24.17
Ricoh	22.01
Xerox	23.80

C. Cost Proposal

Cost scores were normalized, based on the lowest cost proposal evaluated without security screening services included. The lowest cost proposal, relative to their total cost, received a total of 35 points. Other proposals received scores based on the following normalization formula where the total cost of the proposal remains the Respondent’s total cost:

$$\text{Respondent's Cost Score} = (\text{Lowest Cost Proposal} / \text{Total Cost of Proposal}) \times 35 \text{ points}$$

The Respondent’s scores were based on a review of the costs submitted, without security screening services included, in each applicable section of the Cost Proposal and answers to subsequent clarifications.

The cost scoring is as follows:

Table 2: Clarified Cost Score

Respondent	Cost Score (35 Max)
Novitex	23.11
Post Masters	25.63
Ricoh	28.45
Xerox	35.00

D. Step 2 Initial Total Scores

The Cost Score was then combined with the Management Assessment and Quality Score to generate the total score for this step of the evaluation process as described in the RFP. The combined scores out of a maximum possible 75 points are tabulated in Table 3 below.

Table 3: MAQ + Clarified Cost Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (40 Max)	Cost Score (35 Max)	Total Score (75 max)
Novitex	26.21	23.11	49.32
Post Masters	24.17	25.63	49.80
Ricoh	22.01	28.45	50.46
Xerox	23.80	35.00	58.80

The candidates were deemed viable for contract award and moved forward to the oral presentation step.

E. Oral Presentation

Respondents were instructed to address specific topics, display their proposed solution and answer questions based on a uniform agenda. In doing so, the Respondents were requested to send knowledgeable representatives to discuss their proposals specific to solution functionality, implementation, training, and post implementation support as outlined in their responses. Respondents were encouraged to send representatives who would participate on the project team as well as any key subcontractors.

The evaluation team's scores were based on a review of the Respondent's proposed approach to each section of the business proposal, technical proposal, oral presentation and answers to subsequent clarifications.

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

Table 4: Oral Presentation MAQ + Clarified Cost Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (40 Max)	Cost Score (35 Max)	Total Score (75 max)
Novitex	23.74	23.11	46.85
Post Masters	27.89	25.63	53.52
Ricoh	20.15	28.45	48.60
Xerox	21.20	35.00	56.20

The candidates were deemed viable for contract award and moved forward to the Workshop step.

F. Workshop

Respondents were given an opportunity to participate in a structured open forum with the Evaluation Committee to address a specific list of topics, where the State felt additional elaboration was necessary to gain better understanding of the attributes in each solution. The agencies described their respective needs and current operating environment, while providing answers to questions from each Respondent. Interviews were attended by the Evaluation Committee and their key advisors, representing each of the agencies involved in the selection. Respondents were highly encouraged to bring individuals who will participate on the project team and those considered subject matter experts.

Table 5: Workshop MAQ + Clarified Cost Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (40 Max)	Cost Score (35 Max)	Total Score (75 max)
Novitex	20.91	23.11	44.02
Post Masters	29.86	25.63	55.49
Ricoh	20.41	28.45	48.86
Xerox	17.78	35.00	52.78

The candidates were deemed viable for contract award and advanced to the final evaluation.

G. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas using criteria published in the RFP: Buy Indiana (5 points); Indiana Economic Impact (5 points); Minority and Women Business Participation (5 points each); and Indiana Veteran’s Business Participation (5 points). Minority, Women and Indiana Veteran’s Business Participation was evaluated utilizing the total cost of the solution, less postage costs. When necessary, IDOA clarified certain Buy Indiana, Indiana Economic Impact, Minority and Women Business Participation and Indiana Veteran’s Business Participation information with each Respondent.

Table 6: Final Overall Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (40 Max)	Cost Score (35 Max)	Buy Indiana (5 max)	Indiana Economic Impact (5 max)	MBE (5 max + 1 bonus)	WBE (5 max + 1 bonus)	IVBE (5 max + 1 bonus)	Total Score (100 max + 3 bonus)
Novitex	20.91	23.11	5.00	4.59	4.38	1.25	3.53	62.77
Post Masters*	29.86	25.63	5.00	3.65	6.00	5.00	6.00	81.14
Ricoh	20.41	28.45	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.38	5.00	73.24
Xerox	17.78	35.00	5.00	4.28	6.00	5.00	6.00	79.06

* As outlined in section 3.2.8 “Qualified State Agency Preference Scoring” of the RFP and pursuant to Indiana Code 5-22-13, Postmasters was awarded preference points for Minority, Women, and Indiana Veteran Business Enterprises equal to the Respondent awarded the highest combined points for these preferences as scored in this RFP.

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 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. Renewals of contract thereafter will be at the State's option.

John E. Helmer IV
Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration