



Michael R. Pence, Governor

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

## Award Recommendation Letter

Date: June 10, 2016

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

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

Subject: Selection Recommendation for Request for Proposal 16-05, Field Audit Software

### **Estimated Two Year Contract: \$295,970.00**

The evaluation team received proposals from one (1) vendor:

- MTW Solutions, LLC ("MTW")

Based on the evaluation of responses to Request for Proposal ("RFP") 16-058, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that MTW be selected to begin contract negotiations for the implementation of Field Audit Software for the Department of Workforce Development ("DWD").

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, this proposal was evaluated by the Indiana Department of Administration ("IDOA") and scored by the DWD evaluation team:

- Adherence to Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality (60 points)
- Price (30 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)

The proposal was 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 proposal was reviewed for adherence to mandatory requirements. The respondent met these requirements and was 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, experience with similar clients and government, 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: test of employer’s payroll records must be performed to verify the accuracy and completeness of reported payroll; performing quality checks; identification, reporting, and documentation of misclassified workers; audit management process including but not limited to the ability to identify the auditor, transferring, cancelling; audit expansion; reporting; account management; support and training assistive technology.

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

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

**Table 1: Initial MAQ Score**

Respondent	MAQ Score (60 Max)
MTW	44.08

## 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 where the total cost of the proposal remains the respondent’s total cost:

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

The cost scoring is as follows:

**Table 2: Initial Cost Score**

Respondent	Cost Score (30 Max)
MTW	30.00

## D. Initial Round 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 90 points are tabulated in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Initial MAQ + Cost Score**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score (60 Max)</b>	<b>Cost Score (30 Max)</b>	<b>Total Score (90 max)</b>
MTW	44.08	30.00	74.08

The candidate was deemed viable for contract award and moved forward to the final evaluation step. Prior to further evaluation, IDOA dispatched a request for the Best and Final Offer (“BAFO”). The updated scoring is reflected in Table 4 below.

**E. IDOA Scoring**

IDOA scored the respondent in the following areas using criteria published in the RFP: Minority and Women Business Participation (5 points each). When necessary, IDOA clarified certain Minority and Women Business Participation information with the respondent.

**Table 4: Final Overall Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score (60 Max)</b>	<b>Cost Score (30 Max)</b>	<b>MBE (5 max + 1 bonus)</b>	<b>WBE (5 max + 1 bonus)</b>	<b>Total Score (100 max + 2 bonus)</b>
MTW	44.08	30.00	-1.00	-1.00	72.08

**Award Summary**

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized the proposal 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 proposal based on the stipulated criteria outlined in the RFP.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of two (2) years from the date of contract execution. There may be additional renewals at the State’s option.

---

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