STATE OF INDIANA

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
Commissioner's Office

Michael R. Pence, Governor

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

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: May 26, 2016

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

Mark A. Hempel

Digitally signed by Mark A. Hempel
DN: cn=Mark A. Hempel, o=Indiana Department of Administration, ou=IDOA Procurement, email=mhempel@idoa.IN.gov, c=US
Date: 2016.05.26 14:46:34 -04'00'

From: William Pierce, Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Selection Recommendation for Request for Services (RFS) 16-47,
Quality Assurance Consulting for the INvest Child Support Automated System

Estimated five (5) year initial contract length with up to five (5) one (1) year renewals
Initial Contract: $13,212,768.00

Based on the evaluation of responses to Request for Services ("RFS") 16-47, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **CSG Government Solutions** be selected to begin contract negotiations for Quality Assurance Consulting for the INvest Child Support Automated System for the Department of Child Services (DCS).

CSG Government Solutions is committed to subcontracting 8% of the total contract value to Engaging Solutions (a certified Minority-Owned Business), and 10% of the total contract value to CSpring (a certified Woman-Owned Business).

Terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received proposals from five (5) vendors:

- Cognizant Technology Solutions (Cognizant)
- CSG Government Solutions (CSG)
- Deloitte Consulting LLP (Deloitte)
- First Data Government Solutions, LP (First Data)
- MAXIMUS Human Services, Inc. (MAXIMUS)

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

- Adherence to Requirements (Pass/Fail)
- Management Assessment/Quality 55 points)
- Price 35 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 proposals were 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

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 regarding the following sections of the business proposal: References, Corporate Qualifications, Company Structure, Financial Statements, Integrity, Performance Standards and Contract clauses.

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: Governance, Quality Management, Quality Assurance, Quality Control, IV&V, QA Scope of Work, Project Management, Staffing, Independent Testing (optional), and DDI RFS Assistance (optional).

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. The scores were then normalized to 55 points.

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

Table 1: Initial MAQ Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (55 max)
Cognizant	**19.58**
CSG	**55.00**
Deloitte	**36.36**
First Data	**34.71**
MAXIMUS	**39.54**

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 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:

Respondent's Cost Score = (Lowest Cost Proposal / Total Cost of Proposal) X 35 points

The cost scoring is as follows:

Table 2: Initial Cost Score

Respondent	Cost Score (35 max)
Cognizant	**29.86**
CSG	**28.95**
Deloitte	**13.28**
First Data	**35.00**
MAXIMUS	**21.61**

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 RFS. The combined scores out of a maximum possible 75 points are tabulated in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Initial MAQ + Cost Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (55 max)	Cost Score (35 max)	Total Score (90 max)
Cognizant	**19.58**	**29.86**	**49.44**
CSG	**55.00**	**28.95**	**83.95**
Deloitte	**36.36**	**13.28**	**49.64**
First Data	**34.71**	**35.00**	**69.71**
MAXIMUS	**39.54**	**21.61**	**61.15**

There was a clear and natural break among the respondents. As such, Cognizant and Deloitte were eliminated. The other three (3) candidates were deemed viable for further consideration and moved forward to the next evaluation step.

E. Oral Presentation

Respondents were instructed to address specific topics and answer questions based on a uniform agenda. In doing so, respondents were requested to send knowledgeable representatives to discuss their proposals specific to the categories of QA Services 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 + Initial Cost Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (55 max)	Cost Score (35 max)	Total Score (90 max)
CSG	**55.00**	**20.48**	**75.48**
First Data	**19.98**	**35.00**	**54.98**
MAXIMUS	**46.67**	**20.65**	**67.32**

There was a clear and natural break among the respondents. As such, First Data was eliminated.

The remaining two (2) respondents were deemed viable for contract award and advanced to the final evaluation. Prior to further evaluation, IDOA dispatched a request for the Best and Final Offer ("BAFO"). The updated scoring is reflected in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Demonstration Presentation MAQ + Clarified Cost Score

Respondent	MAQ Score (55 max)	Cost Score (35 max)	Total Score (75 max)
CSG	**55.00**	**31.01**	**86.01**
MAXIMUS	**46.67**	**35.00**	**81.67**

F. IDOA Scoring

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

Table 6: Final Overall Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score (55 max)	Cost Score (35 max)	MBE (5 max + 1 bonus)	WBE (5 max + 1 bonus)	Total Score (100 max + 2 bonus)
CSG	**55.00**	**31.01**	**5.00**	**6.00**	**97.01**
MAXIMUS	**46.67**	**35.00**	**5.00**	**5.00**	**91.67**

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 RFS.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of five (5) years from the date of contract execution. There may be five (5) one-year renewals for a total of ten (10) years at the State's option.

William Pierce

Digitally signed by William Pierce
DN: cn=William Pierce, o=Department of Administration, ou=IDOA, email=bpierce@idoa.in.gov, c=US
Date: 2016.05.26 09:06:07 -04'00'

William Pierce
Account Manager
Indiana Department of Administration