



STATE OF INDIANA  
Eric Holcomb, Governor

Department of Administration  
Procurement Division  
402 W Washington Street, Room W468  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204  
317.232.3053

### Award Recommendation Letter

Date: August 11, 2022

To: Erin Kellam, Deputy Commissioner *Mark Hempel*, for  
Indiana Department of Administration

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

Subject: Selection of RFP 22-71264: Document Center Services

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 22-71264, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **Phoenix Data Corporation** be selected to begin contract negotiations to provide Document Center Services for the Indiana Family & Social Services Administration (FSSA), Division of Family Resources (DFR).

Phoenix Data Corporation has committed to subcontract 10.00% of the contract value to **Professional Management Enterprises, Inc.**, a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE), and 10.00% of the contract value to **netlogx LLC**, a certified Women-owned Business (WBE).

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated four (4) year Contract Value: \$8,832,328.30

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. Automated Health Services
2. Phoenix Data Corporation

The proposals were evaluated by DFR, IOT and IDOA according to the following criteria established in the RFP:

Criteria	Points
1. Adherence to Mandatory Requirements	Pass/Fail
2. Management Assessment/Quality (Business and Technical Proposal)	55
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	25
4. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
5. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
Total: 90 (92 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. None of the Respondents were deemed non-responsive, as they met the mandatory requirements listed in the RFP.

**B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Scoring (55 Points)**

The two (2) responsive Respondents’ proposals were each evaluated based on their respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

These areas were reviewed to assess the Respondent’s ability to serve the State:

- Company Information
- Experience
- References
- Proposed Approach
- Quality Assurance
- Project Management
- Transition and Turnover
- Staffing
- Overall Ability to Meet the State’s Needs

The evaluation team’s Round 1 scoring is based on a review of the Respondent’s proposed approach to each section of the Business Proposal and Technical Proposal. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation are shown below:

**Table 1: Management Assessment/Quality Scores - Round 1**

Respondent	MAQ Score 55 pts.
Automated Health Systems	20.25
Phoenix Data Corporation	55.00

**C. Cost Proposal (25)**

Price points were awarded on the Respondents’ Costs as follows:

Score =

- If Respondent’s Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 25.
- If Respondent’s Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:

$$25 * \frac{\text{(Lowest Respondent’s Cost amount)}}{\text{(Respondent’s Cost amount)}}$$

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents’ cost proposals is as follows:

**Table 2: Cost Scores - Round 1**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Cost Score 25 pts.</b>
Automated Health Systems	25.00
Phoenix Data Corporation	21.24

**D. First Round Total Scores**

The combined Round 1 MAQ and Cost scores from the initial evaluations are listed below.

**Table 3: Total Scores - Round 1**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Total Score 80 pts.</b>
Automated Health Systems	45.25
Phoenix Data Corporation	76.24

The evaluation team elected to invite one (1) Respondent to give oral presentations: Phoenix Data Corporation. Additionally, the evaluation team issued clarification questions and a request for Best and Final Offers (BAFOs).

**E. Post Clarifications, Oral Presentations and BAFO Evaluations**

The Respondents' cost scores were updated based on their BAFOs. The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed based on the responses to the clarification questions and the oral presentations. The scores for the Respondents after the clarification questions, oral presentations and BAFOs were as follows:

**Table 4: Post-Oral Presentations and BAFOs - Evaluation Scores - Round 2**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score (55)</b>	<b>Cost Score (25)</b>	<b>Total Score (80)</b>
Phoenix Data Corporation	50.25	25.00	<b>75.25</b>

**F. IDOA Scoring**

IDOA scored the Respondent in the following areas: MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) and WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. When necessary, IDOA clarifies certain M/WBE information with Respondents. Once the final M/WBE forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 92 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

**Table 5: Final Evaluation Scores**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>MAQ Score</b>	<b>Cost Score</b>	<b>MBE*</b>	<b>WBE*</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>90 (+2 bonus pts.)</b>
Phoenix Data Corporation	50.25	25.00	6.00	4.50	85.75

\* See Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE bonus points.

### **Award Summary**

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

The term of the contract shall be for a period of four (4) years and two (2) months. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years and two (2) months at the State's option.