



STATE OF INDIANA

Eric Holcomb, Governor

Department of Administration  
Procurement Division

402 W Washington Street, Room W468  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: March 9, 2022

To: Erin Kellam, Deputy Commissioner,  
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Teresa Deaton-Reese, Senior Account Manager,  
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-69574: Premium Billing and Collection Services

Based on the State's evaluation of responses to RFP 22-69574, **Gainwell Technologies LLC ("Gainwell")** is recommended to begin contract negotiations to provide Premium Billing and Collection Services for the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA).

*Gainwell has committed to subcontract 7.70% of the contract value to **Briljent, LLC** (a certified Woman-owned Business (WBE)), 9.49% to **Bucher & Christian Consulting, Inc. d.b.a. BCforward** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 3.91% to **Esource Resources, LLC** (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)), and 4.84% to **Sahasra Technologies Corp d.b.a. STLogics** (WBE).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated Contract Values:

- Gainwell: \$6,979,199.04

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. Gainwell Technologies LLC ("Gainwell")
2. Transworld Systems Inc. ("Transworld")

The proposals were evaluated 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)	50
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	30
4. Buy Indiana	5
5. Minority Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)

6. Women Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
7. Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
Total: 100 (103 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. All of the Respondents were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

**B. Management Assessment/Quality (MAQ): Initial Consensus Scoring**

The Respondents’ proposals were each evaluated based on their respective Business and Technical Proposals.

**Business Proposal (8 Points)**

For the Business Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the information the Respondent provided in the Business Proposal. These areas were reviewed to assess the Respondent’s ability to serve the State:

- Company Information
- References

**Technical Proposal (42 Points)**

For the Technical Proposal evaluation, the evaluation team considered the Respondent’s proposal in the following areas:

- General Requirements and Definitions
- Scope of Work Section 1 – Introduction, Background, and General Operational Requirements
- Scope of Work Section 2.1 – Premium Billing
- Scope of Work Section 2.2 – Premium Collection
- Scope of Work Section 2.3 – Customer Service
- Scope of Work Sections 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6 – Quality Assurance Process, Reporting, and Technical Requirements
- Scope of Work Sections 3 and 4 – Deliverables and Project Management
- Scope of Work Sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 – Billing and Invoicing, Defect Severity Levels, Performance Standards and Payment Withholds, and Damages

The evaluation team’s initial 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: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores**

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Gainwell	42.25
Transworld	13.75

**C. Cost Proposal (30)**

Cost points were awarded based on a Respondent’s proposed Total Four Year Bid Amount.

Points were awarded on a graduated scale, with a maximum of thirty points (30) going to the Respondent with the lowest proposed Total Four Year Bid Amount. Points were allocated proportionately to the other Respondents.

Points were awarded using the following formula:

$$\text{Score} = \begin{cases} \bullet \text{ If the Respondent's proposed Total Four Year Bid Amount is lowest among all Respondents, then the score is 30.} \\ \bullet \text{ If the Respondent's proposed Total Four Year Bid Amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then the score is:} \\ 30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Proposed Total Four Year Bid Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Proposed Total Four Year Bid Amount})} \end{cases}$$

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

**Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores**

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
Gainwell	12.69
Transworld	30.00

#### D. First Round Total Scores and Shortlisting

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

**Table 3: Round 1 – Total Scores**

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Gainwell	54.94
Transworld	43.75

The evaluation team elected to issue Best and Final Offer (BAFO) requests, Clarification Questions, and Oral Presentations requests to both Respondents.

#### E. Post BAFOs, Oral Presentations, and Clarification Responses

The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentations and Clarification Responses. Respondents were also given the opportunity to update their cost proposal during the Best and Final Offer (BAFO) round.

The scores for the respondents after these updates are as follows:

**Table 4: Round 2 (Post BAFOs, Oral Presentations, and Clarification Responses) – Evaluation Scores**

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.	Cost Score 30 pts.	Total Score 80 pts.
Gainwell	42.25	12.69	54.94
Transworld	13.75	30.00	43.75

#### F. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: Buy Indiana (5 points), MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. The total scores out of 103 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>Buy Indiana</b>	<b>MBE*</b>	<b>WBE*</b>	<b>IVOSB*</b>	<b>Total Score</b>
<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>5 (+1 bonus pt.)</b>	<b>100 (+3 bonus pts.)</b>
Gainwell	42.25	12.69	0.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	72.94
Transworld	13.75	30.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	40.75

\* See Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE bonus points, and 3.2.7 of the RFP for information on available IVOSB bonus points.

#### **Award Summary**

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability of the proposed ability to meet the goals of the program and the needs of the State. The 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 from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.