



STATE OF INDIANA

Eric J. Holcomb, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Commissioner's Office

Indiana Government Center South
402 West Washington Street, Room W462
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: October 4, 2022

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

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

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 22-70621,
Workload Automation (WLA) Solution

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 22-70621, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Mainline Information Systems, Inc. (Mainline) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Workload Automation (WLA) for the Indiana Office of Technology (IOT).

Mainline has no subcontractor commitments to enumerate on this project.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$5,002,341.67

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. Mainline Information Systems, Inc. (Mainline)
2. RADcube LLC (RADcube)

The proposals were evaluated by IOT, Key Stakeholder State Agencies, 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)	45
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	35
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 Enterprise 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. Two (2) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. None were disqualified.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Consensus Scoring

The Respondents' proposals were each evaluated based on their respective Business Proposal and Technical Proposal.

Business Proposal (5 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
- Experience & References

Technical Proposal (40 Points)

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

- Scope of Work Sections 1, 2, and 3 – Introduction, About IOT and Current State, Future State Goals and General Project Requirements
- Scope of Work Sections 4 and Attachment L – Solution Specifications and Functionalities, and Desired Functionalities
- Scope of Work Sections 5 and 11 – Transition, Project Management, Implementation, and Training and End of Contract Turnover
- Scope of Work Sections 6 and 7 – System Maintenance & Operation (M&O)
- Scope of Work Sections 8 – Business Continuity, Disaster Recovery, and Performance Management
- Scope of Work Sections 9 and 10 – Contractor Performance and Service Level Agreements, Billing and Invoicing, Corrective Actions, and Service Credits

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 evaluation team issued MAQ & Cost Clarifications to all Respondents prior to finalizing Round 1 scores. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation and Pricing Questions are shown below:

Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.
Mainline	39.75
RADcube	27.00

C. Cost Proposal (35 Points)

The price points on the Respondent's Costs were awarded as follows:

Score =

The cost scoring is:

- If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among all Respondents, then score is 35.
- If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among all Respondents, then score is:
$$35 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}$$

Table 3: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 35 pts.
Mainline	33.57
RADcube	35.00

D. First Round Total Scores and Shortlisting

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

Table 4: Round 1 – Total Scores (MAQ + Cost)

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
Mainline	73.32
RADcube	62.00

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to not shortlist Mainline and RADcube based on Round 1 Total Scores and elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the two (2) Respondents.

E. Post Oral Presentations – Second Round MAQ Scores

The Respondents' (who were shortlisted after the First Round) MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentations and the written responses to questions asked during Oral Presentations. The scores for the Respondents (who were shortlisted after the First Round) after the Oral Presentations were as follows.

Table 5: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 45 pts.
Mainline	43.75
RADcube	10.00

F. Post Best and Final Offer Opportunity – Final Round Cost Scores

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the two shortlisted Respondents. Mainline did not provide a BAFO response.

The cost scoring as a result of the Respondents' BAFO Cost Proposals is as follows:

Table 7: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 35 pts.
Mainline	33.22
RADcube	35.00

G. Round 2 - Total Scores

The combined final scores for the Respondents, based on Round 2 Management Assessment/Quality and BAFO Cost Scores are listed below.

Table 8: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	45	35	80
Mainline	43.75	33.22	76.97
RADcube	10.00	35.00	45.00

H. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents in the following areas: MBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), WBE Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), IVOSB Subcontractor Commitment (5 points + 1 available bonus point), and Buy Indiana (5 points) using the criteria outlined in the RFP. IDOA requested updated M/WBE and IVOSB commitments from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE and IVOSB forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 100 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 9: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	MBE*	WBE*	IVOSB*	Buy Indiana*	Total Score
Points Possible	45	35	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5	100 (+3 bonus pt.)
Mainline	43.75	33.22	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	0.00	73.97
RADcube	10.00	35.00	5.00	5.00	6.00	5.00	66.00

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

Award Summary

During the course of evaluation, the State scrutinized all proposals to determine the viability 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.