



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 9, 2024

To: L. 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 25-78600, Immunization Information System (IIS)

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 25-78600, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that **STChealth, LLC** be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Immunization Information System (IIS) for the Indiana Department of Health (IDOH).

STChealth, LLC has committed to subcontract 7.51% of the contract value to **Professional Management Enterprises, Inc.** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)).

STChealth, LLC has committed to subcontract 10.96% of the contract value to **Briljent, LLC** (a certified Woman-owned Business (WBE)).

The term of the contract should be for a period of five (5) years with an estimated value of **\$8,606,470.31**. There may be three (3) one-year renewals for a total of eight (8) years at the State's option.

The evaluation team received four (4) proposals from:

1. Gainwell Technologies LLC (Gainwell)
2. STChealth, LLC (STC)
3. Strategic Solutions Group LLC (SSG)
4. VAULT Technologies, LLC (VAULT)

The proposals were evaluated by IDOH 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 Proposal and Technical Proposal)	50
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	30
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. Three (3) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. One (1) proposal (Gainwell Technologies LLC) was disqualified as they did not meet the minimum requirements listed in RFP Section 1.4.1.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Consensus Scoring

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

Business Proposal and Technical Proposal (50 points)

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

- Company Information
- Experience
- Proposed System
- Implementation Approach
- Maintenance and Operations
- Project Management
- 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 evaluation team issued clarifications prior to finalizing Round 1 scores. The initial results of the Management Assessment/Quality Evaluation Questions are shown below:

Table 1: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
STC	37.00
SSG	27.25
VAULT	13.25

C. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

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

Score =

If Respondent's Cost amount is lowest among Respondents, then score is 30.
 If Respondent's Cost amount is NOT lowest among Respondents, then score is:

$$30 * \frac{(\text{Lowest Respondent's Cost Amount})}{(\text{Respondent's Cost Amount})}$$

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

Table 2: Round 1 – Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
STC	21.57
SSG	30.00
VAULT	15.81

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 (MAQ + Cost)

Respondent	Total Score 80 pts.
STC	58.57
SSG	57.25
VAULT	29.06

The evaluation team elected to invite two (2) Respondents to give oral presentations and demonstrations: STC and SSG. Additionally, the evaluation team issued clarification questions and a request for Best and Final Offers (BAFOs).

E. Post Oral Presentations, Demonstrations, and Clarifications – Second Round MAQ Scores

The evaluation team issued Clarifications to Respondents prior to finalizing Round 2 scores. Additionally, Respondents were invited to give oral presentations and demonstrations to the evaluation team. The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on oral presentations, demonstrations, and the written responses to clarification questions. The scores for the Respondents after the second round of MAQ scoring are listed below.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
STC	39.50
SSG	28.50

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

The State elected to issue a request for Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the two shortlisted Respondents.

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

Table 5: Round 2 – BAFO Cost Scores

Respondent	Cost Score 30 pts.
STC	17.34
SSG	30.00

G. Round 2 - Total Scores

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

Table 6: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	80
STC	39.50	17.34	56.84
SSG	28.50	30.00	58.50

H. IDOA Scoring

IDOA scored the Respondents 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. IDOA requested updated M/WBE commitment forms from the Respondents who submitted BAFO Cost Proposals. Once the final M/WBE commitment forms were received from the Respondents, the total scores out of 92 possible points were tabulated and are as follows:

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores*

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	MBE*	WBE*	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	90 (+2 bonus pts.)
STC	39.50	17.34	5.00	5.00	66.84
SSG	28.50	30.00	3.75	0.90	63.15

* See Sections 3.2.5 and 3.2.6 of the RFP for information on available M/WBE 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 five (5) years. There may be three (3) one-year renewals for a total of eight (8) years at the State's option.