



STATE OF INDIANA

Mike Braun, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Commissioner's Office

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

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: September 3, 2026

To: Robert Cohen, Category Director – Major Procurements
Indiana Department of Administration

Signed by:

Robert Cohen

57B1B8F1A26C4DB...

From: Eli Sturgeon, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-86822
Statewide Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) Services

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-86822, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that the following vendors be selected to enter the existing Managed Service Provider (MSP) QPA and become eligible to provide IV&V services for the Indiana Department of Administration (IDOA):

1. aFit Staffing Inc. (aFit)
2. Berry, Dunn, McNeil & Parker, LLC (BDMP)
3. Bucher and Christian Consulting, Inc. (BCforward)
4. Corvano LLC (Corvano)
5. Crowe LLP (Crowe)
6. CSG Government Solutions, Inc. (CSG)
7. Diversified Services Network, Inc. (DSN)
8. eimagine Technology Group, inc. (eimagine)
9. ILAB, LLC (ILAB)
10. International Consulting Acquisition Corp. (ICA)
11. Maximus US Services, Inc. (Maximus)
12. netlogx LLC (netlogx)
13. NTT DATA State Health Consulting, LLC (NTT)
14. Public Consulting Group LLC (PCG)
15. Resultant LLC (Resultant)
16. Stonemill Consulting, LLC (Stonemill)
17. Tech Valley Talent LLC (Tech Valley)

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

The evaluation team received twenty-four (24) proposals from:

1. aFit
2. Avasant LLC (Avasant)

3. BDMP
4. BCforward
5. Corvano
6. Crowe
7. CSG
8. DSN
9. eimagine
10. First Data Government Solutions, LP (FDGS)
11. Forvis Mazars, LLP (Forvis)
12. GovTech Advisors (GTA)
13. ILAB
14. Inspira Enterprise, Inc. (Inspira)
15. ICA
16. Maximus
17. netlogx
18. NTT
19. PCG
20. Public Knowledge, LLC (Public Knowledge)
21. Resultant
22. RSM US LLP (RSM)
23. Stonemill
24. Tech Valley

The proposals were evaluated by 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)	50
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	30
Total: 80	

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. Twenty-four (24) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements. Zero (0) proposals were disqualified.

B. Management Assessment/Quality: Initial Scoring

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

Business Proposal

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

- General Information (profile, structure, history) / Experience Serving State Governments / Similar Clients
- Company Financials
- References

Technical Proposal

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

- IV&V / Risk Analysis Experience and Knowledge (Procurements)
- IV&V / Risk Analysis Experience and Knowledge (Contracts and SOWs)
- IV&V / Risk Analysis Experience and Knowledge (Contract Execution)
- IV&V Common Risks and Mitigations (Procurements)
- IV&V Common Risks and Mitigations (Contracts / SOWs)
- IV&V Common Risks and Mitigations (Contract Execution)
- Deliverable Review and Assessment
- Service Level Agreements
- Reporting and Documentation
- Status and Trend Determination
- IV&V Federal Requirements Experience
- Risk Escalation
- IV&V General Staffing
- IV&V Staffing Stability
- IV&V Staffing Estimation
- Tools
- Independence and De-Confliction Understanding
- Making a Difference with IV&V Delivery

- IV&V Continuous Improvement
- Keys to Success
- Artificial Intelligence (AI)
- Pricing Method Compliance

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

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
Maximus	45.11
ILAB	43.22
Corvano	41.11
PCG	40.22
eimagine	39.06
DSN	38.67
CSG	38.44
BDMP	38.33
netlogx	36.67
Stonemill	35.61
Resultant	34.83
BCforward	34.11
Crowe	33.44
ICA	33.00
Tech Valley	31.83
AFit	29.78
NTT	29.56
RSM	25.69

Inspira	23.22
GTA	22.11
FDGS	20.89
Public Knowledge	19.89
Forvis	14.06
Avasant	12.00

C. First Round MAQ Scores and Shortlisting

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist the following vendors based on Round 1 MAQ Scores:

- Maximus
- ILAB
- Corvano
- PCG
- eimagine
- DSN
- CSG
- BDMP
- netlogx
- Stonemill
- Resultant
- BCforward
- Crowe
- ICA
- Tech Valley
- AFit
- NTT

D. Cost Proposal (30 Points)

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

Score =

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

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

E. IDOA Scoring

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

Table 2:Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	80
Maximus	45.11	24.78	69.89
PCG	40.22	26.64	66.86
DSN	38.67	27.25	65.92
Stonemill	35.61	26.01	61.62
AFiT	29.78	30.00	59.78
ILAB	43.22	15.32	58.54
BCforward	34.11	16.49	50.60
BDMP	38.33	10.70	49.03
Eimage	39.06	9.80	48.86
Corvano	41.11	6.88	47.99
netlogx	36.67	9.20	45.87
Resultant	34.83	7.91	42.74
CSG	38.44	3.66	42.10
Crowe	33.44	8.14	41.58
Tech Valley	31.83	9.71	41.54

ICA	33.00	3.62	36.62
NTT	29.56	4.42	33.98

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 selected vendors will enter the State's existing Managed Service Provider (MSP) QPA and are eligible to begin providing IV&V services for the Indiana Department of Administration.