



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 28, 2026

To: Eric Skaggs, Deputy Commissioner,
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Kevin March, IT Category Director
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-84338,
Opioid Settlement Reporting Platform

Signed by:

Eric Skaggs

A30AC56668964C8...

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-84338, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Crowe, LLP be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Opioid Settlement Reporting Platform.

*Crowe has committed to subcontract 3% of the contract value to **Professional Management Enterprises, Inc.** (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 5-year Contract Value: \$993,800.00
Estimated optional 1-year extension Contract Value: \$156,100.00
Estimated total contract value including optional extension: \$1,149,900.00

The evaluation team received seven (7) proposals from:

1. Advocates for Human Potential, Inc ("AHP")
2. Concourse Tech Inc. ("Concourse")
3. Crowe, LLP ("Crowe")
4. Egis BLN Consulting, LLC ("Egis")
5. Michigan Public Health Institute ("MPHI")
6. Syra Health Corp. ("Syra")
7. Venturit Inc. ("Venturit")

The proposals were evaluated by FSSA, 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)	50
3. Cost (Cost Proposal)	30
4. Buy Indiana	5
5. Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business Enterprise Subcontractor Commitment	5 (1 bonus pt. available)
Total: 90 (91 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. Seven (7) proposals were deemed responsive and adhered to the mandatory requirements.

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 information the Respondent provided in the Business Proposal. These areas were reviewed to assess the Respondent's ability to serve the State:

- Company Financials
- References
- Experience Serving State Governments & Experience Serving Similar Clients

Technical Proposal

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

- Question 1 - National Opioid Settlement Experience
- Question 2 – Flexibility to Adapt Workflows to Meet State Requirements
- Question 3 – Indiana Local Government Experience
- Question 4 – Solution Configuration, Implementation, Extension, and/or Deployment
- Question 5 – User Interface for Local Units of Government
- Question 6 – Reporting
- Question 7 – Quality Control Measures
- Question 8 – Implementation Plan and Project Schedule
- Question 9 – Communication to Local Units of Government
- Question 10 – Staffing and Qualifications
- Question 11 – AI Use in the Solution
- Question 12 - Equipment

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: Round 1 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
AHP	42.25
Concourse	22.25
Crowe	24.25
Egis	31.25
MPHI	22.00
Syra	27.25
Venturit	0.00

C. 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:

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

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.
AHP	9.55
Concourse	29.81
Crowe	30.00
Egis	12.35
MPHI	26.77
Syra	9.28
Venturit	25.64

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.
AHP	51.80
Concourse	52.06
Crowe	54.25
Egis	43.60
MPHI	48.77
Syra	36.53
Venturit	25.64

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist AHP, Concourse, and Crowe based on Round 1 Total Scores.

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the three (3) shortlisted 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 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 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
AHP	42.25
Concourse	14.25
Crowe	34.00

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the three (3) 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.
AHP	9.62
Concourse	30.00
Crowe	28.68

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 6: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	80
AHP	42.25	9.62	51.87
Concourse	14.25	30.00	44.25
Crowe	34.00	28.68	62.68

H. IDOA Scoring

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

Table 7: Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Buy Indiana*	IVOSB*	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	90 (+1 bonus pt.)
AHP	42.25	9.62	0.00	-1.00	50.87
Concourse	14.25	30.00	0.00	-1.00	43.25
Crowe	34.00	28.68	5.00	5.00	72.68

* See Section 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 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 five (5) years from the date of contract execution. There may be one (1) one-year renewals for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.

