



STATE OF INDIANA

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION Commissioner's Office

Mike Braun, Governor

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

Award Recommendation Letter

Date: September 23, 2026

To: Kevin March, Category Director,
Indiana Department of Administration

Signed by:
Kevin March
F57C5348AE7D4C5...

From: Christina Garcia, Procurement Consultant,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-84315,
WIC Management Information Systems (MIS) Maintenance and Operations (M&O)

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-84315, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that GCOM Software LLC d/b/a Voyatek (GCOM) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the WIC Management Information Systems (MIS) Maintenance and Operations (M&O) for the Indiana Department of Health.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 4-year Contract Value: \$8,848,155.12
2 year extension: \$5,333,233.30
Total Contract: \$14,181,388.42

The evaluation team received two (2) proposals from:

1. GCOM Software LLC d/b/a Voyatek
2. Kunz, Leigh & Associates inc.

The proposals were evaluated by 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)	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. Two (2) 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 Information
- References
- Experience Serving State Government

Technical Proposal

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

- Mandatory Requirements
- Program Director and Project Management Team
- Project Plans & Schedules
- Project Meetings
- Timeline for Project
- Contractor Responsibilities
- Communication and Marketing
- Virtual Help Desk Office Hours
- Staff Qualifications

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 and Cost Clarifications to all Respondents prior to finalizing Round 1 scores. 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.
GCOM Software LLC d/b/a Voyatek	39.50
Kunz, Leigh & Associates	41.50

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.
GCOM Software LLC d/b/a Voyatek	30.00

Kunz, Leigh & Associates	23.67
--------------------------	-------

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.
GCOM Software LLC d/b/a Voyatek	69.50
Kunz, Leigh & Associates	65.17

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the two (2) Respondents.

E. Post Oral Presentations – Second Round MAQ Scores

The Respondents' 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 after the Oral Presentations were as follows.

Table 4: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 50 pts.
GCOM Software LLC d/b/a Voyatek	42.00
Kunz, Leigh & Associates	46.00

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the four 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.
GCOM Software LLC d/b/a Voyatek	30.00
Kunz, Leigh & Associates	22.72

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 – Final Evaluation Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score	Cost Score	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	80
GCOM Software LLC d/b/a Voyatek	42.00	30.00	72.00
Kunz, Leigh & Associates	46.00	22.72	68.72

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.

