



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: August 6, 2026

To: Eric Skaggs, Chief Procurement Officer

From: Kevin March, Procurement Consultant,
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-86280,
Salesforce Center of Excellence

Signed by:

Eric Skaggs

A30AC56668964C8...

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-86280, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that Corvano, LLC be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Salesforce Center of Excellence for the Indiana Office of Technology (IOT).

*Corvano has committed to subcontract 10% of the contract value to **Sondhi Solutions dba EXOS** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 15% of the contract value to **aFit Staffing, Inc.** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), and 75% of the contract value to **Corvano, LLC**. (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 2-year Contract Value: \$1,744,320.00

The evaluation team received eleven (11) proposals from:

1. 580 Strategies LLC (580)
2. Aimpoint Technology LLC (Aimpoint)
3. Arora Infotech Inc (Arora)
4. AT&T Communications of Indiana Inc (AT&T)
5. Brite Systems Inc (Brite)
6. Corvano LLC (Corvano)
7. Crowe LLP (Crowe)
8. elImagine Technology Group Inc (elImagine)
9. ILABS Inc (ILABS)
10. KPMG LLP (KPMG)
11. MTX Group (MTX)

The proposals were evaluated by IOT 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. 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. Eleven (11) 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:

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

Technical Proposal

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

- Response to Section 1.4 of RFP
- Security Profile & Health Assessments
- Auditing, Oversight, and Architectural Review
- Licensing
- Training & Support
- Technical Consultation, Assessment, and Analysis Services
- Documentation of Best Practices & Patterns
- Support of LCNC Enterprise CoE Governance and Advisory Committee
- Large Project Support Services
- Cross-Program Coordination and Alignment
- Metrics & KPIs
- LCNC Implementations
- Staffing & Resumes
- Expectations of the State

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 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.
580	13.00
Aimpoint	15.75
Arora	27.50

AT&T	0.5
Brite	26.00
Corvano	34.75
Crowe	28.00
elImagine	27.00
ILABS	28.50
KPMG	27.50
MTX	28.75

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.
580	30.00
Aimpoint	15.02
Arora	9.70
AT&T	9.97
Brite	13.88
Corvano	11.33
Crowe	7.30
elImagine	12.11
ILABS	22.77
KPMG	7.08

MTX	13.23
-----	-------

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.
580	43.00
Aimpoint	30.77
Arora	37.20
AT&T	10.47
Brite	39.88
Corvano	46.08
Crowe	35.30
elImagine	39.11
ILABS	51.27
KPMG	34.58
MTX	41.98

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist 580, Arora, Brite, Corvano, elImagine, ILABS, and MTX, based on Round 1 Total Scores.

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the seven (7) 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 the 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.
580	8.00
Arora	22.25
Brite	23.75
Corvano	39.00
elImagine	26.25
ILABS	22.50

MTX	26.75
-----	-------

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the seven 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.
580	30.00
Arora	10.80
Brite	12.63
Corvano	10.32
elmaigne	12.00
ILABS	21.24
MTX	12.41

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
580	8.00	30.00	38.00
Arora	22.25	10.80	33.05
Brite	23.75	12.63	36.38
Corvano	39.00	10.32	49.32
elmaigne	26.25	12.00	38.25
ILABS	22.50	21.24	43.74
MTX	26.75	12.41	39.16

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 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*	MBE*	WBE*	IVOSB*	Total Score
Points Possible	50	30	5	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	5 (+1 bonus pt.)	100 (+3 bonus pt.)
580	8.00	30.00	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	35.00
Arora	22.25	10.80	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	30.05
Brite	23.75	12.63	5.00	5.00	5.00	-1.00	50.38
Corvano	39.00	10.32	5.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	72.32
elImagine	26.25	12.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	58.25
ILABS	22.50	21.24	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	40.74
MTX	26.75	12.41	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	36.16

* 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 two (2) years from the date of contract execution. There may be two (2) one-year renewals for a total of four (4) years at the State's option.

