



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,
Indiana Department of Administration

From: Kevin March, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFP 26-86281,
Power Platform Center of Excellence

Signed by:

Eric Skaggs
A30AC56668964C8...

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFP 26-86281, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that elmachine Consulting Group LLC ("elmachine") be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Power Platform Center of Excellence for the Indiana Office of Technology (IOT).

*elmachine has committed to subcontract 8% of the contract value to **BCforward** (a certified Minority-owned Business (MBE)), 12% of the contract value to **aFit Staffing, Inc.** (a certified Women-owned Business (WBE)), and 3% of the contract value to **Professional Management Enterprises** (a certified Indiana Veteran Owned Small Business (IVOSB)).*

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Estimated 2-year Contract Value: \$1,410,750.00

The evaluation team received eight (8) proposals from:

1. ACOMdev LLC (ACOMdev)
2. Crowe LLP (Crowe)
3. Datum Consulting Group LLC (Datum)
4. elmachine Technology Group, Inc (elmachine)
5. ILABS Inc (ILABS)
6. MTX Group, Inc (MTX)
7. Para Solutions Inc (Para)
8. Planet Technologies Inc (Planet)

The proposals were evaluated by IOT, 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
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. Eight (8) 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 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
 - Direct Maintenance & 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 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.
ACOM	7.25
Crowe	37.50
Datum	27.75

elImagine	30.75
ILABS	26.50
MTX	29.25
Para	9.75
Planet	14.00

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.
ACOM	10.63
Crowe	12.89
Datum	30.00
elImagine	15.67
ILABS	20.37
MTX	13.42
Para	9.55
Planet	12.56

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.
ACOM	17.88

Crowe	50.39
Datum	57.75
elImagine	46.42
ILABS	46.87
MTX	42.67
Para	19.30
Planet	26.56

With IDOA approval, the evaluation team elected to shortlist Crowe, Datum, elImagine, ILABS, and MTX based on Round 1 Total Scores.

The evaluation team elected to issue invites to Oral Presentations to the five (5) 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 written 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.
Crowe	37.50
Datum	13.50
elImagine	40.75
ILABS	13.50
MTX	15.25

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

The State elected to issue Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) to the five (5) 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.
Crowe	12.65
Datum	30.00
elImagine	16.05
ILABS	19.82

MTX	13.74
-----	-------

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
Crowe	37.50	12.65	50.15
Datum	13.50	30.00	43.50
elImagine	40.75	16.05	56.80
ILABS	13.50	19.82	33.32
MTX	15.25	13.74	28.99

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.)
Crowe	37.50	12.65	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	70.15
Datum	13.50	30.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	63.50
elImagine	40.75	16.05	5.00	5.00	6.00	5.00	77.80
ILABS	13.50	19.82	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	30.32
MTX	15.25	13.74	0.00	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	25.99

* 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.

