

**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: October 6, 2026

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

Signed by:

Robert Cohen

57B1B8F1A26C4DB...

From: Mitchell Roelecke, Procurement Consultant
Indiana Department of Administration

Subject: Recommendation of Selection for RFS 26-87776, Gaming Commission Compliance Testing

Based on its evaluation of responses to RFS 26-87776, it is the evaluation team's recommendation that BMM North American, Gaming Laboratories International, and Nick Farley & Associates (dba Eclipse Testing) be selected to begin contract negotiations to administer the Gaming Commission Compliance Testing for the Indiana Gaming Commission (IGC).

This award recommendation is conditioned upon successful finalization of a contract between the State and the respondents within forty-five (45) calendar days. If the State and respondents fail to reach an agreement on contract terms in a timely manner, the State may choose to withdraw this award recommendation from the respondent.

The terms of this recommendation are included in this letter.

Four (4)-year contract value: \$0

The evaluation team received three (3) proposals from:

1. BMM North America
2. Gaming Laboratories International
3. Nick Farley & Associates (dba Eclipse Testing)

The proposals were evaluated by IGC and IDOA according to the following criteria established in the RFS:

Criteria	Points
1. Adherence to Mandatory Requirements	Pass/Fail
2. Management Assessment/Quality (Business and Technical Proposal)	100

The proposals were evaluated according to the process outlined in Section 3.2 (“Evaluation Criteria”) of the RFS. Scoring was completed as follows:

A. Adherence to Requirements

Each proposal was reviewed for responsiveness and adherence to mandatory requirements. Three (3) 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 Respondent’s proposal in the following areas:

- Company Structure
- Company Financials
- References
- Experience Serving State Governments and Similar Clients

Technical Proposal

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

- History of the Company
- Employee information and IGC specific staff
- Experience
- Resources

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 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 100 pts.
BMM North America	97.33

Gaming Laboratories International	100
Nick Farley & Associates (dba Eclipse Testing)	24.89

C. Post Oral Presentations – Second Round MAQ Scores

The Respondents' MAQ scores were reviewed and re-evaluated based on the Oral Presentations. The scores for the Respondents after the Oral Presentations were as follows.

Table 2: Round 2 – Management Assessment/Quality Scores

Respondent	MAQ Score 100 pts.
BMM North America	97.33
Gaming Laboratories International	100
Nick Farley & Associates (dba Eclipse Testing)	73.78

D. Round 2 - Total Scores

The final scores for the Respondents, based on Round 2 Management Assessment/Quality are listed below.

Table 3: Round 2 - Evaluation Scores

Respondent	Total Score
Points Possible	100
BMM North America	97.33
Gaming Laboratories International	100
Nick Farley & Associates (dba Eclipse Testing)	73.78

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 RFS document.

The term of the contract shall be for a period of four (4) years from the date of contract execution. There may be one (1) 2-year extensions for a total of six (6) years at the State's option.