**Instructions to respondents for the completion of Exhibit A-4:**

All respondents to this solicitation shall utilize **Exhibit A-4**, Submission Requirements and Evaluation Criteria Components (Technical Response), for submission of its response and shall adhere to the instructions below for each Submission Requirement Component (SRC).

Respondents **shall not** include website links, embedded links and/or cross references between SRCs.

Each SRC contains form fields. Population of the form fields with text will allow the form field to expand and cross pages. There is no character limit.

Attachments are acceptable for any SRC but must be referenced in the form field for the respective SRC and located behind each respective SRC response. Respondents shall name and label attachments to refer to respective SRCs by SRC identifier number.

Agency evaluators will be instructed to evaluate the responses based on the narrative contained in the SRC form fields and the associated attachment(s), if applicable.

Each response will be independently evaluated and awarded points based on the criteria and points scale using the Standard Evaluation Criteria Scale below unless otherwise identified in each SRC contained within **Exhibit A-4**.

|  |
| --- |
| **STANDARD EVALUATION CRITERIA SCALE** |
| **Point Score** | **Evaluation** |
| 0 | The component was not addressed. |
| 1 | The component contained significant deficiencies. |
| 2 | The component is below average. |
| 3 | The component is average. |
| 4 | The component is above average. |
| 5 | The component is excellent. |

The SRCs in **Exhibit A-4** may not be retyped and/or modified and must be submitted in the original format.

Failure to submit, **Exhibit A-4**, may result in the rejection of response.

**Exhibit A-4** is available for respondents to download at:

[http://ahca.myflorida.com/procurements/index.shtml](http://ahca.myflorida.com/Procurements/index.shtml).

**Respondent Name:**

**CATEGORY 1: TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**SRC# 1: TABLE OF CONTENTS**

The respondent shall include a Table of Contents in its response. The Table of Contents shall contain section headings and subheadings along with corresponding page numbers.

**Response:**

**Evaluation Criteria:**

The respondent shall include a Table of Contents in its response. The Table of Contents shall contain section headings and subheadings along with corresponding page numbers.

**Score:** No points will be awarded for this SRC.

**CATEGORY 2: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**SRC# 2: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The respondent shall include an executive summary that indicates a thorough understanding of the overall need for and purpose of the services as described in this solicitation, acceptance of the terms and conditions of the solicitation and the resulting Contract, and adequately summarizes its approach to delivering these services according to the specifications of this solicitation. The executive summary should demonstrate the respondent’s capability to provide the services required in this solicitation by describing its organizational structure and history.

**Response:**

**Evaluation Criteria:**

The respondent shall include an executive summary that indicates a thorough understanding of the overall need for and purpose of the services as described in this solicitation, acceptance of the terms and conditions of the solicitation and the resulting Contract, and adequately summarizes its approach to delivering these services according to the specifications of this solicitation. The executive summary should demonstrate the respondent’s capability to provide the services required in this solicitation by describing its organizational structure and history.

**Score:** No points will be awarded for this SRC.

**CATEGORY 3: PROJECT EXPERIENCE**

**SRC# 3: PROJECT EXPERIENCE**

The respondent shall demonstrate its capability to provide the services described in this solicitation by describing its experience within the last three (3) years (since October 1, 2017) providing services similar in nature to those described in this solicitation, as well as its proposed subcontractor’s experience and qualifications, if applicable. At a minimum, the description shall include:

1. For each identified Project, the following information shall be provided:
	1. The client for which the Project was performed;
	2. The name of the Project;
	3. The time period of the Project;
	4. A brief narrative describing the role of the respondent and scope of the work performed, including services provided; and
	5. If applicable, the use of any subcontractor(s) on each Project, their scope of work, and the percentage of the work on the Project completed by subcontractors.

This SRC is focused on evaluating the respondent’s last three (3) years of experience, however, additional points will be rewarded for the adequacy of the respondent’s demonstrated years of experience for which it is/was the lead Vendor on any projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity as the services outlined in this solicitation within the last fifteen (15) years.

**Response:**

**Evaluation Criteria:**

1. The adequacy of the respondent’s demonstrated experience based on its projects it has undertaken within the last three (3) years (since October 1, 2017) that demonstrate the respondent’s proficiency in:
2. Development and certification of Medicaid managed care rates for children and adults with chronic conditions and co-morbid conditions;
3. Development and certification of Medicaid managed care rates for the population dually eligible for Medicare and Medicaid;
4. Development and certification of Medicaid managed care rates for managed long-term care programs;
5. Development and certification of Medicaid managed care rates for programs with a population over 1,000,000;
6. Development of high cost risk pools;
7. Analysis of health plan financial performance;
8. Critical assessment of health care data;
9. Risk adjustment of health care payments;
10. Analysis or forecast of health care cost trends; and/or
11. Evaluation of federal health policy as it affects Medicaid costs or capitation rate development.
12. The adequacy of the respondent’s demonstrated years of experience for which it is/was the lead Vendor on any projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity as the services outlined in this solicitation within the last fifteen (15) years:
13. Ten (10) points will be awarded for this section if respondent has ten (10) or more years of experience on projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity as the services outlined in this solicitation within the last fifteen (15) years.
14. Five (5) points will be awarded for this section if respondent has five (5) to ten (10) years of experience on projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity as the services outlined in this solicitation within the last fifteen (15) years.
15. Zero (0) points will be awarded for Criteria 2 if the respondent has no experience or less than five (5) years of experience on projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity as the services outlined in this solicitation within the last fifteen (15) years.

**Score:** This section is worth a maximum of 60 raw points with each component in Criteria 1 being worth a maximum of 5 points each, and Criteria 2 being worth a maximum of 10 points.

**Category 4: ORGANIZATIONAL CAPABILITY**

**SRC# 4: ORGANIZATIONAL CAPABILITY**

The respondent shall demonstrate its capability to successfully meet the requirements of this solicitation by describing its organizational capability. The respondent shall disclose and describe any liquidated damages, sanctions, or fines in excess of **$10,000.00** or numerous (multiple contracts with similar sanctions) within the five (5) years preceding the date of its response to this solicitation, that have been imposed on the respondent as a result of performance of services for past projects similar to the scope outlined in this solicitation.

The respondent shall use **Exhibit A-4,** **SRC# 4 Sanctions Template,** in order to document any liquidated damages, sanctions, or fines in excess of **$10,000.00.**

**Response:**

**Evaluation Criteria:**

1. The adequacy of the respondent’s experience and qualification based on its management approach and demonstrated history of meeting deadlines and providing accurate deliverables.
2. The adequacy of the respondent’s experience and qualifications based on its applications of Information Technology systems used to process and exchange large volumes of data.
3. The adequacy of the respondent’s demonstrated performance of past projects based on any liquidated damages, sanctions, or fines in excess of **$10,000.00** or numerous (multiple contracts with similar sanctions) within the five (5) years preceding the date of its response to this solicitation, imposed on the respondent as a result of performance of services for the project. The respondent will list out all penalties in excess of **$10,000.00** or numerous (multiple contracts with similar sanctions) within the five (5) years preceding the date of its response to this solicitation, assessed in past projects by listing out the client, project title, time frame of project, type of penalty (liquidated damage, sanction, etc.), and amount of penalty for each penalty the respondent has received.

**Score:** This section is worth a maximum of 15 raw points with each component being worth a maximum of 5 points each.

**Category 5: KEY STAFF**

**SRC# 5: KEY STAFF**

The respondent shall demonstrate its capability to provide key staff to meet the requirements of the resulting Contract in regard to experience and qualification requirements, including associate credentials and staffing plans as described in **Attachment B**, Scope of Services, **Section II.,** Manner of Service(s) Provision, **Sub-Section** **E.**, Staffing. At a minimum, the respondent shall provide a bio/resume and proposed project lead assignments/areas of expertise for the projects classified below, and as described in **Attachment B**, Scope of Services, **Section II.**, Manner of Service(s) Provision, **Sub-Section C.**, Deliverables, **Table 1**, Capitation Rate Development Deliverable Schedule ,for proposed staff members that are classified under the following key staff positions:

Key Staff Positions:

1. Contract Lead Actuary / Contract Manager;
2. Deputy Contract Lead Actuary; and
3. Senior Consultant.

Projects:

1. MMA Capitation Rate Setting;
2. LTC Capitation Rate Setting;
3. Dental Capitation Rate Setting;
4. NEMT Capitation Rate Setting;
5. PACE Capitation Rate Setting;
6. SNP Capitation Rate Setting;
7. Quarterly Risk Adjustment; and
8. Hospital Inpatient and Outpatient FFS Reimbursement Rate Setting.

Project deliverables and due dates are described in **Attachment B**, Scope of Services, **Section II.**, Manner of Service(s) Provision, **Sub-Section C.**, Deliverables, **Table 1**, Capitation Rate Development Deliverable Schedule.

**Response:**

**Evaluation Criteria:**

The adequacy of the respondent’s proposed staff classified under the following key staff positions, based on the evidenced qualifications and credentials as required by **Attachment B**, Scope of Services, **Section II.,** Manner of Service(s) Provision, **Sub-Section E.,** Staffing.

1. Contract Lead Actuary / Contract Manager;
2. Deputy Contract Lead Actuary; and
3. Senior Consultant.

**Score:** This section is worth a maximum of 15 raw points with each component being worth a maximum of 5 points each.

**Category 6: STAFFING STRUCTURE**

**SRC# 6: STAFFING STRUCTURE**

The respondent shall demonstrate its capability to meet general staffing requirements and levels as described in **Attachment B,** Scope of Services, **Section II.,** Manner of Service(s) Provision, **Sub-Section E.,** Staffing, by describing the proposed staffing structure.

**Response:**

**Evaluation Criteria:**

1. The adequacy of the respondent’s proposed staff organization chart that identifies reporting relationships and all positions to be assigned to the resulting Contract, and their titles.
2. The adequacy of the respondent’s proposed description of dedicated staff and applicable variable staff if needed, assigned to the resulting Contract, including their title and time assigned/dedicated to the resulting Contract.
3. The adequacy of the respondent’s proposed decision-making authority of proposed staff within the organization.
4. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed recruitment plan for ensuring adequate staff will be available within thirty (30) calendar days of the execution of the resulting Contract.
5. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed plan indicating which positions will be filled by a current employee of the respondent, and which positions will need to be filled.
6. The adequacy of the respondent’s proposed staffing plan to demonstrate how it will ensure it currently has and will maintain for the term of the resulting Contract, the organizational structure and operational capability to complete the services described in this solicitation.
7. If applicable, the adequacy and appropriateness of the respondent’s proposed subcontractor utilization plan.
8. If applicable, the adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed approach to coordinate and communicate with any proposed subcontractors and the Agency to ensure effective integration of services.

**Score:** This section is worth a maximum of 40 raw points with each component being worth a maximum of 5 points each.

For Criteria 7. and 8., if a respondent will not use a subcontractor for the resulting Contract, each component will receive a score of 5.

**Category 7: INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE**

**SRC# 7: INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE**

The respondent shall demonstrate is capability to ensure internal quality assurance for meeting the requirements as described in **Attachment B,** Scope of Services, **Section II.**, Manner of Service(s) Provision, **Sub-Section F.**, Internal Quality Assurance.

**Response:**

**Evaluation Criteria:**

1. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s existing or proposed Standard Operating Procedures including but not limited to: Quality Assurance; written internal quality control policies and procedures; and a description of any existing or proposed quality control committees or staff, and their responsibilities.
2. The adequacy of the respondent’s approach to ensure existing or proposed quality assurance policies and procedures ensure oversight of staff and resources, quality assessment, internal review of work performed by employees, and performance improvement.
3. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed plan to mitigate conflict of interest in business lines.

**Score:** This section is worth a maximum of 15 raw points with each component being worth a maximum of 5 points each.

**Category 8: DISASTER RECOVERY**

**SRC# 8: DISASTER RECOVERY**

The respondent shall demonstrate is capability to ensure internal disaster recovery plan for meeting the requirements as described in **Attachment B,** Scope of Services, **Section XII**., Disaster Recovery.

**Response:**

**Evaluation Criteria:**

1. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed disaster recovery plan for restoring the application of software and current master files and for hardware backup in the event the production systems are disabled or destroyed.
2. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed plan to limit service interruption to a period of twenty-four (24) clock hours.

**Score:** This section is worth a maximum of 10 raw points with each component being worth a maximum of 5 points each.

**Category 9: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

**SRC# 9: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

The respondent shall demonstrate its ability to ensure Information Technology requirements are met in accordance with **Attachment B**, Scope of Services, **Section XI.**, Information Technology.

**Response:**

**Evaluation Criteria:**

1. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed approach to ensure proper security of Medicaid data and how the respondent will restrict access in compliance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA) standards.
2. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed approach to retrieve medical records in compliance with HIPAA standards.
3. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed approach to ensure HIPAA standards for data and document management will be met and ensure that any PHI released is done so in accordance with HIPAA requirements.
4. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed approach to ensure all incidents whereby PHI may have been released inappropriately are reported to the Agency without unreasonable delay, within ten (10) business days of discovery if the disclosure of PHI is to an unauthorized party, within twenty-four (24) hours of discovery if the disclosure is due to a security incident, and at least on a monthly basis, including if no breaches occurred during that period.
5. The adequacy of the respondent’s approach to ensure a File Transfer Protocol (FTP) site, email capability and a sufficient number of telephones are maintained to interface with the Agency and Agency designees, as needed.
6. The adequacy of the respondent’s approach to shall ensure its internet browser version standards remain concurrent with the Agency’s current deployed internet browser software version.
7. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s type of data system(s) to be used in generating reports.

**Score:** This section is worth a maximum of 35 raw points with each component being worth a maximum of 5 points each.

**Category 10: Statewide Medicaid Managed Care (SMMC) Long-Term Care (LTC) Innovative Approach**

**SRC# 10: Statewide Medicaid Managed Care (SMMC) Long-Term Care (LTC) Innovative Approach**

The respondent shall demonstrate its capability to propose innovative approaches to rate-setting for the current LTC program to promote the Agency’s goal of transitioning LTC recipients into a home and community-based setting while maintaining statutory and contractually required transition percentages.

**Response:**

**Evaluation Criteria:**

1. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed approach(es) to ensure compliance with the Florida Statute target for transitioning recipients into a home and community-based setting.
2. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed approach(es) to ensure compliance with the SMMC contract requirements.
3. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed approach(es) to be operationalized by the Agency.

**Score:** This section is worth a maximum of 15 raw points with each component being worth a maximum of 5 points each.

**Category 11: Innovative Value Based Purchasing Arrangements**

**SRC# 11: Innovative Value Based Purchasing Arrangements**

The respondent shall demonstrate its capability to propose innovative approaches within rate setting to incentivize Statewide Medicaid Managed Care (SMMC) health plans to adopt value-based purchasing arrangements. Preferred arrangements include providers taking upside and downside risk. The proposed approaches should incentivize health plans or providers to drive better health outcomes, improve efficiency, and increase provider engagement.

**Response:**

**Evaluation Criteria:**

1. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed approach(es) to incentivize SMMC health plans to engage providers in value-based purchasing arrangements that include upside and downside risk.
2. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed approach(es) to be operationalized by the Agency.
3. The adequacy and viability of the respondent’s proposed approach(es) to drive better health outcomes, improve efficiency, and increase provider engagement.

**Score:** This section is worth a maximum of 15 raw points with each component being worth a maximum of 5 points each.

**Category 12: Hospital Inpatient and Outpatient Reimbursement Rate Setting Proposal**

**SRC# 12: Hospital Inpatient and Outpatient Reimbursement Rate Setting Proposal**

As described in **Attachment B,** Scope of Services, **Section II.**, Manner of Service(s) Provision, **Sub-Section B.**, Services Provided by the Vendor, Item 2., Sub-Item m., the respondent may be directed by the Agency to develop and implement hospital inpatient and outpatient reimbursement rates. Responses to this SRC will not be scored and may, at the Agency’s discretion, be included in the negotiations phase.

**Attachments are limited to the following:**

* A description of the Vendor’s experience developing reimbursement rates for hospital inpatient and outpatient services for the Medicaid fee-for-service (FFS) delivery system using All-Patient Refined Diagnosis Related Grouper (APR-DRG) and Enhanced Ambulatory Patient Grouping Systems (EAPG).
* An estimated work plan for setting the Hospital Inpatient and Outpatient reimbursement rates for year 1 of the resulting Contract for the fee-for-service (FFS) Medicaid delivery system.
* Work plan that must contain designated staff who would be assigned to the project for year 1.
* Resumes for key staff assigned to the work plan.
* Hospital inpatient and outpatient reimbursement respondent proposed rate setting methodology and process document and/or diagram outlining how the respondent would calculate the hospital inpatient and outpatient reimbursement rates for each program.

**Response:**

**Evaluation Criteria:**

**Score:** No points will be awarded for this SRC.