

FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED ATTACHMENT Q: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Vendor's responses will be evaluated using the applicable evaluation methodologies described in this Attachment Q: Evaluation Methodology and the process described in Section 3 – 3.4 Evaluation Process of the RFP. The evaluation process will be repeated for each module.

I. Minimum Requirements Rating

The Evaluation Committee will review the Vendor's responses to the questions in Attachment N: Minimum Requirements Responses for each module and evaluate the responses based on the requirements described in the RFP. Based on this review, the Evaluation Committee will record a rating for each question using the Minimum Requirements Rating Scale.

Table I.1: Minimum Requirements Rating Scale	
Meets	The Proposal meets the stated requirements, and Vendor provided any required confirmation and Vendor provided any required documents
Does Not Meet	The Proposal does not meet the stated requirements, or Vendor failed to provide confirmation, or Vendor failed to provide required documents.

II. Technical Requirements Rating

For each question in Attachment O: Technical Requirements Response for each module, the Evaluation Committee will review Vendor's response and evaluate the response at the question level, considering and documenting any strengths and weaknesses, risks, confidence level, or advantages in the response based on the requirements described in the RFP. A rating table is identified for each technical response question for each module as set forth in Tables II.O-1, II.O-2, and II.O-3 below. Based upon this review, the Evaluation Committee will describe the Vendor's response to the Evaluation Question using the categories in the appropriate rating table as set forth below. A rationale will be documented for any rating other than acceptable. No rationale will be provided for a determination of acceptable.

Table II.-1 - Strengths and Weaknesses Rating Scale	
Rating	Definition
Significant Strength	The response meets the requirements of the Plan; and Information disclosed, described, or provided greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance and/or appreciably exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Plan.
Strength	The response meets the requirements of the Plan; and Information disclosed, described, or provided enhances the potential for successful contract performance and/or that exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Plan.
Acceptable	The response meets the requirements of the Plan; and Information disclosed, described or provided is responsive to the question and does not raise concerns that the Vendor will not be able to meet the RFP requirements.
Weakness	The response meets some of the requirements of the Plan; and Information

	disclosed, described, or provided does not meet all requirements and/or is incomplete and/or deficient in a way that creates a risk for unsuccessful contract performance.
Significant Weakness	The response meets either some or none of the requirements of the Plan; and Information disclosed, described, or provided does not meet all requirements and/or is incomplete and/or deficient in a way that creates a significant risk for unsuccessful contract performance; or The response contained insufficient information to evaluate.
Table II.-2. - Risks Rating Scale	
Rating	Definition
Acceptable	The Vendor confirmed it will meet the requirements of the Plan with no limitations identified or the Vendor confirmed it will meet the requirements of the Plan and information disclosed, described or provided does not create a risk of unsuccessful performance.
Low Risk	The Vendor confirmed it will meet the requirements of the Plan with some limitations that create a low risk of unsuccessful contract performance, or the Vendor confirmed it will meet the requirements of the Plan and information disclosed, described or provided creates a low risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Risk	The Vendor confirmed it will meet the requirements of the Plan with some limitations that create a risk of unsuccessful contract performance, or the Vendor confirmed it will meet the requirements of the Plan and the information disclosed, described, or provided creates a risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Significant Risk	The Vendor confirmed it will meet the requirements of the Plan with limitations that create a significant risk of unsuccessful contract performance, or the Vendor did not confirm that it would meet the requirements of the Plan. And/or the information disclosed, described, or provided creates a significant risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Table II.-3. - Experience and Performance Rating Scale	
Rating	Definition
Strength	The response meets the requirements of the Plan; and Information disclosed, described, or provided related to the experience of the entity/individuals enhances the potential for successful contract performance and/or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Plan.
Acceptable	The response meets the requirements of the Plan; and Information disclosed, described, or provided related to the experience of the entity/individuals is responsive to the question and does not raise concerns that the Vendor will be unable to meet the RFP requirements.
Weakness	The Response does not meet some of the requirements; or, the information disclosed, described, or provided related to the experience of the entity/individuals raises or creates a risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Table II.-4. - Confidence Rating	
Rating	Definition
Significant Strength	Based on the information provided, the Plan has substantial confidence that the Vendor possesses the knowledge and skills to successfully meet contract requirements and/or support the Plan's strategy and initiatives.
Acceptable	Based on the information provided, the Plan has confidence that the Vendor possesses the knowledge and skills to successfully meet contract requirements and/or support the Plan's strategy and initiatives.
Weakness	Based on the information provided, the Plan has limited confidence that the Vendor possesses the knowledge and skills to successfully meet contract requirements and/or support the Plan's strategy and initiatives.
Significant Weakness	The information provided does not give the Plan confidence that the Vendor possesses the knowledge and skills to successfully meet contract requirements and/or support the Plan's strategy and initiatives.

Table II.-5. - Strengths and Weaknesses Rating Scale- Advantageous to the Plan	
Rating	Definition
Significant Strength	Information disclosed, described, or provided greatly enhances the potential for successful contract administration by the Plan or performance by the Vendor and/or appreciably improves operational efficiency and/or effectiveness and/or appreciably improves member experience and/or appreciably exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Plan.
Strength	Information disclosed, described, or provided enhances the potential for successful contract administration by the Plan or performance by the Vendor and/or improves operational efficiency and/or effectiveness and/or improves member experience and/or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Plan.
Acceptable	Information disclosed, described or provided is responsive to the question and does not raise concerns that the Vendor will not be able to meet the Contract performance requirements but does not impact the Plan's ability to administer the Contract(s) or impact operational efficiency and/or effectiveness and/or member experience.

The rating tables corresponding to each Evaluation Question for each module:

Table II.O-1: Rating Scales for Module 1 Technical Response Questions	
Question #	Rating Scale
9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 36, 37, 42, 48	Table II.-1. -Strengths and Weaknesses
2, 3, 7, 8, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, 24, 27, 31, 32, 35, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44	Table II. – 2. – Risks
4, 5	Table II. – 3. - Experience and Performance
N/A	Table II. – 4. Confidence Rating

6, 49	Table II. – 5. - Strengths and Weaknesses – Advantageous to the Plan
1, 45, 46, 47	Not scored

Table II.O-2: Rating Scales for Module 2 Technical Response Questions	
Question #	Rating Scale
7, 8, 9, 10, 17, 23, 26, 27, 28, 37	Table II. -1. - Strengths and Weaknesses
2, 3, 16, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35	Table II.-2. - Risks
4, 5	Table II.-3. - Experience and Performance
11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19	Table II – 4. -Confidence Rating
6, 38	Table II.-5.-Strengths and Weaknesses – Advantageous to the Plan
1, 36	Not scored

Table O-3: Rating Scales for Module 3 Technical Response Questions	
Question #	Rating Scale
8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29,	Table II.-1- Strengths and Weaknesses
2, 3, 11, 16, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34	Table II.-2.-Risks
4, 5, 6	Table II.-3.-Experience and Performance
N/A	Table II.-4.-Confidence Rating
7, 35	Table II.-5.-Strengths and Weaknesses – Advantageous to the Plan
1, 33	Not scored

III. Criterion Level Rating

After the Evaluation Committee has reviewed and evaluated each of the Vendor's responses at the question level, the Evaluation Committee will evaluate the Vendor's overall response at the criterion level (see Section 3.4) and determine a consensus rating for each criterion identified in Section 3.4 using the Criterion Level Rating Scale. Except as to the functional area criteria for *Oral Presentations* and *Multiple Module Efficiencies*, the Evaluation Committee will evaluate the Vendor's overall response at the criterion level and determine a consensus rating for each criteria using Table III.-1 - Criterion Level Rating Scale. The Evaluation Committee will determine a criterion level rating based upon the Committee's overall impression of a Vendor's response to the questions within the criterion. For the Oral Presentations and Multiple Module Efficiencies, the rating at the question level will serve as the rating at the criterion level. Except as otherwise indicated (i.e., Oral Presentations and Multiple Module Efficiencies) any strengths, weaknesses, risks, confidence ratings, or advantages recorded by the Committee during the question level evaluation are not dispositive and do not necessarily result in any specific criterion level rating being assigned. Vendor Technical Proposals will be ranked from most advantageous to least advantageous by the Evaluation Committee based on the consensus ratings for the evaluation factors stated in this RFP at Section 3.4 and their relative importance. n

Table III.-1. - Criterion Level Rating Scale	
Rating	Definition
Exceeds Requirements	The responses demonstrate that the Vendor: ➤ Understands the requirements of the RFP; and

	➤ Has proposed an approach that meets and, in some areas, exceeds requirements in a way that adds value to the Department; and ➤ Demonstrates Vendor has the capacity, capability, and/or experience to implement or operationalize the approach; and/or ➤ The information disclosed described or provided is responsive and increases Department's confidence Vendor will be able to meet and, in some areas, exceed, the requirements of the RFP.
--	---

Table III.-1. - Criterion Level Rating Scale (Continued)	
Rating	Definition
Meets Requirements	The responses demonstrate that the Vendor: ➤ Understands the requirements of the RFP and has proposed an approach that meets the requirements; and ➤ Demonstrates the Vendor's capacity, capability, and/or experience needed to implement or operationalize the approach; and/or ➤ The information disclosed, described, or provided is responsive and does not raise concerns that the Vendor will not be able to meet the requirements of the RFP.
Partially Meets Requirements	The responses demonstrate the Vendor: ➤ Has a fair understanding of the requirements of the RFP; and ➤ Proposed an approach for which there is limited capacity, capability, and/or experience to implement or operationalize the requirements; and/or ➤ The information disclosed, described, or provided raises concerns that Vendor will be able to meet the requirements of the RFP and may have performance issues.
Does Not Meet Requirements	No response provided or the responses provided: ➤ Demonstrate Vendor has an insufficient understanding of the requirements; or ➤ Demonstrate a proposed approach that does not meet requirements; or ➤ Does not demonstrate sufficient capacity, capability, and/or experience to meet the requirements; and/or ➤ The information disclosed, described, or provided raises substantial concerns that the Vendor will not be able to meet the requirements of the RFP and may have performance issues.

IV. Cost Proposal

Vendor's proposed cost is an evaluation factor in the selection process. Cost is evaluated with the relative importance as identified in Section 3.4. The Plan will evaluate Cost Proposals submitted for each Module for the Total Cost to the Plan based on administrative fees and programmatic cost in the formatted cost tables provided in the RFP. The overall evaluation methodology for the cost proposal and module specific evaluation information is further described below. See Attachment A: Cost Proposal for additional information. Vendor cost proposals will be ranked according to total cost from lowest to highest.

The overall financial standing of a proposal will be established using the information provided in Vendor's Cost Proposal for the three-year period from January 1, 2028, to December 31, 2030.

Total cost from administrative fees will be estimated from the fees listed in the STANDARD SERVICE FEES table, net of applicable credits, allowances, and discounts. Vendors must clearly identify the unit basis for each fee in their Cost Proposal.

For evaluation purposes, the Plan will calculate total estimated fees by applying the Vendor's proposed rates to the Plan's projections of the applicable fee basis. The fee basis may include, but is not limited to:

- Total Membership (e.g., Per Member Per Month or Per Subscriber Per Month)
- Total Claims (e.g., per-claim fees)
- Total Hours of Work (e.g., hourly rates for implementation or special projects)
- Other Units of Measure as specified in the Cost Proposal

Module 1: Programmatic costs will be determined based on the minimum effective discount rate guarantees and maximum dispensing fee guarantees. To determine applicable AWP and volume, claims will be aggregated and evaluated by expected delivery channel (Retail 30 vs. Retail 90) and drug status (brand, generic). An adjustment may be applied for the generic dispensing rate guarantee. Non-guaranteed claims, where identifiable, will be excluded.

Module 2: Programmatic costs will be evaluated relative to the estimated total aggregate sum of Wholesale Acquisition Cost (WAC) for all claims, using consistent assumptions across all proposals. The Minimum Rebate Guarantees will be applied to the total aggregate sum of WAC for all claims, except those excluded from rebate guarantees. Adjustments to reflect one or more Strategic Initiatives may be considered at the Plan's discretion.

Module 3: Programmatic costs will be determined based on the maximum dispensing fee guarantees, the minimum NDC-level discount guarantees, and the minimum default discount guarantees. To determine applicable AWP and volume, claims will be aggregated and evaluated by expected delivery channel (Affiliated pharmacy vs. non-Affiliated pharmacy) and drug status (brand, generic). Non-guaranteed claims, where identifiable, will be excluded.

The evaluation will incorporate adjustments to reflect the estimated impact of any non-compliant or non-standard responses to the Cost Proposal Requirements.

The Plan reserves the right to adjust calculations to reflect differences in scope, service design, or other proposal-specific factors that materially affect projections, as determined by the Plan.

V. Final Ranking

The Evaluation Committee will conduct a Best Value analysis of the Vendor's proposals, comparing the ratings of each response and the total price provided in the Vendor's Cost Proposal to determine which response provides the best trade-off between price and performance. The Evaluation Committee will rank the Vendors from most advantageous to least advantageous based on this comparative analysis, using the evaluation factors in this RFP at Section 3.4 and their relative importance. A narrative of relative strengths and weaknesses will be documented to support this ranking. The overall ranking of any offer

may be adjusted up or down during the Best Value process and may differ from the preliminary ranking given under either the Technical Proposal evaluation and/or Cost Proposal evaluation. If Vendors have any questions regarding the evaluation criteria or evaluation process or if any portion of the evaluation criteria or evaluation process are not clear to Vendor, they are advised to submit a formal written question(s) (See Section 2.5 Proposal Questions).

VI. Recommendation for Award

Based on the final ranking, the Evaluation Committee will make a recommendation for award to the Executive Administrator