

ATTACHMENT Q: FIRST AMENDED AND RESTATED 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 .0 Method of Award and Proposal Evaluation Process.

I. Minimum Requirements Rating

The Evaluation Committee will review the Vendor's responses to the questions in Attachment N: Minimum Requirements Response 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, 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 as set forth 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.

The following Technical Response questions will be evaluated against the rating scale set forth in Table II.-1 – Strengths and Weaknesses Rating Scale:

Questions: 6 – 23, 45-49, 53, 54, 62, 89-91, 198-203

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.
----------------------	---

The following Technical Response questions will be evaluated against the rating scale set forth in Table II.-2 – Risks Rating Scale:

Questions: 4, 5, 24-44, 50-52, 55-61, 63-88, 92-197, 214-216

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.

The following Technical Response questions will be evaluated against the rating scale set forth in Table II.-3 – Experience and Performance Rating Scale:

Questions: 1-3

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.
----------	---

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. 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. 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.

Table III.-1. - Criterion Level Rating Scale	
Rating	Definition
Exceeds Requirements	<p>The responses demonstrate that the Vendor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 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 Plan; 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 Plan's confidence that Vendor will be able to meet and, in some areas, exceed, the requirements of the RFP.
Meets Requirements	<p>The responses demonstrate that the Vendor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 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	<p>The responses demonstrate the Vendor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 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	<p>No response provided or the responses provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 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 the Total Cost to the Plan based on projected claims costs developed using responses to the network administrative fees and programmatic cost in the formatted cost tables provided in the RFP. The overall evaluation methodology for the cost proposal 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 Table A-10.1, Table A-10.2, and Tables A-10.3 and A-10.4, net of applicable credits, allowances, and discounts. Vendors must clearly identify the unit basis for each fee in their Cost Proposal.

Programmatic costs will be calculated based on the information provided in Attachment A-3: Completed Claims Repricing File; Attachment A-5: Claims Repricing Reconciliation and Explanation; Attachment A-11: Trend and Network Pricing Guarantees; Attachment A-9: Other Provider Payments; Attachment A-8: Contract Effective Dates and Improvements; Attachment A-6: Repricing Summary - Service Category; Attachment A-7: Repricing Summary - By Provider; and A-12: Self-Funded Claims Projection.

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.