

SCORING SUMMARY
TO # YH26-0094

	Max Points	Guidehouse	Mercer	Milliman	Myers and Stauffer
METHOD OF APPROACH	500	138	300	275	450
EXPERIENCE & CAPACITY	300	60	150	180	270
COST	200	49	200	110	105
TOTAL SCORE	1000	246	650	565	825

Evaluation Committee Members Attestation: We hereby attest that the points awarded to each offeror listed on this Scoring Sheet were scored in accordance with the established evaluation criteria and represent our best judgment of each offeror's proposal. As indicated by the scores and the justification in the Executive Summary, our recommendation for contract award is:

Myers and Stauffer

NARRATIVE SCORING TOOL

RFP #

Guidance	Points
Excellent, insightful response	5
More than adequate response	4
Adequate response, some special insights	3
Adequate response, no special insights	2
Inadequate response	1
Totally inadequate or No response given	0

DIRECTIONS: This is for preliminary scoring only. Final scores will be determined in consensus scoring meetings.

Using the Guidance Table above, fill in preliminary scores (0-5) in the **yellow** boxes below for each Offeror in the categories of Method of Approach and Experience and Expertise. Cost score will be entered by the procurement officer.

Only enter scores into the yellow boxes. Do not touch the other boxes. Do not worry about weighting, or max points available. Your score of 0-5 will be weighted according to the methodology we agreed to and scores will be assigned accordingly.

			Guidehouse		Mercer		Milliman		Myers and
Evaluation Criteria	Points Max	Weight	Evaluator's Score (0-5)	Weighted Score	Evaluator's Score (0-5)	Weighted Score	Evaluator's Score (0-5)	Weighted Score	Evaluator's Score (0-5)
Method of Approach									
7.2.1 Proposed Methodology	125	12.5%	1.5	38	3	75	3	75	4.5
7.2.2 Methods and Resources used	125	12.5%	1	25	3	75	2	50	4.5
7.2.3 Recommended Deliverables	125	12.5%	2	50	3	75	3	75	4.5
7.2.4 Timeline	125	12.5%	1	25	3	75	3	75	4.5
	500	50%		138		300		275	
Experience & Capacity									
7.3.1 Experience with this type of project (OF THE FIRM)	100	10%	1	20	2.5	50	3	60	4.5
7.3.2 Names and Classification of Personnel	100	10%	1	20	2.5	50	3	60	4.5
7.3.3 Experience of Proposed Staff	100	10%	1	20	2.5	50	3	60	4.5
	300	30%		60		150		180	
Pricing Proposal									
Pricing Proposal	200	20%		93		200		101	

Total w/o Cost	198	Total w/o Cost	450	Total w/o Cost	455	Total w/o Cost	
Total	291	Total	650	Total	556	Total	

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

TO # YH26-0094

DIRECTIONS: Use this to take notes to justify scores on first tab. Use black font for Strenths and red font for Weaknesses.
BE CONSISTENT WITH COMMENTS

Evaluation Criteria		Guidehouse		Mercer		Milliman	
		Strengths	Weaknesses	Strengths	Weaknesses	Strengths	Weaknesses
Method of Approach							
7.2.1 Proposed Methodology	Talked about stakeholder engagement process	Insufficient response - Lean 6 sigma based, response lacked any details relating to P&T or pharmacy	Good focus on understanding P&T processes in AZ. Both federal and state requirements. How to gauge stakeholder feedback. P&T guidelines	Response appears to indicate that AZ subject to Open Meetings Law. Response was not clear if they have strong understanding of the P & T Committee in AZ, approach seems to be very AHCCCS resource reliant, vendor appears to have an incorrect assumption that PBM is a stakeholder	Adequate response, did include some detail	We would need to provide direction to them, lacked insight to AHCCCS policies and practices, overreliance on AHCCCS staff	Strong proposal, provided robust response, detailed and thoughtful. Discussed tribal considerations, showed understanding of AHCCCS
7.2.2 Methods and Resources used		Insufficient Response - no mention of CMS, other states, or regulations nothing specific to medicaid pharm program		Appears to be heavily reliant on AHCCCS resources, lacked sufficient detail	Provided information about best practices, and methods,	Lacked mention of distinction between using CMS requirements which are different than commercial rules, did not include states either. Not familiar with our P&T process or policies, should have been able to access information on our website, did not list any resources they would use for research- only their framework and process, underemphasized the utilization of Arizona regulations	Insightful response, will review up to 10 states, for P&T DUR reports and activities, best practices, will work with us to identify stakeholders, willing to do focus groups
7.2.3 Recommended Deliverables		Insufficient Response	adequate response but again heavily reliant on AHCCCS resources		Adequate response	no mention of public facing summary	Provided detailed response, showed initiative to do the work with AHCCCS approval, not heavy on AHCCCS resource needs
7.2.4 Timeline		Insufficient Response - cannot enlarge it to view	Said they would look at up to 5 states, Stakeholder meetings	Response is heavily reliant on AHCCCS resources which may affect deliverable timelines	Adequate response, nothing stands out, looked at workstreams concurrently	Provided minimal info, and non-specific target dates, did not include specific start or end dates, response was not sufficient	Tied to specific P&T items, provided insightful response, showed they understand what is needed and best practices , shows begin dates and end dates
Experience & Expertise							
7.3.1 Experience with this type of project (OF THE FIRM)		Insufficient response - insufficient relevant experience listed		Provide some understanding of landscape in AZ, would have liked to see more understanding of the P&T for AHCCCS. Some experience owrking with other states on pharmacy, but not specific to P&T.	adequate, but not robust	Projects listed did not specifically work on P&T	Most experienced offeror, worked with many states on pharmacy, they have 5 active engagements with MA states, works closely with CMS, have developed the NADAC. Lots of staff assigned and two were previous pharm directors
7.3.2 Names and Classification of Personnel		Insufficient Response			adequate but not robust		Good cross section of proposed staff, lots of pharmacists
7.3.3 Experience of Proposed Staff		Insufficient response - insufficient experience listed	Provide adequate names and experience, no special insights	Pharm Director does not have a lot of experience	adequate but not robust	Proposed staff listed experience heavy on financial consulting, but insufficient pharmacy experience for most	Excellent response, 2 dedicated staff that are former pharm directors, added a number of other staff, one staff listed, Nancy, has experience with AHCCCS

Pricing Proposal Scoring

	Guidehouse	Mercer	Milliman	Myers and Stauffer
Total Price	\$360,000.00	\$87,500.00	\$159,170.00	\$166,100.00
Cost Points Awarded	49	200	110	105

$$\left(\frac{\text{Price}_{lowest}}{\text{Price}_{offered}} \right) \times \text{Points}_{max} = \text{Points}_{awarded}$$