

---

**SECTION V: EVALUATION AND SELECTION CRITERIA**

Proposals determined by the Department to satisfy the Minimum Mandatory Requirements (MMR) set forth in Section III of this RFP will be evaluated by the Department or its agent. An Offeror's Proposal may be removed from the evaluation process and not be considered should it be determined that the Offeror did not demonstrate it met one or more of the MMR set forth in Section III of this RFP, despite any attestation made by the Offeror regarding the MMR.

During the evaluation process, the Department may require clarifying information from an Offeror to assure the Department's full understanding of the Offeror's proposal. This clarifying information must be submitted in writing in accordance with formats set forth in Section II of this RFP and, if submitted timely, shall be included as a formal part of the Offeror's Proposal. Failure to provide required information by the due date set forth in the Department's request for clarification may result in rejection of the Offeror's Proposal. Nothing in the foregoing shall mean or imply that the Department is obligated to seek or allow clarifications. The Department may, at its discretion, elect to perform site visits of Offerors' facilities and have all Offerors provide oral presentations pertaining to their Proposal. The Procurement Manager will coordinate the necessary scheduling arrangements with Offerors.

The Department will consider for evaluation and selection purposes only those Proposals that, as determined by the State, meet the MMR specified in Section III of this RFP and are responsive to the duties and responsibilities set forth in the RFP. The evaluation will entail the review and scoring of the Offeror's Administrative and Technical Proposals. The Technical evaluation process is based on 1,000 available points, and is scored as described below.

The Department intends to select the responsive and responsible Offeror whose Proposal offers the best value to the Department and the State as specified in the following evaluation criteria for entering negotiations for the execution of a contract (i.e., the Agreement).

**A. Technical Evaluation**

The Technical Proposal of those Offerors that meet the MMR will be evaluated. Each Offeror's ability and willingness to deliver the Program Services described in this RFP will be evaluated and scored based on a weighted point system. The evaluation of the Offeror's Technical Proposal will be based on that Offeror's written Technical Proposal; and responses to clarifying questions, if any; information obtained through, oral presentation(s) conducted to amplify and/or clarify that Offeror's proposed Technical Proposal; and site visits.

**1. Technical Score Ratings**

Offerors' Technical Proposals will be evaluated based on the following rating scale and criteria as applied to the Offeror's response to each evaluated requirement, except in the case of Performance Guarantees. A rating of "excellent" equates to a score of 5 for each evaluated requirement. Each reduction in the ratings results in a one point reduction in the score such that a rating of "poor" equates to a score of 1.

**EXCELLENT (5)**

The Offeror far exceeds the requirement. The response provided indicates that the Offeror will provide very high quality services and is very pro-active and innovative.

**GOOD (4)**

The Offeror exceeds the requirement. The response provided indicates that the Offeror will exceed the Plan's needs. The Offeror demonstrates some innovative features not shown in typical proposals.

**MEETS CRITERIA (3)**

The Offeror meets but does not exceed the requirement. The response provided indicates that the Offeror will meet the Plan's needs.

**FAIR (2)**

The Offeror's answer is minimal; or the answer is very general and does not fully address the requirement; or the Offeror meets only some of the requirement.

**POOR (1)**

The Offeror misinterpreted or misunderstood the requirement; or the Offeror does not answer the requirement in a clear manner or the Offeror does not address or meet the requirement.

**2. Allocation of Technical Score Points**

The scores referenced above shall be applied to weighted point values associated with each evaluated requirement. The relative point value for each section of the Technical Proposal is as follows:

**a. Program Administration - 30% of Total Technical Score**

1. Firm and Account Team Qualifications – 15%
2. Implementation – 15%

**b. Program Services - 70% of Total Technical Score**

1. Customer Service – 10%
2. Employee Communication Support – 5%
3. Eligibility Management – 20%
4. Claims Submission and Processing – 20%
5. Reporting – 10%
6. Transition and Termination of Agreement – 5%

**3. Technical Scoring**

The Offeror's Technical Proposal will be evaluated independently by multiple evaluators based on pre-established Evaluation Criteria. Individual scores will then be averaged. The average score for each response shall be applied to the points associated with each evaluated requirement such that an average score of "Excellent" for each evaluated requirement will result in a maximum of 1,000 points. The awarded technical scores are calculated to the hundredth decimal place.

**B. Best Value Determination**

The Department shall issue a tentative award letter to the responsive and responsible Offeror with the highest technical score to enter into negotiations for executing a contract.

**Please note:** The terms in Appendix A, Standard Clauses for All New York State Contracts, are ***not*** subject to negotiation.

If the Department determines that contract negotiations between the Department and the selected Offeror are unsuccessful, the Department may invite the Offeror with the next highest Technical Score to enter negotiations for purposes of executing a contract. Prior to negotiating with the Offeror with the next highest technical score, the Department will notify the Offeror originally selected and provide the date when negotiations shall cease should an agreement not be reached. Scores will not be recalculated for any remaining Offerors should contract negotiations between the Department and the selected Offeror be unsuccessful because of material differences in key provision(s).