

November 12, 2021

Meggan LaPorte, CPPO, MSW  
Chief Procurement Officer  
Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System  
801 East Jefferson Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85034

Dear Ms. LaPorte:

The purpose of this letter is to summarize the assistance provided to AHCCCS by The Pacific Health Policy Group (PHPG) during the 2021 AHCCCS Complete Care Expansion procurement (Contract YH19-0001), and to offer our assessment of the process itself.

### **Firm Qualifications**

PHPG specializes in assisting state and county Medicaid agencies to develop, implement and evaluate managed care programs for acute, long-term care and other special needs populations. As part of these activities, we have provided technical assistance in approximately forty Medicaid competitive procurements across the country. Within Arizona, we have assisted in the past twelve AHCCCS managed care procurements, including this one (seven AHCCCS health plan and five ALTCS program contractor).

### **Scope of Work**

We were asked to apply our expertise to the 2021 procurement by performing four tasks:

1. Reviewing the Agency's draft and final evaluation instruments for clarity and consistency with RFP standards and proposal submission requirements;
2. Examining the Agency's proposal evaluation process, to determine whether it was fair and objective;
3. Facilitating evaluator deliberations and consensus ranking of written responses to RFP submission requirements;
4. Documenting major observations of evaluators during consensus ranking deliberations.

Our findings in each of these areas are presented below. It should be noted that our work did not encompass serving as proposal evaluators.

### **Evaluation instruments**

We received draft copies of the evaluation instruments prior to release of the RFP. Upon receipt of the draft instruments, we examined the broad categories and related criteria to be used by evaluators in preparing for consensus ranking and communicated in writing a small number of suggested revisions. The final versions reflected our recommendations.

In our opinion, the final evaluation instruments served as appropriate tools for comparing and ranking proposals on an objective basis. The broad categories and related criteria included within each of the tools were appropriately aligned with the written submission requirements.

### **Evaluation Process**

To render an opinion on the evaluation process, we reviewed the instructions developed by the Agency for ranking technical proposals. We also participated in the training session held for persons serving as proposal evaluators.

The evaluators selected to serve on the evaluation teams had appropriate backgrounds and relevant experience. They were properly prepared for the evaluation during the training session.

### **Facilitating Proposal Evaluations**

PHPG consultants facilitated evaluator deliberations, using the evaluation instruments to organize the discussion. Consultants documented the major observations made by evaluators in reaching their consensus ranking decisions. In our opinion, evaluator deliberations were thoughtful and adhered to the content of the evaluation instruments.

### **Documentation of Evaluator Deliberations**


PHPG consultants documented the major observations made by evaluators and reviewed these observations and consensus ranking decisions with evaluators after conclusion of the deliberations. The consensus rationale documents accurately reflect the criteria applied by evaluators in making their final consensus ranking decisions.

**Conclusion**

Overall, we believe the evaluation was well designed and carefully executed. The final rankings therefore can serve as an appropriate guide for the Agency in making contract award decisions.

It was a pleasure working with you and your colleagues on this project. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'AC', written over a light blue horizontal line.

The Pacific Health Policy Group  
Andrew Cohen, Director