



COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Department of Health
Puerto Rico Medicaid Program

AWARD NOTIFICATION HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY – ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN 2023-PRMP-HIT-006

Pursuant to Executive Order Num. 2021-029¹, Administrative Order Num. OA-535², Act. No. 38/2017³, as amended, and 45 CFR 74.327-329, the Puerto Rico Medicaid Program (PRMP) issued a Request for Proposal with the purpose of procuring professional services for the conduction of an Environmental Scan related to the use of technology in the health providing sector.

In response to the request, PRMP received proposals from two (2) vendors: V2A, LLC, (V2A), and Bridgewater Consulting Group, Inc., (Bridgewater). In accordance with section 4.3 of the RFP, proposals were evaluated by a Puerto Rico Department of Health (PRDoH) appointed committee, according to a weight/score method. The highest considerations were to be given to the qualifications/experience of the proponent and to its proposal. Also, section 4.1 stated: “[T]he Buena Pro will be awarded in favor of the proposal that represents the best value for PRMP and the Government of Puerto Rico.”

Based on the committee’s determinations and scores given to the proposals, the Evaluation Committee recommended to the PRMP Executive Director that the Buena Pro and subsequent contract be awarded to Bridgewater, whose proposal scored a total of 38 points. V2A proposal scored 35.2 points. Having agreed with and accepted the committee’s recommendation, the Executive Director notifies this Award Notification in favor of Bridgewater Consulting Group, Inc.

Prior to the formation of the contract, Bridgewater must submit all appropriate documentation to the PRMP contract office. Furthermore, no service should be provided by Bridgewater until a copy of the contract is filed with the Puerto Rico Office of the Comptroller.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On August 22, 2023, the PRMP published RFP 2023-PRMP-HIT-006 seeking proposals from qualified vendors for the provision of consulting services to develop and implement an environmental scan of the state of the health information technology (HIT) across diverse groups of healthcare providers in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

¹Issued by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.


²Issued by the Department of Health of Puerto Rico.

³Known as the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act of the Government of Puerto Rico.

Vendors presented questions related to the RFP and were answered by PRMP by September 6, 2023. Proposals were submitted on September 13, 2023. The Evaluation Committee presented written questions to the vendors to further clarify aspects of each proposal. Vendors complied with the provision of written answers.

On October 3, 2023 the Evaluation Committee completed its evaluation of the technical proposals and proceeded to sign the technical evaluation memorandum, which summarized consensus technical evaluation scores. After attesting to the results of the technical evaluation, PRMP opened and announced the cost bid proposals submitted by the vendors. Once opened, the cost proposals were evaluated and scored, and added to the technical scores to determine the final value of each proposal. The Evaluation Committee proceeded to sign the final evaluation memorandum which summarized the final score or value of each vendor. This constituted the committee's recommendation to the program's executive director.

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

 V2A, LLC, a company with 20 years of experience in the Puerto Rico healthcare sector, proposes a survey sample of 450 providers, under a "best efforts approach" due to foreseen probable difficulties "recruiting healthcare workers to participate in a quantitative survey".⁴ The project would be done in conjunction with Lateral Strategy, a market research firm based in Puerto Rico. The proposed methodology will consist of 4 phases: (1) development of environmental scan, (2) administration of environmental scan, (3) analysis of environmental scan and (4) final report and presentation. V2A estimated the duration of the project to be 9 months. Their proposal has a cost of \$1,563,500.

Bridgewater Consulting Group, Inc., was founded in 2009 to provide management consulting services to the public and private sector. The project will be done in conjunction with Impacto, LLC, a healthcare consulting firm. Its proposal will employ a stratified random sampling technique and "intends to engage and involve provider professional associations and interest groups that can complement and support the outreach and communication activities that will be performed as part of the Scan."⁵ The methodology includes the following activities: (1) planning, (2) mobilization, (3) data gathering, (4) survey monitoring and data validation, and (5) analysis and final report, with an estimated duration of the project to be six months. Bridgewater did not provide a survey sample figure. Instead, indicated that during the planning process can provide an initial sample size estimate, which will be revised during the mobilization phase of the proposed approach. Their proposal has a cost of \$499,482.

⁴ Page 5 of V2A technical proposal – approach and methodology.

⁵ Page 4 of Bridgewater proposal – executive summary.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION – METHOD AND ANALYSIS

Section 1.5 of the RFP instructed vendors to submit proposals in two distinct parts sealed in separate envelopes: technical (consisting of: (a) vendor qualifications and experience, (b) project proposal) and cost. Technical proposals were evaluated and scored by the Evaluation Committee, prior to the opening of its correspondent cost proposal. As stated before, for its analysis the Evaluation Committee used a weight/score formula within the following criteria:

Vendor Qualification and Experience

For this criteria, members of the Committee considered the following:

- Description of firm/organization and personnel (key, subcontractor)
- Two case studies with similar services rendered.
- Experience with tight timelines
- compliance with requirements (ASG/RUP, good standing)

Project Proposal

For this criteria, members of the Committee considered the following:

- Detailed initial project schedule/work plan
- Detailed tasks and timelines outlining the major tasks planned by vendor.
- Work breakdown structure (WBS)
- Project schedule for all project deliverables and milestones
- Identification of resources assigned as the responsible entity for each deliverable within the WBS to the level at which control will be exercised.
- Dependencies to task should be identified.

Cost Proposal

Score provided by formula.

Vendor qualifications and experience, and project proposal criterion were each assigned a maximum available weight of 4; whereas cost proposal criteria was given a weight of 2. In an individual level, members of the Evaluation Committee were to assign a score from a scale of 1 through 5 to each criterion according to the following rubric:

- 5 – Excellent: exceeds the requirements
- 4 – Good: fully addresses the requirements
- 3 – Acceptable: addresses the requirements, but has some minor deficiencies
- 2 – Marginal: partially addresses the requirements or is very limited
- 1 – Unacceptable: fails to address the requirements

Once every technical proposal was scored at an individual level, the committee followed the analysis process with a group discussion where they exchanged and debated their individual scores until a group score consensus was reached for each criterion. The final value or score for each criterion was determined by the following arithmetic exercise: the multiplication of the assigned weight by the consensus score given. The technical proposal had a maximum possible score or value of 40 points.

After the technical evaluation exercise ended, the committee proceeded to add the cost proposal criteria to the equation. The highest possible score, 5, was automatically given to the proposal with the lowest cost. The score provided to the other cost proposal was assigned using the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{lowest offeror's cost}}{\text{the offeror's cost being scored}} \times \text{the maximum number of cost points available}$$

According to the vendors cost proposals, scores are as follows:

Bridgewater:
 $(\$499,482/\$499,482) \times 5 = 5$

V2A:
 $(\$499,482/\$1,563,500) \times 5 = 1.6$

The product of these formulas was then multiplied by the corresponding assigned weight of 2 to get the final score or value assigned to their cost proposals. Bridgewater ended up with the maximum score or value of 10 points, while V2A received a final cost score or value of 3.2 points.

In total, the maximum possible score or value for this request of proposal is 50 points.

The following table portrays the final scores given to each proposal:

Criteria	Weight	V2A		Bridgewater	
		Score	Total	Score	Total
Vendor Qualifications/Experience	4	4	16	3	12
Project Proposal	4	4	16	4	16
Cost Proposal	2	1.6	3.2	5	10
Total			35.2		38

As shown in the table, technical scores were relatively similar in both proposals, having V2A, according to the Evaluation Committee, an edge in the 'vendor qualifications/experience' criteria.

The Evaluation Committee commented the following regarding both proposals:

Bridgewater

- *Has a variety portfolio with over 10 years of experience with 80% of their work being in the healthcare industry.*
- *The vendor and personnel have experience with the Department of Health and have expertise with IT and consulting, but the essence of the work may be performed by the subcontractor.*
- *Personnel roster (key and subcontractors) seems highly competent, touching the required fields in terms of technology and survey conception.*
- *Bridgewater has prior experience with MPIPPR that can facilitate collaborations and understanding of the PRMP structure and protocols. Their access to a provider contacts list and relationship with providers on behalf of PRMP could serve in survey testing, jump start the data collection process, provide preliminary data/early survey (instrument) evaluation.*
- *Has detailed project analysis and implementation.*

V2A

- *The vendor and subcontractor have experience in analytics and research. Presented a proposal that seems to share the work requirements in equality.*
- *Key personnel roster's experience and credentials are solid.*
- *In the approach and methodology, the sample size of the survey was clearly stated.*
- *Has a detailed work schedule plan with a defined timeline. The WBS seems adequate for what is being requested, including the schedule for deliverables and milestones.*
- *V2A is realistic about the timeline of the project and states that the duration of it is estimated to be 9 months with an administration phase of 6 months.*

According to those comments, it seems clear that in the opinion of the Committee, both proponents presented a solution that would have provided PRMP the solicited service within an acceptable or good outcome. Nevertheless, the cost factor played a major role, switching the final total score or value in favor of Bridgewater.

Even though section 4.1 of the RFP stated that cost was not a decisive factor to award the good pro in favor of a participant, the excessive difference in cost between both proposals outweighed the slight advantage that V2A could have shown in the qualifications/experience criteria. Simply put, the Evaluation Committee saw no reason for paying \$1,563,500 instead of \$499,482, which is over 300% more, for a similar service. We agree. Since according to their proposals, both vendors are qualified and able to provide the requested services, the award is given to the entity with the most attractive price.⁶ In this instance, that is Bridgewater.

PRMP DETERMINATION

Hereby it is notified that the Puerto Rico Medicaid Program accepts the Evaluation Committee's recommendation to award the Buena Pro and subsequent contract to Bridgewater. PRMP coincides with the Committee that Bridgewater's proposal is in the best interests for the program, for the Puerto Rico Department of Health and for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. As mentioned before, the contract must be filed with the Puerto Rico Office of the Comptroller before any services can be provided.

In accordance with section 3.19⁷ of the Puerto Rico Administrative Procedures Act, a copy of this Award Notification will be sent by certified **EMAIL** to all vendors to the addresses provided.

On October 19, 2023 in San Juan, Puerto Rico.



Dinorah Collazo-Ortiz, ESQ
Executive Director
Puerto Rico Medicaid Program


⁶ See 45 CFR 75.329(d)(4).

⁷ See 3 LPRA §9672.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVISION/JUDICIAL REVIEW – TERMS

Any person or party adversely affected or aggrieved by this award may, according to 3 LPRC §9659, file a motion for reconsideration with the Puerto Rico Department of Health (PRDoH) within a term of **ten (10) days** from the date of the notification of the award. The PRDoH must consider the motion for reconsideration within **ten (10) business days** of being filed. If any determination is made in its consideration, the term to request the appeal for judicial review will begin from the date on which a copy of the notification of the decision of the PRDoH is filed on record, according to the case, resolving the motion for consideration. If the filing date of the copy of the notification of the decision is different from that of the deposit in the ordinary mail or the sending by electronic means of said notification, the term will be calculated from the date of the deposit in the ordinary mail or sending by electronic means, as appropriate. If the PRDoH fails to take any action in relation to the motion for reconsideration within **ten (10) days** of its filing, it shall be understood that the motion was denied outright, and the time to request judicial review shall start to run from said date.

If the PRDoH Accepts the reconsideration request within the term provided, it must issue the reconsideration decision or resolution within **thirty (30) days** following the filing of the motion for reconsideration. If the PRDoH accepts the motion for reconsideration but fails to take any action in relation to the motion within **thirty (30) days** of its filing, it will lose its jurisdiction and the term to request the judicial review will begin from the expiration of said term of **thirty (30) days**. The PRDoH may extend said term only once, for an additional period of **fifteen (15) days**.

 Any person or party adversely affected by a final reconsideration or decision may file a petition for review with the Puerto Rico Court of Appeals within a term of **twenty (20) business days** of such final decision or determination being filed. See 3 LPRC § 9672.


The mere presentation of a motion for reconsideration does not have the effect of preventing the PRMP from continuing with the procurement process within this request for Proposal.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that on October 19, 2023, copy of this award Notification has been sent via certified mail to all vendors to the addresses provided for legal notices in the submitted proposals:

Juan Pablo Semidey, PE
President & CEO
Bridgewater Consulting Group, Inc.
PO Box 70171 PMB 186
San Juan, PR 00936-8171
ipsemidy@bridgewatercg.com

Graciela Salcedo Canto
Director
V2A, LLC
District View Plaza
644 Ave Fernandez Juncos Ste 401
San Juan, PR 00907-3183
gracielasalcedo@v2aconsulting.com



Elizabeth Otero Martínez
Solicitation Coordinator
elizabeth.otero@salud.pr.gov

PK