

# AWARD RECOMMENDATION

**Notice of Intent to Award Number:** 240000000006

The Department of Technology, Management, & Budget’s Procurement office has completed the evaluation of Request for Proposal No. 230000002146 - Physician Services for Statewide Review for Prior Authorization Certification Evaluation Review (PACER) and Selected DME/Medical Supplies and has recommended an award to Michigan Peer Review Organization dba iMPROve Health in the amount of \$875,352 pending State Administrative Board approval, if applicable. More information on the State Administrative Board can be found at: [State Administrative Board](#).

Bidders who were not recommended for the award are encouraged to schedule a debriefing session with the Solicitation Manager. The debriefing session will provide the bidder with the State’s rationale on why the bidder was not recommended for the award. The Solicitation Manager may be contacted as follows:

Jordana Sager, Solicitation Manager.  
 SagerJ2@michigan.gov  
 517-896-1903

**Background Information:**

This Request for Proposal (RFP) was to solicit responses for selection of a Contractor to provide Physician Services for Statewide Review for Prior Authorization Certification Evaluation Review (PACER) and Selected DME/Medical Supplies For Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS). The term of this contract is three -years with up to three additional one-year renewal options.

**Bidders:**

The RFP was posted on SIGMA VSS on Monday, July 24, 2023, for 31 days. The following bidders submitted proposals by the published due date of August 24, 2023.

Bidder	Address, City, State, Zip Code	SDVOB*	GDBE**
Michigan Peer Review Organization dba iMPROve Health	625 Kenmoor Ave SE, Suite 350, PMB 47995 Grand Rapids, MI 49546-2395	No	No
Physicians Review Organization, Inc.	1305 Abbot Road, Suite 100, East Lansing, MI 48823	No	No

\*SDVOB: Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Business

\*\*GDBE: Geographically Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

# EVALUATION SYNOPSIS

## I. Evaluation Process

A Responsible Vendor is a vendor that demonstrates it has the ability to successfully perform the duties identified by the solicitation. A Responsive proposal is one that is submitted in accordance with the solicitation instructions and meets all mandatory requirements identified in the solicitation.

### Proposal Instructions: Evaluation Process

	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weight
1.	Vendor Questions Worksheet (except Experience)	5
2.	Vendor Questions Worksheet, Experience	20
3.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1.1	40
4.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1.2 – 1.6	20
5.	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2 - 10	115
	<b>Total</b>	200

Proposals receiving **160** or more technical evaluation points will have pricing evaluated and considered for award.

The full evaluation process is stated in the RFP Proposal Instructions.

## II. Evaluation Method

Responses to this solicitation were reviewed by a Joint Evaluation Committee, which consisted of the following individuals:

Voting	Advisory
Gretchen Backer BPHASA Program Review Division, Director DHHS	Lisa Trumbell BPHASA, Policy Division, Policy Specialist DHHS
Lori Hinkle BPHASA Program Review Division, Medical Equipment & Services Section, Manager DHHS	Danielle Walsh Department Analyst DHHS
David Wartinger, DO BPHASA Office of Medical Affairs, Physician Consultant DHHS	
Jordana Sager Category Analyst DTMB	

## III. Evaluation Results

### A. iMPROve Health

The Evaluation Team determined that iMPROve Health based on a score of 194, did meet the requirements of this RFP This determination was accomplished by evaluating their responses to the Technical Evaluation Criteria.

1. Vendor Questions Worksheet – except experience 5/5  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
  
2. Vendor Questions Worksheet - experience 20/20  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were satisfactory.
  
3. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1.1. 37/40  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. 1.1.A.2.d General requirements, the Bidder response to the initial physician reviews related to specialty does not meet State’s requirements.
  - b. 1.1.A.4 a-b General requirements, the Bidder response does not address the timeframe for completion of reconsiderations and retrospectives do not meet the State’s requirement.
  - c. 1.1.B.4.a-b General requirements, the Bidder response does not address the timeframe for completion of reconsiderations and retrospectives do not meet the State’s requirement.
  
4. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1.2 – 1.6 18/20  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. 1.6 End-User Operating Environment, the Bidder response related to personal devices goes against PSP policy.
  
5. Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2 - 10 114/115  
 The Evaluation Team determined that overall, the responses were mostly satisfactory, but the following deficiencies were noted:
  - a. 10. A – C Service-Level Agreement (SLA), the Bidder response related to timeframe for completion of reconsiderations does not meet State’s requirements.

**Total Score: 194/100**

**B. Physicians Review Organization**

Physicians Review Organization has not met the requirements of being responsive due to not addressing the scope of the work requirements.

**IV. Technical Evaluation Summary**

Selection Criteria		iMPROve Health	
<b>1</b>	Vendor Questions Worksheet (except Experience)	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>2</b>	Vendor Questions Worksheet, Experience	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3</b>	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1.1	<b>40</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>4</b>	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 1.2 – 1.6	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>5</b>	Schedule A, Statement of Work, Sections 2 - 10	<b>115</b>	<b>114</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>194</b>

### V. Pricing Summary

Pricing was evaluated for the bidders who passed technical. The following is a summary of their price proposals:

Deliverable		iMPROve Health – 3 Year pricing
<b>1</b>	<b>Total PACER Reviews</b>	\$ 545,280
<b>2</b>	<b>Total DME/VDCU Reviews</b>	\$ 291,072
<b>3</b>	Consultation Requests*	\$ 39,000
	<b>Total Price</b>	<b>\$ 875,352</b>

\*Based on 40 hours per year

### VI. Negotiations

The State requested second-round pricing from iMPROve Health and none was offered.

### VII. Award Recommendation

Award recommendation is made to the responsive and responsible Bidder who offers the best value to the State of Michigan. Best value is based on the proposal meeting the minimum point threshold and offering the best combination of the factors stated in the *Proposal Instructions Evaluation Process* section, and price.

iMPROve Health provided the best value to the State. Best value factors for Award Recommendation include:

1. Knowledge and scope of past experiences working with states with larger health systems and the State of Michigan.
2. The subspecialties included dentistry and vision.
3. Organization is well accredited.
4. Quarterly inter-rater reliability testing on 10 PACER/DME/MS/VDCU cases reviewed by each physician reviewer.
5. Knowledge of MDHHS policies and applications.
6. No new report development required.

As part of the best value determination, overall economic impact to the State of Michigan was considered and is not a determinative factor in making this award.

Award Recommendation is made to iMPROve Health in the amount of \$ 875,352.