

FACT SHEET: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN 2019 SHP RFP AND 2022 SHP RFP

This chart reflects key changes in RFP methodology from 2019 to 2022. Those changes resulted in a decision that relied on arbitrary criteria, limited information, and a distorted scoring system.

| Summary of Changes | 2019 | 2022 |
|---|---|---|
| Cost Proposal: <i>Less detailed analysis of cost proposals</i> | Evaluated each vendor’s cost proposals on a 10,000 -point scale. | Evaluated each vendor’s cost proposal on a 10 -point scale. |
| Cost Proposal: <i>Did not clearly define how costs proposals would be assessed</i> | Stated that the State Health Plan (Plan) would award the maximum number of points to the vendor with the “ lowest total cost [,] with others receiving points proportionately.” | Stated that Plan would award maximum number of points to the vendor “offering the most competitive cost proposal , with others receiving points proportionately,” but did not explain how the committee evaluating each vendor’s proposal would decide which was “most competitive.” |
| Technical Proposal: <i>Significant reduction in the amount of technical information collected</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided the ability to offer narrative responses to technical questions which allowed for a more thorough evaluation • Finalist presentations - Required | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibited narrative responses. Vendors could only give a binary “Confirm” or “Does Not Confirm” response to each question. • Finalist presentation – Not available |
| Technical Proposal: <i>Oversimplified and reduced point scale</i> | Each vendor’s responses to the Plan’s technical questions would be scored on a 10,000-point scale, just as the cost proposals were. | Used a 310-point scale, with one point being awarded based solely on the response to each of the 310 yes-or-no technical questions in the RFP. |
| <i>Increased the importance of cost scores, decreased the level of financial analysis</i> | Cost proposal accounted for 40% of each vendor’s final overall score. Technical proposal accounted for the remaining 60%. | Cost proposals and technical proposals each worth 50% of total score. (The 2022 RFP therefore increased the importance of cost scores, while decreasing the ability to measure differences in each vendor’s cost proposal.) |
| <i>Eliminated North Carolina resources preference</i> | Stated a preference for vendors “with resources in North Carolina.” | Does not state a preference for a vendor with North Carolina resources. |