



## AWARD NOTIFICATION

### **Puerto Rico Medicaid Program Contact Center (Contact Center) Request for Proposals (RFP)**

**(2022-PRMP-MES-ContactCenter-004)**

DATE: June 16, 2022  
TO: Proposing Vendors for 2022-PRMP-MES-ContactCenter-004  
FROM: Puerto Rico Medicaid Program (PRMP)  
SUBJECT: AWARD NOTIFICATION: Puerto Rico Medicaid Program Contact Center RFP  
(2022-PRMP-MES-ContactCenter-004)

Pursuant to the authority and responsibilities set forth in Act No. 81-1912, as amended, known as "Health Department Act," and Act No. 38-2017, as amended, known as the "Uniform Administrative Procedures Act of the Government of Puerto Rico," the Puerto Rico Department of Health (hereinafter, "PRDoH"), Puerto Rico Medicaid Program (hereinafter, "PRMP"), issued a Request for Proposals (hereinafter, "RFP") for the purpose of selecting a vendor to provide Contact Center services in support of its Medicaid Enterprise Systems (MES), as per 2022-PRMP-MES-ContactCenter-004.

In response to the RFP, the PRMP received proposals from seven (7) vendors: IntelVox, LLC (hereinafter, "IntelVox"), LinkActiv Group (hereinafter, "LinkActiv"), Atento de PR Inc (hereinafter, "Atento"), JAYE Inc DBA TeleMedik Group (hereinafter, "TeleMedik"), Telecontacto-Telecontact, Inc. (hereinafter, "Telecontacto"), TAS United LLC (hereinafter "TAS United"), and Insight Communication, Corp (hereinafter, "Insight Group"). In accordance with Section 5.2: Evaluation Process of the RFP, proposals were evaluated by a five (5) person committee (hereinafter, "Evaluation Committee"). Pursuant to Section 5.2: Evaluation Process and Section 6.2: Contract Award Process of the RFP, the Evaluation Committee's determinations and scores were submitted to the PRMP Executive Director.

Based on the scores of the evaluations of the technical proposals and cost proposals, the Evaluation Committee recommended to the PRMP Executive Director, who agreed with such recommendation, that the contract be awarded to Telecontacto, whose proposal scored a total of 773.83 points, compared to TeleMedik with 679.65 points, LinkActiv with 562.46 points, IntelVox with 544.38 points, and Atento with 476.22 points.

In accordance with Act No. 38-2017, as amended, known as the "Uniform Administrative Procedures Act of the Government of Puerto Rico," and Section 6.2: Contract Award Process of



the RFP, the PRDoH, PRMP, hereby notifies this Award Notification, announcing its contract award to Telecontacto.

This Notification of Award does not create rights, interests, or claims of entitlement in either the selected vendor or any other vendor. It does not constitute the formation of a contract between the PRDoH and Telecontacto. Telecontacto must submit all appropriate documentation to the PRDoH contract office and request approval from the federal partners before the contract is executed with the PRDoH.

## I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

1. On April 11, 2022, PRDoH, PRMP, published 2022-PRMP-MES-ContactCenter-004, for the purpose of selecting a vendor to provide Contact Center services in support of its MES, as per Section 1.1: Purpose of the RFP. Vendors were required to submit proposals in two distinct parts: technical and cost.
2. On April 27, 2022, PRMP responded to vendors' written questions.
3. On May 11, 2022, six (6) vendors submitted their respective proposals, in accordance with Section 3.8: Proposal Submission and Section 3.12: Proposal Submittal and Instructions of the RFP.
4. On May 12, 2022, Insight Group (proposal 7), submitted its proposal after the proposal submission due date of May 11, 2022.
5. On May 12, 2022, PRMP opened the technical proposals submitted by IntelVox, LinkActiv, Atento, TeleMedik, Telecontacto, and TAS United.
6. On May 13, 2022, the Solicitation Coordinator completed the Mandatory Requirements Review of the proposals in accordance with Section 5.4: Evaluation Criteria of the RFP. The Solicitation Coordinator determined that all six (6) proposals met all of the mandatory requirements. All six (6) proposals were subsequently provided to the Evaluation Committee to complete their technical evaluations, per Section 5.4: Evaluation Criteria of the RFP.
7. On May 26, 2022, the Evaluation Committee completed their evaluation of the technical proposals. During the evaluation of proposal six (6) by vendor TAS United, it was determined that the proposal should be disqualified due to failure to meet Attachment C: Vendor Qualifications and Experience, mandatory qualification number two. The requirement states "*The vendor must demonstrate at least three (3) years' experience in Medicaid, Medicare, and/or other federally regulated operations (e.g., CMS, Internal Revenue Services [IRS], FCC)*". In addition to failing to meet mandatory qualification number two, the vendor did not comply with the submittal instructions as stated in section 3.12.4 of the RFP. The vendor provided one (1) printed copy of the technical proposal



- when six (6) were required. The Evaluation Committee disqualified proposal six (6) in accordance with RFP section 3.11 PRMP Right of Rejection.
8. On May 26, 2022, subsequent to attesting to the results of the technical evaluation, PRMP opened the cost bid proposals for all vendors whose technical proposals were fully evaluated including IntelVox, LinkActiv, Atento, TeleMedik, and Telecontacto. Once opened, the cost proposals were reviewed, and clarifying questions were prepared for two proposals.
  9. On June 1, 2022, the Evaluation Committee completed their evaluation of the cost proposals and attested to the results.
  10. Both the technical and cost evaluation results and their associated recommendations were then presented to PRMP for its review and approval. The PRMP Executive Director reviewed the evaluation results and associated recommendations, as per RFP Section 6.5: Contract Award Process.
  11. On June 1, 2022, the Evaluation Committee, issued a Notice of Award Memorandum, announcing the results of the technical and cost evaluations and its recommendation to the PRMP Executive Director, for the award to be made to Telecontacto.

## II. PROPOSAL SUMMARY

Summaries of each proposal are included below. The narrative summaries were developed using consensus comments made by the Evaluation Committee during the technical evaluation. Cost summaries were directly extracted from the vendors' cost proposals.

### 1. IntelVox:

*The proposal partially addresses the majority of the RFP requirements; however, responses throughout the proposal lack supporting detail. The vendor has been in business for three years and has two years of experience providing similar services specified in the RFP. The vendor did not provide three complete vendor references, as required by Attachment C: Vendor Qualifications and Experience. The proposed staff do not have specific healthcare experience, as seen in the resumes provided. In Attachment G: Response to Statement of Work, the narrative was generic. The responses to the Statement of Work and Attachment F: Requirements Traceability Matrix lacked detail and explanation of how the vendor would comply with the implementation and operational requirements of the RFP.*

*The Cost Proposal totals for both Cost by Volume and Cost by Inquiry are as follows:*

*Cost by Volume – \$8,344,714.29*

*Cost by Inquiry– \$45,614,857.50*



**2. LinkActiv:**

*The vendor has over 25 years of experience in the industry, with 10 being in healthcare, and it has contracting experience with the government of Puerto Rico. This vendor did not provide sufficient detail or explanation with regard to its initial staffing plan. Due to the lack of resumes, a staff assessment could not be completed. Its Approach to System and Technology was very detailed, and its Approach to Operations is acceptable. Having three operation facilities in Puerto Rico is a positive for this vendor. It provided a well-defined and complete Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity Plan. Its Approach to Quality and Training had sufficient details.*

*The Cost Proposal totals for both Cost by Volume and Cost by Inquiry are as follows:*

*Cost by Volume – \$8,115,120.00*

*Cost by Inquiry – \$10,006,322.50*

**3. Atento:**

*The vendor failed to submit Attachment F: Requirement Traceability Matrix (RTM), which comprises a significant portion of the technical proposal. PRMP requires the RTM in order to properly assess the feasibility of a vendor for the services requested in the RFP. The information that was provided was vague, general, and lacked specificity. Very few areas had adequate or sufficient amounts of information for the evaluators to assess the qualifications of the vendor. The Approach to Quality and Training had a description of its Quality Module.*

*The Cost Proposal totals for both Cost by Volume and Cost by Inquiry are as follows:*

*Cost by Volume – \$9,575,370.76*

*Cost by Inquiry – \$12,152,730.45*

**4. TeleMedik:**

*The vendor fully addresses the requirements of the RFP. Its experience in the healthcare insurance industry in Puerto Rico is adequate. The vendor has two locations in different parts of the island, which is positive. The vendor provided a staffing and training program that is well detailed and explains how it would complete each phase. The resumes submitted are related to the activities in the RFP. Its Approach to Systems and Technologies does not provide enough details of the technologies, nor how they would be used. It provided information for the five elements of its Quality Program and sample reports that are available to its clients.*

*The Cost Proposal totals for both Cost by Volume and Cost by Inquiry are as follows:*

*Cost by Volume – \$11,797,565.48*

*Cost by Inquiry – \$10,800,000.00*



## 5. Telecontacto:

*The vendor has experience in the Medicaid and healthcare industry. Its proposal was well organized and provided the information requested, except for addressing business disputes. It provided details of how it is going to use technology in the implementation of services for this Contact Center. It has four locations, but all four are located within the metropolitan area. Its staffing and training methodology is well defined and described. The vendor included information about its corrective plan for underperformance.*

*The Cost Proposal totals for both Cost by Volume and Cost by Inquiry are as follows:*

*Cost by Volume – \$5,475,720.00*

*Cost by Inquiry– \$5,577,360.00*

## III. PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Per Section 5.2: Evaluation Process of the RFP, proposals were evaluated by the Evaluation Committee in two (2) parts. The first part was the Technical Response Evaluation, inclusive of the Mandatory Requirements Review (conducted by the Solicitation Coordinator), followed by the Cost Proposal Evaluation. Per Section 6.2: Contract Award Process of the RFP, the PRMP Executive Director reviewed the Evaluation Committee's recommendations, including, but not limited to, the apparent best-ranked evaluated response. If the PRMP Executive Director had determined that PRMP would award the contract to a vendor other than the one receiving the highest evaluation process score, then the Executive Director would have provided written justification and obtained the written approval of the PRDoH Secretary of Health.

### A. MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS REVIEW

Section 5.5 of the RFP states that vendors must meet or exceed all mandatory requirements outlined in Appendix E: Mandatory Requirements for the rest of their proposal to be scored against the technical requirements of this RFP. Proposals failing to meet one or more mandatory requirements of this RFP may be disqualified and may not have the remainder of their technical or cost proposals evaluated. In accordance with the aforementioned, the Solicitation Coordinator conducted the Mandatory Requirements Review, which consisted of reviewing each vendor's mandatory requirements. Each proposal was evaluated for compliance with:

1. Sixteen (16) mandatory requirements per Attachment E: Mandatory Requirements of the RFP

The Solicitation Coordinator determined that six (6) proposals met all of the mandatory requirements and the proposals were subsequently submitted to the Evaluation Committee to complete the technical and cost evaluations, per Section 5.4: Evaluation Criteria.

In addition to the mandatory requirements review, mandatory qualifications and RFP instructions were also reviewed by the Evaluation Committee. The sixth (6<sup>th</sup>) proposal was disqualified by the



Evaluation Committee due to failure to meet Attachment C: Vendor Qualifications and Experience, mandatory qualification number two. The requirement states “The vendor must demonstrate at least three (3) years’ experience in Medicaid, Medicare, and/or other federally regulated operations (e.g., CMS, Internal Revenue Services [IRS], FCC)”. In addition to failing to meet mandatory qualification number two, the vendor did not comply with the submittal instructions as stated in section 3.12.4 of the RFP. The vendor provided one (1) printed copy of the technical proposal when six (6) were required. The Evaluation Committee disqualified proposal six (6) in accordance with RFP section 3.11 PRMP Right of Rejection. The seventh (7<sup>th</sup>) proposal, from vendor Insight Group, was not submitted to the Solicitation Coordinator by the close of business on May 11, 2022 as required by the RFP submittal instructions. Therefore, Insight Group’s proposal was disqualified by the Solicitation Coordinator in accordance with RFP section 3.11 PRMP Right of Rejection.

**B. TECHNICAL REVIEW AND COST REVIEW**

Section 5.3: Evaluation Criteria of the RFP states that proposals passing the Mandatory Requirements Review would be evaluated and scored across four (4) global criteria, with each receiving a percentage of the overall total 1,000 points. The technical evaluation was based upon the point allocation designated in Table 1: Scoring Allocations of the RFP for a total of 700 points of the 1,000 points. Cost represented 300 points of the 1,000 points. The Evaluation Committee referred to Appendix A: Contact Center Scoring Rubric to support the evaluation of technical proposals.

Section 5.3: Evaluation Criteria of the RFP indicates the evaluation review scoring areas and point allocations. This is also detailed in the table below:

**Table 1: Evaluation Categories and Maximum Points**

Scoring Area	Points Allocated
<b>Global Criterion 1:</b> Vendor Qualifications and Experience	150 Points Possible
<b>Global Criterion 2:</b> Vendor Organization and Staffing	250 Points Possible
<b>Global Criterion 3:</b> Requirements Traceability Matrix and Approach to Statement of Work	300 Points Possible
<b>Global Criterion 4:</b> Cost Proposal	300 Points Possible
<b>Total Points Possible</b>	<b>1,000 Points</b>

After discussing individual scores for all evaluation categories and associated requirements, the Evaluation Committee developed the following consensus in each category of the technical response and proceeded to score the cost proposals.



Table 2: Evaluation Points Summary

Global Criteria	Maximum Points	Proposal 1: Intelvox, LLC	Proposal 2: Linkactive	Proposal 3: Atento	Proposal 4: Telemedik	Proposal 5: Telecontacto
Vendor Qualifications and Experience	150.00	60.00	120.00	54.00	120.00	96.00
Vendor Organization and Staffing	250.00	150.00	30.00	150.00	220.00	180.00
Requirements Traceability Matrix and Approach to Statement of	300.00	137.52	210.04	100.67	187.55	197.83
Cost Proposal	300.00	196.86	202.43	171.56	152.10	300.00
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>1,000.00</b>	<b>544.38</b>	<b>562.46</b>	<b>476.22</b>	<b>679.65</b>	<b>773.83</b>

As previously stated, the sixth (6<sup>th</sup>) proposal, submitted by vendor TAS United, was disqualified during the technical review, due to failure to meet Attachment C: Vendor Qualifications and Experience, mandatory qualification number two. The requirement states “*The vendor must demonstrate at least three (3) years’ experience in Medicaid, Medicare, and/or other federally regulated operations (e.g., CMS, Internal Revenue Services [IRS], FCC)*”. In addition to failing to meet mandatory qualification number two, the vendor did not comply with the submittal instructions as stated in section 3.12.4 of the RFP. The vendor provided one (1) printed copy of the technical proposal when six (6) were required. The Evaluation Committee disqualified proposal six (6) in accordance with RFP sections 3.11 and 5.1 PRMP Right of Rejection.

#### IV. AWARD DETERMINATION

Per Section 6.2: Contract Award Process of the RFP, the Solicitation Coordinator submitted an Award Memorandum including the Evaluation Committee’s determinations and scores to the PRMP Executive Director for consideration along with any other relevant information that might be available and pertinent to contract award. The PRMP Executive Director reviewed the apparent best-ranked evaluated response and subsequently issued a Notice of Award identifying the apparent best-ranked response and made the RFP files available for public inspection.

IntelVox met the mandatory requirements, attained 347.52 technical points, and attained 196.86 cost points, for an **overall score of 544.38 points**.

LinkActiv met the mandatory requirements, attained 360.03 technical points, and attained 202.43 cost points, for an **overall score of 562.46 points**.

Atento met the mandatory requirements, attained 304.66 technical points, and attained 171.56 cost points, for an **overall score of 476.22 points**.



TeleMedik met the mandatory requirements, attained 527.55 technical points, and attained 152.10 cost points, for an **overall score of 679.65 points**.

Telecontacto met the mandatory requirements, attained 473.83 technical points, and attained 300.00 cost points, for an **overall score of 773.83 points**.

The differences in scoring in the responses to the Vendor Qualifications and Experience, Project Organization and Staffing, and Approach to Statement of Work, requirements are exemplified by comments made by evaluation committee members during the evaluation as shown below.

### IntelVox

*"The vendor's proposed approach to systems and technology lacked specificity describing the vendor's approach to complying with the requirement. For example, the vendor's response lacked a detailed explanation of its planned use of software, hardware, and technology systems. From the vendor's response, it is not clear how the systems would be implemented."*

*"The proposed key staff lacked experience in the healthcare industry, specifically Medicaid. The proposed key staff's resumes were not consistent or detailed."*

*"The vendor's proposed approach to operations is general. The vendor's proposed approach does explain some of the methods for complying with the requirement; however, the proposed approach lacks description detailing the vendor's proposed approach. For example, the disaster recovery plan and the business continuity plan are referenced, but not described or provided as an example."*

*"The vendor's proposed approach to reporting is limited. The vendor's response provides no examples of reports and does not specify the procedures and/or frequency of reporting."*

*"The vendor only provided one complete vendor reference, but Attachment C: Vendor Qualifications and Experience requires three vendor references."*

### LinkActiv

*"The vendor has over 25 years of experience, 10 years of healthcare experience, and states industry advantages that set them apart from other vendors."*

*"The vendor has had consistent contracts with government agencies in Puerto Rico over the last 20 years, including health and human services departments."*

*"The vendor's response did not provide sufficient information to evaluate the key staff and resumes. The vendor's response included general bios for proposed staff, instead of resumes detailing the years of experience of staff and their ability to meet the requirements of the RFP."*

*"The vendor's response describes the system and software they would use, as well as the configurable nature of the systems, the system features including security and IT protocols, and operational plans for a contact center (routing, campaigns, and reporting)."*





*"The vendor's response describes how they will provide and monitor network services and compliance with security protocols."*

*"The vendor's response explains in details their operations for call vectoring, queue management, and telephony systems."*

*"The vendor's response fully addresses the requirements and describes how the vendor will approach the management of operations, as described in the RFP."*

*"The vendor's response provided a detailed disaster recovery plan and checklist."*

*"The vendor's response includes a detail approach to reporting with descriptions of reporting frequency and types of reports that will be regularly provided to PRMP."*

*"The vendor's response includes a detailed approach to the training, including but not limited to a training program description, training provided during onboarding, and ongoing annual training. The vendor's response also included a detail approach to quality management, including, but not limited to monthly quality audits."*

#### **Atento**

*"The vendor did not provide specific business relationships."*

*"The vendor did not provide Attachment F - Requirements Traceability Matrix, which prevented the ability of evaluators to properly assess the vendor's ability to meet this requirement."*

*"The vendor provided a quality module."*

#### **TeleMedik**

*"The vendor has well-detailed experience in Puerto Rico. They have worked with most healthcare insurance companies on the island."*

*"The vendor documented their staffing model and how staff will support each phase of work. They provided detailed staffing activities."*

*"The vendor provided standardized resumes with references. Their experience is related to this RFP."*

*"The vendor provided some information, but not enough detail of the technology nor how it will be used. The information provided was sufficient, but not complete."*

*"The vendor has two locations, Guaynabo and Mayaguez, which is positive. Specifically because they are in different parts of the island."*

*"The vendor provided an example of the possible reports offered to clients."*



*"The vendor provided information of the five elements of their Quality Program."*

### **Telecontacto**

*"The vendor has over 25 years' experience, including with Medicaid, and four locations."*

*"The vendor provided the information requested in an organized manner. They have direct experience."*

*"They provided detailed information on how they are going to use/apply the technology to the contact center."*

*"The vendor mentioned more details of the technology used to make sure the campaign is successful."*

*"The vendor provided the quality methodology in detail as well as the training and requirements for staff to pass the training."*

*"The vendor included a corrective action plan."*

The Evaluation Committee determined that as a result of a fair and objective evaluation process, Telecontacto's proposal was the highest scoring proposal and is the best value decision for PRMP.

In accordance with Section 6.2: Contract Award Process of the RFP, the Evaluation Committee, per the Solicitation Coordinator, recommended that the contract be awarded to Telecontacto, who attained the highest overall score. The PRMP Executive Director has evaluated the recommendation and found it is in the best interest of the Government of Puerto Rico, the PRDoH, and PRMP, to award the contract to Telecontacto. The PRMP concludes that Telecontacto's proposal meets the RFP's requirements and demonstrates more of an ability to fulfill compliance with the requirements of the RFP. Based on the aforementioned facts, the PRMP agrees with the Evaluation Committee, and awards the contract to Telecontacto.

### **V. STATEMENT OF APPEALS**

Award revisions will be governed by Act No. 38-2017, as amended, known as the "Uniform Administrative Procedures Act of the Government of Puerto Rico," Sections 3.19 and 4.2.

A copy of the Award Notification will be sent by e-mail to all vendors.

Any party adversely affected by the PRDoH's decision may file a request for reconsideration before the PRDoH within twenty (20) days of the date the PRDoH's decision was notified. The date of notification will be determined by as the day that follows from the date on which the e-mail was sent to all vendors to the addresses provided for legal notices in the submitted proposals.

An original of the request for reconsideration must be filed with the PRDoH at the following location: Oficina de Asesores Legales, Edificio A, Calle Periferal Interior, Barrio Monacillos, Rio



Piedras P.R. The party requesting reconsideration must notify all other vendors, including awardees, with a copy of its request. A digitalized copy must be sent on the same date to Elizabeth Otero Martinez, [elizabeth.otero@salud.pr.gov](mailto:elizabeth.otero@salud.pr.gov) (PRMP).

The PRDoH according to Act No. 38-2017, shall consider the request for reconsideration within thirty (30) days of filing. The PRDoH may extend said term only once, for an additional term of fifteen (15) calendar days. If the PRDoH does not answer the request for reconsideration within such period, it will be deemed to have been rejected.

If any determination is made in your consideration, the term to file the petition for judicial review will begin to count from the date a copy of the notification of the decision of the PRDoH resolving the request for reconsideration. If the PRDoH fails to take any action in relation to the request for reconsideration within the corresponding term, as provided herein, it will be understood that it has been rejected outright, and from that date the term to file a petition for judicial review will begin.

In summary, the vendor may file a petition for judicial review of PRDoH' s final decision before the Puerto Rico Appellate Court within twenty (20) days from the earlier of:

- (i) The notification of PRDoH's final decision regarding the vendor's request for reconsideration. The date of notification will be determined by the official United States Postal Service postmark on the envelope containing the final decision regarding the request for reconsideration; or
- (ii) The date that the request for reconsideration is deemed to have been rejected

Vendors who fail to file a request for reconsideration or a petition for judicial review within the periods indicated herein waive their right to contest an award.

On June 16, 2022 in San Juan, Puerto Rico,

Dinorah Collazo Ortiz  
Executive Director  
Puerto Rico Medicaid Program

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on June 17, 2022, copy of this Award Notification has been sent by e-mail to all vendors to the address provided for legal notices in the submitted proposals:

**Rafael Toro, Esa.**  
**IntelVox, LLC (IntelVox)**  
Address: PO Box 11064



San Juan, PR 00922  
[rafa@toro-arsuaga.com](mailto:rafa@toro-arsuaga.com)

**Javier Aviles Feliu**  
**LinkActiv Group (LinkActiv)**  
Marginal Carr. 165 km 2.8  
Guaynabo, PR 00907  
[javier.aviles@linkactiv.com](mailto:javier.aviles@linkactiv.com)

**Rosa Maldonado Zabala**  
**Atento de PR Inc. (Atento)**  
Urbanizacion Industrial El Troche. Carr 189 KM 2.0  
Caguas, PR 00725  
[rmaldonado@atento.com](mailto:rmaldonado@atento.com)

**Joaquin Fernandez Quintero**  
**JAYE Inc. DBA TeleMedik Group (TeleMedik)**  
PMB 347 Ave. Winston Churchill #138  
San Juan, PR 00926-6013  
[fernandez@telemedik.com](mailto:fernandez@telemedik.com)

**Miguel Merced Mader**  
**Telecontacto-Telecontact, Inc. (Telecontacto)**  
Urb. Hyde Park 275 Ave. Jesus T Pinero  
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00927  
[miguel@telecontacto.com](mailto:miguel@telecontacto.com)

**Jay Casalduc**  
**TAS United LLC (TAS United)**  
580 Marinal Buchanan Suite 210  
Guaynabo, PR 00969  
[jcasalduc@tasunited.com](mailto:jcasalduc@tasunited.com)

**Neftali Bernard**  
**Insight Communication, Corp. (Insight Group)**  
342 San Luis St. Suite 304  
New Port IV Building – Bechara Industrial Park  
San Juan, PR 00920  
[nbernard@insightgrouppr.com](mailto:nbernard@insightgrouppr.com)

Elizabeth Otero Martinez  
[elizabeth.otero@salud.pr.gov](mailto:elizabeth.otero@salud.pr.gov)  
Solicitation Coordinator



### Appendix A: Contact Center Scoring Rubric

Rating	Relation to Requirements	Strengths	Weaknesses	Likelihood of Success
<b>Excellent</b> 5	Exceeds the requirements	Numerous and significant in key areas	None	Very High
<b>Good</b> 4	Fully addresses the requirements	Some and significant in key areas	Minor, but far outweighed by strengths	High
<b>Acceptable</b> 3	Addresses the requirements, but has some minor deficiencies	Some and adequate in key areas	Minor, but outweighed by strengths	Fair
<b>Marginal</b> 2	Partially addresses the requirements or is very limited	Some that are outweighed by weaknesses	Significant	Poor
<b>Unacceptable</b> 1	Fails to address the requirements	None or some that are far outweighed by weakness	Extreme	None