



## Award Notification

### Puerto Rico Medicaid Program Printing and Mailing Services Request for Proposals (RFP)

(2022-PRMP-EE-Printing-Mailing-001/SP-2022-2023-014-MEDICAID)

DATE: May 12, 2023

TO: Proposing Vendors for 2022-PRMP-EE-Printing-Mailing-001/SP-2022-2023-014-MEDICAID

FROM: Puerto Rico Medicaid Program (PRMP)

SUBJECT: Puerto Rico Medicaid Program Printing and Mailing Services RFP (2022-PRMP-EE-Printing-Mailing-001/SP-2022-2023-014-MEDICAID)

## Overview

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 printing and mailing services in support of its Medicaid Enterprise Systems (MES), as per 2022-PRMP-EE-Printing-Mailing-001/SP-2022-2023-014-MEDICAID.

The final version of the RFP was divided into two parts, Part A and Part B. Part A focuses on printing and mailing services including validating addresses, printing and mailing, and managing operations. Part B focuses on managing returned mail and managing operations.

### Part A: Overview

In response to Part A of the RFP, the PRMP received proposals from two (2) vendors: Database Marketing Services (hereinafter, Database) and Evertec Group LLC (hereinafter, Evertec). In accordance with Section 5.1: Evaluation Process of Part A of the RFP, proposals were evaluated by a five (5) person evaluation committee. Pursuant to Sections 5.1: Evaluation Process and 6.2: Contract Award Process of Part A 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 Database, whose proposal scored a total of 850 points, compared to Evertec whose proposal was disqualified due to lack of compliance with the mandatory specifications resulting in no technical or cost scores.

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





Part A of the RFP, the PRDoH and PRMP, hereby notifies this Award Notification, announcing its contract award to Database.

*PK*  
*celly*  
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 Database. Database must submit all appropriate documentation to the PRDoH contract office and PRMP must request approval from the federal partners before the contract is executed with the PRDoH.

## Part B: Overview

In response to the Part B of the RFP, the PRMP received a proposal from one (1) vendor: Database. In accordance with Section 4.1: Evaluation Process of Part B of the RFP, proposals were evaluated by a five (5) person evaluation committee. Pursuant to Section 4.1: Evaluation Process of Part B of the RFP and Section 6.2: Contract Award Process of Part A 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 Database, whose proposal scored a total of 805 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 Part A of the RFP, the PRDoH, PRMP, hereby notifies this Award Notification, announcing its contract award to Database.

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 Database. Database must submit all appropriate documentation to the PRDoH contract office and PRMP must request approval from the federal partners before the contract is executed with the PRDoH.

## Procedural Background

This section provides an overview of milestones for this RFP effort beginning with the initial posting of the RFP and ending with the evaluation committee's recommendation and the PRMP executive director's concurrence with the evaluation committee's recommendation. Where applicable, procurement materials are specifically referenced with milestones.

1. On October 28, 2022, PRDoH, PRMP, published 2022-PRMP-EE-Printing-Mailing-001/SP-2022-2023-014-MEDICAID, for the purpose of selecting a vendor to provide printing and mailing services in support of its MES.
2. On November 23, 2023, PRMP responded to vendors' written questions via the vendor question and answer (Q&A) document. Additionally, PRMP posted updated RFP materials (RFP Amendment 1).





- R*  
*copy*
3. On December 6, 2023, one vendor (Database) submitted a proposal in accordance with Section 3.7: Proposal Submission and Section 3.11: Proposal Submittal and Instructions of the RFP. The solicitation coordinator completed the mandatory specifications review of the proposal in accordance with Section 5.2: Evaluation Criteria of the RFP. The solicitation coordinator determined that the proposal did not meet all the mandatory specifications of the RFP and was thus disqualified. Since PRMP did not receive any viable proposals, PRMP decided to work towards reposting the RFP.
  4. On December 14, 2023, PRMP posted an amended version of the RFP and related materials (RFP Amendment 2).
  5. On January 13, 2023, PRMP responded to vendors' written questions via the vendor Q&A document (Vendor Q&A Amendment 1). Additionally, PRMP posted updated RFP materials (RFP Amendment 3 and Outcomes Traceability Matrix (OTM) Amendment 1).
  6. On February 9, 2023, one vendor (Database) submitted a proposal in accordance with Section 3.7: Proposal Submission and Section 3.11: Proposal Submittal and Instructions of the RFP. The solicitation coordinator completed the mandatory specifications review of the proposal in accordance with Section 5.2: Evaluation Criteria of the RFP. The solicitation coordinator determined that the proposal did not meet all the mandatory specifications of the RFP and was thus disqualified. Since PRMP did not receive any viable proposals, PRMP decided to work towards revising and then resubmitting the RFP to vendors.
  7. On March 13, 2023, the solicitation coordinator submitted the RFP (Parts A and B) and associated materials to 22 vendors.
  8. On March 31, 2023, PRMP responded to vendors' written questions via the vendor Q&A document (Vendor Q&A). Additionally, PRMP posted updated RFP materials (Attachment templates for Parts A and B, RFP Amendment 1 for Parts A and B, Cost Proposal Amendment for Parts A and B, and OTM Amendment 1 for Parts A and B).
  9. On April 21, 2023, two vendors (Database and Evertec) submitted proposals, in accordance with Section 3.7: Proposal Submission and Section 3.11: Proposal Submittal and Instructions of Part A of the RFP. Proposal 1 (Database) responded to both Parts A and B of the RFP, while Proposal 2 (Evertec) only responded to Part A.
  10. On April 21, 2023, PRMP opened the technical proposals submitted by Database and Evertec.
  11. Between April 21, 2023, and April 24, 2023, and prior to the beginning of technical evaluations, the solicitation coordinator completed the mandatory specifications review of Proposal 1 (Database) and Proposal 2 (Evertec) in accordance with Section 5.2: Evaluation Criteria of Part A of the RFP and Section 4.2: Evaluation Process of Part B of the RFP. The solicitation coordinator determined that Proposal 1 (Database) met all the mandatory specifications, and the proposal was subsequently provided to the evaluation committee to complete their technical evaluations, per Section 5.2: Evaluation Criteria of Part A of the RFP and Section 4.2: Evaluation Process of Part B of the RFP. The solicitation coordinator determined that Proposal 2 (Evertec) did not meet all the mandatory specifications and was disqualified per Section 5.4: Failure to Meet Mandatory Specifications of Part A of the RFP. See the section titled Proposal Evaluation Part A: Mandatory Specifications Review and Part B: Mandatory Specifications Review within this document for more information.





- R  
copy
12. On April 25, 2023, the evaluation committee completed its evaluation of the technical proposals for both Parts A and B. The evaluation committee signed a technical evaluation points summary, which summarized consensus technical evaluation scoring and confirmed the formula the evaluation committee would use to score cost proposals.
  13. On April 26, 2023, after the evaluation committee attested via signatures to the results of the technical evaluation, the evaluation committee opened the cost proposals for Proposal 1 (Database). Once opened, the cost proposals for Parts A and B were evaluated and scored. The cost proposal for Proposal 2 (Evertec) was opened only for record keeping purposes per Section 5.6: Cost Proposal Opening and Evaluation of Part A of the RFP.
  14. On April 26, 2023, the evaluation committee signed an evaluation points summary attesting to the results of the technical and cost evaluations and identifying Proposal 1 (Database) as the highest scoring proposal for both Parts A and B of the RFP.
  15. After the conclusion of evaluations both the technical and cost evaluation results and their associated recommendations for Parts A and B were then presented to the PRMP executive director for review and approval. The PRMP executive director reviewed and agreed with the evaluation results and associated recommendations, as per RFP Section 6.2: Contract Award Process of Part A of the RFP.

## Proposal Evaluation Details

Per Section 5.1: Evaluation Process of Part A of the RFP and Section 4.1: Evaluation Process of Part B of the RFP, proposals were evaluated in two (2) parts. The first part was the technical proposal evaluation, inclusive of the mandatory specifications review, followed by the second part, the cost proposal evaluations. Per Section 6.2: Contract Award Process of Part A of the RFP, the PRMP executive director reviewed the apparent best-ranked evaluated response. If the PRMP director had determined that PRMP would award the contract to a vendor other than the one receiving the highest evaluation process score, then they would have provided written justification and obtained the written approval of the PRDoH Secretary of Health.

### Part A: Mandatory Specifications Review

The solicitation coordinator conducted the mandatory specifications review to determine if each proposal met the mandatory specifications, per Section 5.2: Evaluation Criterion of Part A of the RFP. Each proposal was evaluated for compliance with mandatory specifications including:

1. Submission requirements
2. Mandatory requirements
3. Mandatory qualifications

The solicitation coordinator determined that Proposal 1 (Database) met all the mandatory specifications and submitted the proposal to the evaluation committee for evaluation per Section 5.2: Evaluation Criteria of Part A of the RFP and Section 4.2: Evaluation Criteria of Part B of the RFP.





The solicitation coordinator determined that Proposal 2 (Evertec) did not meet all the mandatory specifications and was disqualified per Section 5.4: Failure to Meet Mandatory Specifications of Part A of the RFP.

*Re  
copy*

Proposal 2 (Evertec) did not comply with the instructions and requirements of Attachment F: OTM. In two instances in Proposal 2 (Evertec) the vendor populated “Will Not Meet” in the vendor disposition column of the OTM. Per the instructions for Attachment F: OTM “The vendor must respond with ‘Will Meet’ for each outcome in order for the proposal to be considered responsive to PRMP requirements and be further evaluated” and “If a vendor responds with “Will Not Meet” to one or more outcomes, the proposal will be considered non-responsive and may be disqualified per Attachment E: Mandatory Specifications and Section 5.4: Failure to Meet Mandatory Specifications of Part A of the RFP. As part of the Q&A response, PRMP provided guidance related to responding to the OTM and being compliant with the mandatory specifications of the RFP. Question 16, included in the Q&A document posted on March 31, 2023, reinforces the instructions of the RFP related to responding to the OTM and further clarifies that “the vendor must respond with ‘Will Meet’ for each outcome for the proposal to be considered responsive to PRMP requirements and be further evaluated.”

### Part A: Technical and Cost Reviews

Section 5.2: Evaluation Criteria of Part A of the RFP states that proposals passing the mandatory specifications review would be evaluated and scored across five (5) global criteria, with each receiving a percentage of the overall total 1,050 points. The technical evaluation was based upon the point allocation designated in Table 7: Scoring Allocations of Part A of the RFP for a total of 750 points of the 1,050 points. Cost represented 300 points of the 1050 points. The evaluation committee referred to Appendix A: Printing and Mailing Services Scoring Rubric to support the evaluation of technical proposals.

Section 5.2: Evaluation Criteria of Part A of the RFP indicates the evaluation review scoring areas and point allocations. This is also detailed in Table 1: Evaluation Categories and Maximum Points. The evaluation committee decided not to hold oral presentations, so the total applicable points was reduced from 1,050 to 1,000.

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

Scoring Area	Points Allocated
Vendor Qualifications and Experience	150
Project Organization and Staffing	100
Approach to Statement of Work	450
Cost Proposal	300
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>1,000</b>



The evaluation committee determined the formula below to use to score the cost proposals prior to cost proposal evaluations.

$$\text{Lowest price of all proposals} / \text{proposal price} \times 300 = \text{Price Score}$$

After discussing individual scores for all evaluation categories and associated specifications, 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

Scoring Area	Points Allocated	Database Marketing Services	Evertec Group LLC
Vendor Qualifications and Experience	150	120	0
Vendor Organization and Staffing	100	70	0
Approach to Statement of Work	450	360	0
Cost Proposal	300	300	0
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>850</b>	<b>0</b>

Total Costs for Printing and Mailing Services Part A

$$\text{Database: } \$4,759,420.00 / \$4,759,420.00 \times 300 = 300$$

Evertec: This cost proposal was opened only for record keeping purposes, but was not evaluated, per Section 5.6: Cost Proposal Opening and Evaluation of Part A of the RFP.





## Part A: Award Determination

Per Section 6.2: Contract Award Process of Part A of the RFP, the solicitation coordinator submitted the evaluation committee determinations and scores to the PRMP executive director for consideration along with any other information pertinent to contract award. The PRMP executive director reviewed the apparent best-ranked evaluated response and subsequently issued a notice of award (this document) identifying the apparent best-ranked response and made the RFP files available for public inspection.

Database Marketing Services met the mandatory specifications, attained 550 technical points, and attained 300 cost points, for an **overall score of 850 points**.

Evertec Group LLC did not meet the mandatory specifications, and was consequently disqualified, resulting in no technical or cost scores.

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

### Database Marketing Services

*"The vendor has 25+ years of experience and a mix of clients including similar government agencies performing similar services."*

*"The proposed subcontractor is the incumbent, so they have knowledge of the current system. Additionally, the vendor has shown they have many long-standing relationships with multiple other local agencies."*

*"The vendor's response fully addresses the requirement as there are no reported business disputes for the principal or subcontractor in the last 5 years."*

*"The vendor provided references for multiple clients with long-standing relationships of at least 10 years extending over 20 years. The reference from AAA showed the vendor could handle large volumes and maintain a long-standing relationship."*

*"The vendor provided an organizational chart but lacked significant description and details of the staffing plan as specified in Attachment D: Vendor Organization and Staffing of Part A of the RFP."*

*"The vendor included four key staff whereas the RFP only specified two key staff. The proposed key staff have over 22 years of experience and have long-standing relationships with Database which indicates stability with staff across the vendor's organization."*

*"The vendor proposed using both automatic and manual validation processes for validating addresses. The vendor provided a step-by-step explanation which detailed how validation would be involved in each step. The vendor also proposed a quality and assurance team that will review fixed addresses and change addresses according to industry best practices."*



*"The vendor details their compliance with performance standards and SLAs. They detail a step-by-step process and the quality and assurance team will validate that the address is correctly positioned."*

*"The vendor's proposed approach details compliance with all specifications and requirements of the RFP and detailed the vendor's approach to accomplishing PRMP's intended goals. The vendor has plans in place for business continuity and disaster recovery to support operational activities."*

### **Evertec Group LLC**

*The vendor's proposal did not meet the mandatory specifications of the RFP, and was consequently disqualified, resulting in no technical or cost scores.*

Resulting from a fair and objective evaluation process, the evaluation committee determined the Database Marketing Services proposal was the highest scoring proposal and is the best value decision for PRMP.

In accordance with Section 6.2: Contract Award Process of Part A of the RFP, the evaluation committee, per the solicitation coordinator, recommended that the contract be awarded to Database Marketing Services, 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 Database Marketing Services. The PRMP concludes that the Database Marketing Services proposal meets the RFP specifications and offers the best approach to meeting PRMP's needs. Based on the previously mentioned facts, the PRMP executive director agrees with the evaluation committee, and awards the contract to Database Marketing Services.





## Part B: Mandatory Specifications Review

*R*  
*copy*  
The solicitation coordinator conducted the mandatory specifications review to determine if each proposal met the mandatory specifications, per Section 4.2: Evaluation Criterion of Part B of the RFP. Each proposal was evaluated for compliance with mandatory specifications including:

1. Submission requirements
2. Mandatory requirements
3. Mandatory qualifications

The solicitation coordinator determined that Proposal 1 (Database) met all the mandatory specifications and submitted the proposal to the evaluation committee for evaluation per Section 4.2: Evaluation Criteria of Part B of the RFP. There were no other proposals submitted and screened for compliance with the mandatory specifications for Part B of the RFP.

## Part B: Technical and Cost Reviews

Section 4.2: Evaluation Criteria of Part B of the RFP states that proposals passing the mandatory specifications review would be evaluated and scored across five (5) global criteria, with each receiving a percentage of the overall total 1,050 points. The technical evaluation was based upon the point allocation designated in Table 5: Scoring Allocations of Part B of the RFP for a total of 750 points of the 1,050 points. Cost represented 300 points of the 1050 points. The evaluation committee referred to Appendix A: Printing and Mailing Services Scoring Rubric to support the evaluation of technical proposals.

Section 4.2: Evaluation Criteria of Part B of the RFP indicates the evaluation review scoring areas and point allocations. This is also detailed in Table 3: Evaluation Categories and Maximum Points. The evaluation committee decided not to hold oral presentations, so the total applicable points was reduced from 1,050 to 1,000.

**Table 3: Evaluation Categories and Maximum Points**

Scoring Area	Points Allocated
Vendor Qualifications and Experience	150
Project Organization and Staffing	100
Approach to Statement of Work	450
Cost Proposal	300
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>1,000</b>

The evaluation committee determined the formula below to use to score the cost proposals prior to cost proposal evaluations.

$$\text{Lowest price of all proposals} / \text{Proposal Price} \times 300 = \text{Price Score}$$





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 4: Evaluation Points Summary**

Scoring Area	Points Allocated	Database Marketing Services
Vendor Qualifications and Experience	150	120
Vendor Organization and Staffing	100	70
Approach to Statement of Work	450	315
Cost Proposal	300	300
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>805</b>

Total Costs for Printing and Mailing Services Part B

Database:  $\$51,380.00 / \$51,380.00 \times 300 = 300$

## Part B: Award Determination

Per Section 6.2: Contract Award Process of Part A of the RFP, the solicitation coordinator submitted the evaluation committee determinations and scores to the PRMP executive director for consideration along with any other information pertinent to contract award. The PRMP executive director reviewed the apparent best-ranked evaluated response and subsequently issued a notice of award (this document) identifying the apparent best-ranked response and made the RFP files available for public inspection.

Database Marketing Services met the mandatory specifications, attained 505 technical points, and attained 300 cost points, for an **overall score of 805 points**.

The scoring results are supported by comments made by the evaluation committee members during the evaluation as shown below:

### Database Marketing Services

*"The vendor has 25+ years of experience and a mix of clients including similar government agencies performing similar services."*





*"The proposed subcontractor is the incumbent, so they have knowledge of the current system. Additionally, the vendor has shown they have many long-standing relationships with multiple other local agencies."*

*"The vendor's response fully addresses the requirement as there are no reported business disputes for the principal or subcontractor in the last 5 years."*

*"The vendor provided references for multiple clients with long-standing relationships of at least 10 years extending over 20 years. The reference from AAA showed the vendor could handle large volumes and maintain a long-standing relationship."*

*"The vendor provided an organizational chart but lacked significant description and details of the staffing plan as specified in Attachment D: Vendor Organization and Staffing of Part A of the RFP."*

*"The vendor included four key staff whereas the RFP only specified two key staff. The proposed key staff have over 22 years of experience and have long-standing relationships with Database which indicates stability with staff across the vendor's organization."*

*"The vendor proposed using both automatic and manual validation processes for validating addresses. The vendor provided a step-by-step explanation which detailed how validation would be involved in each step. The vendor also proposed a quality and assurance team that will review fixed addresses and change addresses according to industry best practices."*

*"The vendor proposed significant technology and tools to support managing return mail including 24/7 access to reports and dashboards, which are in addition to the deliverables specified in the RFP. However, the vendor's proposed approach lacks detail into the step-by-step process for how they will address returned mailing issues. The turnaround time for processing returned mail in compliance with the SLA was not specified."*

*"The vendor proposed a strong information technology system to protect the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of client data. Additionally, the vendor proposed strong information technology to support managing all areas of operations. The vendor's approach detailed compliance with all the specifications and requirements of the RFP and detailed the approach to accomplishing PRMP's intended goals. The vendor has a plan in place for business continuity and disaster recovery to support operational activities."*

Resulting from a fair and objective evaluation process, the evaluation committee determined the Database Marketing Services proposal was the highest scoring proposal and is the best value decision for PRMP.

In accordance with Section 6.2: Contract Award Process of Part A of the RFP, the evaluation committee, per the solicitation coordinator, recommended that the contract be awarded to Database Marketing Services, 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 Database





Marketing Services. The PRMP concludes that the Database Marketing Services proposal meets the RFP specifications and offers the best approach to meeting PRMP's needs. Based on the previously mentioned facts, the PRMP executive director agrees with the evaluation committee, and awards the contract to Database Marketing Services.





## 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 certified 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 the official United States Postal Service postmark on the envelope containing the Award Notification.

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 PR

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 the PRMP solicitation coordinator, Elizabeth Otero Martinez, [elizabeth.otero@salud.pr.gov](mailto:elizabeth.otero@salud.pr.gov). The PRDoH must consider the request for reconsideration within thirty (30) days of its filing date. If the PRDoH does not answer the request for reconsideration within such period, it will be deemed to have been rejected.

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:

1. 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
2. The date that the request for reconsideration is deemed to have been rejected

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





## Certification

On May 12, 2023 in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Dinprah Collazo-Ortiz, Esq., CHC  
Executive Director  
Puerto Rico Medicaid Program

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on May 12, 2023 copy of this Award Notification has been sent via certified email to all vendors to the address provided for legal notices in the submitted proposals:

**José Alvarado**  
**Database Marketing Services**  
PO Box 2995  
GUAYNABO PR 00970-2995  
jalvarado@databasepr.onmicrosoft.com

**Manuel Quintana Puente, Sr. Attorney**  
**Commercial, Government & International Matters**  
PO Box 364527  
San Juan, PR 00936  
SalesManagementEvertec@evertecinc.com

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