

**Statement of Decision:**

Does AHIM wish to include the option to extend the scope of work from the SHOP to Individual marketplace?

**Option Analysis:**

	<b>Description</b>	<b>Pro</b>	<b>Con</b>
<b>Extend scope of work from SHOP to Individual Market as part of initial contract</b>	AHIM would extend the scope of work to include both the SHOP and Individual Market.	Additional RFP would not be required.	Vendor could be low performing and would have no option to select new vendor for Individual Market.
<b>Limit scope of work to SHOP</b>	AHIM would limit the scope of work to include SHOP only and would issue a separate RFP for the Individual Market.	AHIM would have option to select new vendor for the individual marketplace.	AHIM would have to issue new RFP as a legal obligation of the terms in the original contract.
<b>Include option to extend services to include Individual in contract</b>	AHIM would include a scope of work for SHOP only with an option to negotiate a contract extension for the Individual Market.	Would have option to extend the contract to existing vendor or close contract and issue new RFP for a new vendor.	No con has been identified.

**Recommendation:**

AHIM should provide itself with the option, but not the obligation, to extend the contract from the SHOP to the Individual Market.

**Statement of Decision:**

Should the IV&V contract periods and deliverables be structured around project phases or CCIIO Reviews?

**Option Analysis:**

	<b>Description</b>	<b>Pro</b>	<b>Con</b>
<b>Structure IV&amp;V contract around project phases</b>	AHIM would structure the contract periods around the project phases for the appropriate marketplace.	The IV&V vendor would be present during IT build with a project focus helping to ensure the project stays on track.	The IV&V vendor's work may not correspond well with CCIIO meetings which may cause more work leading up to those meetings.
<b>Structure IV&amp;V contract around CCIIO reviews</b>	AHIM would structure the contract periods around the CCIIO reviews for the appropriate marketplace.	AHIM would be more focused on, and prepared for, CCIIO reviews.	The IV&V vendor would be focused on government oversight rather than full project oversight.

**Recommendation:**

AHIM should structure the IV&V contract periods and deliverables around project phases.

**Statement of Decision:**

Does the Committee want to require Bidders to have completed a similar scope of work in the past, or have extensive ACA experience?

**Option Analysis:**

	<b>Description</b>	<b>Pro</b>	<b>Con</b>
<b>IV&amp;V vendors should have similar work experience</b>	AHIM would require vendors to demonstrate similar past work experience.	Ensures competency of vendor and reduces liability risk.	Potential vendors may be excluded from bidding on the RFP.
<b>IV&amp;V vendor must have ACA experience</b>	AHIM would require vendors to demonstrate past ACA experience.	Would ensure that the vendor has direct experience and reduce risk.	Could limit options of potential vendors and lack competition amongst them.
<b>IV&amp;V vendors should have similar work experience with a preference for ACA experience</b>	AHIM would require vendors to demonstrate similar past work experience and state a preference for ACA experience.	Is a compromise and allows for larger pool of potential vendors.	A vendor without ACA experience may be preferred, but not be chosen because of a competing vendor with ACA experience.

**Recommendation:**

AHIM should require a vendor to have similar work experience with a preference for ACA experience.

**Statement of Decision:**

Should preference be given to those firms are themselves Arkansas-based businesses or that subcontract with one?

**Option Analysis:**

	<b>Description</b>	<b>Pro</b>	<b>Con</b>
<b>Preference given to Arkansas-based businesses</b>	AHIM would give preference to a vendor who was Arkansas-based.	Keeps federal dollars in the State and creates work for AR residents.	Will reduce pool of potential vendors and could result in selection of an incompetent vendor.
<b>No preference for Arkansas-based business</b>	AHIM would give no preference toward a vendor based in Arkansas.	Opens up to vendors Nation-wide. Greater options and creates competition.	Tax dollars could leave the state. Work is given to out of state company.
<b>Preference given for Arkansas-based businesses as either Prime or subcontractor to Prime</b>	AHIM would give preference to a vendor who was either Arkansas-based or subcontracted with an Arkansas-based vendor.	Allows for vendors Nation-wide to bid, with preference to an AR based vendor, should they prove competency.	Non-AR prime vendor with AR subcontractor may not be as strong of candidate as a Non-AR vendor with no AR subcontractor.

**Recommendation:**

AHIM should prefer an Arkansas-based business as either the Prime or Subcontractor, but not use the scoring to annotate such a preference.

**Statement of Decision:**

Should Bidders be required to include any relevant past (3/5 year) or current pending litigation?

**Option Analysis:**

	<b>Description</b>	<b>Pro</b>	<b>Con</b>
<b>Require bidders to disclose litigation for past 3 years</b>	AHIM would require all vendors to disclose any litigation occurring within the past three years.	Allows AHIM to be aware of possible conflicts between vendors.	May not reflect full list of major litigation.
<b>Require bidders to disclose litigation for past 5 years</b>	AHIM would require all vendors to disclose any litigation occurring within the past five years.	Allows AHIM to be aware of possible conflicts between vendors.	May reflect company under previous leadership. Unaware of pre-existing corporate structure.
<b>Require bidders to disclose any current pending litigation</b>	AHIM would require all vendors to disclose any current pending litigation.	Allows AHIM to be aware of any ongoing conflicts of interest.	Unaware of actual outcome of litigation because of pending status.

**Recommendation:**

AHIM should require bidders to disclose any pending litigation and litigation going back 3 years.