



GOBIERNO DE PUERTO RICO
ADMINISTRACIÓN DE SEGUROS DE SALUD
Directora Ejecutiva | Edna Y. Marín Ramos | emarin@asespr.org

August 29, 2022

**VIA EMAIL AND CERTIFIED
MAIL RETURN RECEIPT**

TO: First Medical Health Plan, Inc.
Golden Cross Health Plan, Corp.
MMM MultiHealth, LLC
Plan de Salud Menonita, Inc.
Triple S Salud, Inc.

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD CONTRACT UNDER THE RFP #MCO-2022;
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR THE GOVERNMENT HEALTH PLAN**

I. Request for Proposal:

Pursuant to Act No. 72 of 1993, the Puerto Rico Health Insurance Administration or “ASES” (for its acronym in Spanish) is the government entity responsible for implementing, managing, and negotiating, through contracts with insurers and/or Health Service Organizations, as defined in the Puerto Rico Insurance Code, a health insurance system that allows the medically indigent population of Puerto Rico to receive quality medical-hospital care. Accordingly, ASES administers the Vital Health Plan of the Government of Puerto Rico (hereinafter “PSG” or “Plan Vital”) through which physical and mental health services are provided to approximately 1.4 million Puerto Ricans.

The last Managed Care Organization (MCO) procurement process was conducted in 2018 and the current MCO contracts expire on December 31, 2022. On May 2022, ASES published its Request for Proposals, RFP# MCO 2022 (herein after the “RFP”), requesting competitive proposals from interested insurance companies or other approved health organizations that meet the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) definition of an MCO, to manage the delivery of all Covered Services for all eligible populations including Vieques and Culebra and for foster children/domestic violence victims under a capitated risk-bearing contract, meeting program requirements, and conducting administrative and system development functions. The desired outcome of this procurement is a comprehensive service delivery system that provides, on a timely basis, the full array of benefits and services, ensures cost-effective care, and focuses on quality of integrated physical and behavioral health care services. The expected Go Live date of this Contract

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD
RFP #MCO-2022

is January 1, 2023, with an initial contract term of two (2) years and nine (9) months and two (2) optional extensions of one (1) year each.

The RFP Document Package underwent three (3) amendments on July 7, 12 & 14, 2022.

ASES' preference as stipulated in the RFP is to award contracts to no more than four (4) Offerors, who are the most responsive and responsible entities that demonstrate the ability to meet the requirements of the RFP, to provide the required services to all the Plan Vital eligible population, except the foster children and domestic abuse victims population for which the RFP was designed to select only one (1) Contractor from the successful Offerors.

II. Participating Offerors:

In response to the RFP, the entities herein identified submitted their respective proposals on or before 1:00 PM (AST) on July 15, 2022. Said proposals were submitted electronically to the secure repository of documents created for this purpose. The procurement process under this RFP was designed to promote fair competition and protect the identity of the Offerors from the Executive Committee of the Evaluation Committee of this RFP (herein after "Executive Committee"). For this reason, the Executive Committee evaluated the results of all evaluations without knowing the identity of the Offerors.¹ Likewise, the Board of Directors of ASES (herein after the "BOD") determined, before receiving any information on the submitted proposals, to remain blind throughout the entire evaluation and adjudication process.

To instrument this safeguard, the Document Committee of this RFP (herein after the "Document Committee") selected letters from an envelope and randomly assigning them to each Offeror as the only identifier for the evaluations. Accordingly, the Offerors were identified with the letters A - E, as set below.² Their respective authorized representatives, the letter assigned to each Offeror, and their addresses are the following:

A. Golden Cross Health Plan, Corp. (Golden Cross)

Luis F. Hernández Vélez, Esq.
President
Cond. San Juan Health Centre
150 Ave. De Diego Ste. 509
San Juan, PR 00907
lfhlaw@gmail.com

B. Plan de Salud Menonita, Inc. (PSM)

¹ The evaluators from the Document Committee, Mandatory Requirements Committee and Technical Subcommittees knew their identities but all the evaluation tools were blinded as per the decision made at the beginning of the process.

² To further protect the identities of the Offerors, the Material Subcontractors for each Offeror were also blinded. The Material Subcontractors were identified with the abbreviation "SC" and a number, e.g., Subcontractor 1 = SC1. Likewise, the names of the business references were identified with the abbreviation "Ref" and a number.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD
RFP #MCO-2022

Mr. Pablo Almodovar Scalley
Plan Administrator
PO Box 364668
San Juan, PR 00936-4668
palmodovar@mgphpr.org

C. Triple S Salud, Inc. (SSS)

Mr. Juan R. Serrano
President & CSO
PO Box 363628
San Juan, PR 00936-3628
Juan.serrano@ssspr.com

D. MMM MultiHealth, LLC (MMM)

Orlando González, Esq., CPA
President
PO Box 72010
San Juan, PR 00936-7710
Orlando.gonzalez@mmmhc.com

E. First Medical Health Plan, Inc. (FMHP)

Mr. Francisco Javier Artau Feliciano
President
PO Box 191580
San Juan, PR 00919-1580
j.artau@firstmedicalpr.com

Mr. José A. Pagán Torres
Senior Executive VP
j.pagan@firstmedicalpr.com

III. Procedural Background:

On May 20, 2022, ASES published the Notice of RFP in the “Registro Unico de Subastas or “RUS” for its Spanish acronym” of the Management and Budget Office of the Government of Puerto Rico (“OGP” for its acronym in Spanish), one (1) newspaper of general circulation in Puerto Rico, ASES’ webpage and eleven invitations (11) were issued to companies to submit proposals. RFP documents were provided to nine (9) companies that fulfilled ASES’ requirements for acquiring the documents. Virtual Preproposal and Actuarial Mandatory Conferences were held on June 14, 2022, through Microsoft Teams.

Proposals were received on July 15, 2022, from the five (5) Offerors previously mentioned. Access to the electronic repository was closed immediately after 1:00 PM (AST) on July 15, 2022 and the evaluation process initiated on the same day, with the Document Committee validating from July

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD
RFP #MCO-2022

15 through July 16, 2022 whether the Offerors: (i) submitted the Proposals on time, (ii) provided evidence of the Proposal Bond, (iii) submitted the financial and legal documents required in Section 5 of the RFP, as well as a Technical Proposal pursuant to Section 6 of the RFP, and (iv) complied with the format required by Section 4 of the RFP. No cost proposal needed to be presented because by submitting a Proposal in response to this RFP, the Offeror accepted the PMPM Payments for the initial contract term that were provided with the RFP. See Section 2.3.8 of the RFP, as amended.

The findings of the Document Committee were submitted to the Mandatory Requirements Committee of the Evaluation Committee of this RFP (herein after "MRC") who commenced their evaluation on July 18, 2022. At an early stage of their evaluation, the MRC submitted to the Executive Committee a list of compliance issues that all Offerors had in their Mandatory Requirements Proposals. The Executive Committee examined the evaluation tools of Golden Cross' proposal as submitted by both the Document Committee evaluators and the MRC and determined that Golden Cross failed to pass the Mandatory Requirements evaluation due to its failure to submit a Proposal Bond, as required by Sections 2.2.9 & 5.12 of the RFP. The Executive Committee also noted that Golden Cross failed to comply with multiple other key mandatory requirements.

As to PSM, SSS, MMM and FMHP, the MRC identified and informed the Executive Committee that they all had one (1) or more deficiency or compliance issues. The Executive Committee understood that these deficiencies were rectifiable and denoted an intention to comply with the requirements of the RFP in contrast with the automatic disqualifying nature of Golden Cross' failure to submit a Proposal Bond and the additional multiple failures to comply with key mandatory requirements, as described in more detail under Section V of this Notice. For that reason, the remaining Offerors were given an equal opportunity until midnight on July 22, 2022, to rectify the deficiencies or further explain and provide additional information and/or clarify some of their responses. See Executive Committee's Report and Recommendation to the BOD of August 25, 2022.

After completion of their evaluation, on July 27, 2022, the MRC submitted their report to the Executive Committee where they concluded that PSM, SSS, MMM & FMHP substantially complied with the Mandatory Requirements' Evaluation of this RFP and consequently, recommended they pass to the next evaluation phase. From July 28, 2022, to August 3, 2022, the Executive Committee engaged in a thorough revision of the evaluation tools of these remaining Offerors. During that period, pursuant to Section 4.2 of the RFP, it requested further additional information and clarifications from these Offerors, which was as well reviewed in the first instance by the MRC and then reported to the Executive Committee. The Committee accepted the recommendations of the MRC and passed SSS, PSM, FMHP & MMM for Technical Evaluation.

The Individual Technical Evaluation commenced on July 29, 2022, and Consensus on August 11, 2022. The Technical Evaluation consisted of:

- A. Independent Technical Evaluation - Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) were selected to serve on one (1) of four (4) technical evaluation subcommittees who

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD
RFP #MCO-2022

were responsible for the review and initial rating on a defined scale of (0-4), of a sub-set of questions assigned to them.

B. Consensus Evaluation – The subcommittees participated in consensus evaluations of the proposals in sessions facilitated by an impartial ASES’ consultant (Mercer). During those sessions, all independent ratings and justifications were amply discussed. Through structured conversations, the evaluators found agreement of a single rating for each proposal question and documentation to justify the assigned score.

On August 22, 2022, the Executive Committee reviewed the Technical Scores and accepted the same without change. After a thorough, holistic and all-encompassing evaluation of the totality of the information obtained during this procurement, which included the qualifications, experience, financial capacity and solvency of the Offerors, their compliance with mandatory requirements and their technical scores, including the recommendations of the different evaluation subcommittees, the Executive Committee reached the conclusions and formulated the recommendations included in their August 25, 2022 report to the Board of Directors of ASES (BOD). During its Extraordinary Meeting of August 26, 2022, the BOD discussed, accepted, and ratified the Executive Committee’s decision to disqualify Golden Cross as an Offeror. Likewise, the BOD determined to accept the Executive Committee’s recommendations.

IV. Scoring Results:

EMR

Total technical scores per Offeror both in total points and percentages are as follows in descending ranking order:

Table 1 - Ranked Total Scores

Offeror	Total Points	Total Percentage (Out of 1,000 Points)
Offeror D	665	66.5%
Offeror C	630	63%
Offeror B	590	59%
Offeror E	590	59%

The total technical scores per section, per Offeror, are as follows, with the highest score per section highlighted:

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD
RFP #MCO-2022

Table 2

	Offeror D	Offeror C	Offeror B	Offeror E
6.1 Executive Summary	--	--	--	--
6.2 Benefits and Service Delivery (16% of Total)	46.88%	37.5%	53.13%	68.75%
6.3 Provider Network and Access (16% of Total)	62.5%	62.5%	75%	62.5%
6.4 Provider and Enrollee Experience (15% of Total)	66.67%	75%	50%	41.67%
6.5 Quality Assurance and Utilization Management (15% of Total)	75%	66.67%	58.33%	66.67%
6.6 Administration and Organization (12% of Total)	68.75%	62.5%	56.25%	56.25%
6.7 Financial and Claims Management (10% of Total)	75%	62.5%	75%	50%
6.8 Provider Reimbursement Models (16% of Total)	75%	75%	50%	62.5%
Total	66.5%	63%	59%	59%

↓	↓	↓
5.5%	6.8%	0%

Table 3 - Shows the counts of each score (0-4) for each Offeror.³

EMR

³ Scoring criteria – Table 1 of Section 4.2 of the RFP:

Point Value	Descriptions	Criteria for Point Assignment
0	Absent or Unresponsive	Proposal response is missing or is non-responsive for it does not address ASES' requirements.
1	Barely Satisfactory	Proposal response is incomplete. The Offeror failed to provide a fully compliant response to the requirements in the Procurement and the omission(s), or defect(s), are significant. The quality of the proposal response is considered to be less than average for a qualified Offeror.
2	Satisfactory	Proposal response is satisfactory or meets ASES' requirements. This score may be awarded if the Offeror has met the minimum requirements established in the Procurement. Omission(s) or defect(s), if any, are insignificant and easily addressed. The proposal response is considered to be of average quality for a qualified Offeror.
3	More than Satisfactory	Proposal response is more than satisfactory and fully meets ASES's requirements. Any omission(s) or defect(s) are insignificant and acceptable. The proposal response is above the average quality for a qualified Offeror.
4	Superior	Proposal response surpasses ASES's requirements. No omission(s) or defect(s) are apparent, and the Offeror presents one (1) or more enhancing feature(s), method(s), or approach(es) that will benefit ASES. Response represents excellent quality for a qualified Offeror.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD
RFP #MCO-2022

Score	Criteria	Offeror D	Offeror C	Offeror B	Offeror E
0	Absent or Unresponsive	0	0	0	0
1	Barely Satisfactory	3	4	2	2
2	Satisfactory	6	10	14	12
3	More than Satisfactory	15	9	7	8
4	Superior	0	1	1	2

V. Principal factors and criteria taken into consideration for the adjudication including the reasons for disqualification of the nonresponding Offeror:

A. Reasons for the Disqualification of Golden Cross.

Section 4.2 of the RFP establishes that the Mandatory Requirements will be evaluated against the following criteria: (a) Proposal and Proposal Bond was submitted within the closing date and time for Proposals (on or before 1:00 PM (AST) on July 15, 2022); (b) the Offeror has been deemed to have met all requirements in Section 5 of this RFP; and (c) Mandatory Requirements will be scored as either “Pass” or “Fail”. If the Proposal meets all requirements in Section 5 of this RFP, the Proposal will “Pass” the Mandatory Requirements section. If the proposal is missing certain requirements in Section 5 of this RFP, that are not minor irregularities and minor instances of non-compliance as noted above, the Proposal will “Fail” the Mandatory Requirements section.

In turn, Section 2.2.9 of the RFP provides that:

The Offeror must submit a Proposal Bond, in the terms specified in Section 5.12 of this RFP. A true and exact copy of the Original Proposal Bond must be included with the Proposal on the due date for submission of the Proposal. The Original Proposal Bond must be submitted, either via hand delivery or courier service delivery, to the ASES Administrative and Finance Office, **no later than 1:00 PM AST, July 15, 2022.**

IF THE COPY SUBMITTED WITH THE PROPOSAL IS NOT A TRUE AND EXACT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL BOND SUBMITTED, IT WILL BE CONSIDERED THAT THE PROPOSAL BOND WAS NOT TIMELY SUBMITTED.

FAILURE TO PROVIDE A PROPOSAL BOND IN THE TERMS SPECIFIED IN THIS RFP WILL CAUSE THE PROPOSAL TO BE DEEMED INCOMPLETE AND THE OFFEROR WILL BE DISQUALIFIED.

In its relevant part, Section 5.12 of the RFP, as amended, states that:

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD
RFP #MCO-2022

A Proposal Bond in the amount of TWO MILLION DOLLARS (\$2,000,00.00) is REQUIRED. The Proposal Bond must be accompanied with a pledge that the Offeror will enter into a contract with ASES on the terms stated in the Proposal, the RFP and the Model Contract, if awarded the RFP.

The Proposal Bond shall be issued by a surety company duly authorized to do business in Puerto Rico, duly certified by the Insurance Commissioner of Puerto Rico, and accepted by ASES. The Proposal Bond must be valid beginning on the Proposal due date for One Hundred and Eighty (180) Calendar Days. The name of the company to whom the Proposal Bond is issued as a Principal must be the Offeror. No Letter of Credit and/or Annual Proposal Bond will be accepted.

The Original Bond must be delivered either via hand delivery or courier service delivery no later than 1:00 pm (AST) July 15, 2022, to ASES' Finance Office, located at Urb. Caribe Sector El Cinco, #1549 Calle Alda, San Juan, PR. A true and exact copy of the Original Bond must be included with the Proposal on the due date for submission of the Proposal, that is, no later than 1:00 PM (AST) on July 15, 2022. IF THE COPY OF THE PROPOSAL BOND SUBMITTED WITH THE PROPOSAL IS NOT A TRUE AND EXACT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL BOND LATER SUBMITTED, IT WILL BE CONSIDERED THAT THE PROPOSAL BOND WAS NOT TIMELY SUBMITTED.

EMR
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE TIMELY SUBMISSION OF A PROPOSAL BOND, ISSUED BY A QUALIFIED INSTITUTION AS STATED IN THIS SECTION, IN THE NAME OF ASES AS OBLIGEE, TO COVER THIS PROCUREMENT PROCESS AND IN THE AMOUNT SPECIFIED HEREIN, WILL DISQUALIFY THE OFFEROR.

....

Golden Cross only submitted with its proposal a Bond Request Form dated July 12, 2022. Hence, it failed to comply with the requirements of Section 5.12 of the RFP and, as stated in said section and Section 2.2.9, the immediate consequence of said failure is the disqualification of the Offeror.

As it stems from the evaluation tools of the Document Committee, this Offeror also failed to comply with key mandatory requirements, as follows:

1. RUP certification – Evidence of pending process was for RUL (Registro Unico de Licitadores) not RUP, 5 business days afterwards it submitted evidence that had finalized the request process before ASG on July 22, 2022 but did not have the RUP certification nor has submitted the same as of today.
2. Corporate Resolution – failed to submit
3. Sworn Statement of no debts with the Government - failed to submit
4. Certification of no debts from ASEM - failed to submit
5. Network Provider List, Appendix O of the RFP- failed to submit
6. Insurance Policies – Did not submit any of the required ones, only a certification to the effect that, if awarded a contract, would comply with the requirements

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD
RFP #MCO-2022

7. Financial Information - Failed to submit and responded in the proposal that it was currently working on the balance sheet and income statement for the month of June 2022, as well as on the forecast, financial plan and cash flow budget for the next three (3) years and, that as soon as their external auditors finished the documents, it would promptly submit them.
8. References - Received 2 out of 3 required but only 1 of them was submitted within the July 15, 2022 deadline
9. Other documents were submitted without answering the required questions

For the reasons listed above, Golden Cross failed to comply with the instructions of the RFP and to submit a timely responsive proposal. In marked contrast with the deficiencies of the other Offerors⁴, Golden Cross' failure to submit a Proposal Bond, which on its own is sufficient cause for its disqualification, as well as all the other instances of noncompliance in its mandatory requirements documentation submission, constitutes a failure to comply with clear and specific RFP instructions and mandatory requirements and present a complete proposal.

B. Reasons for the selection of the successful Offerors:

MMM, SSS, PSM & FMHP substantially complied with the Mandatory Requirements of the RFP, possess the necessary experience and qualifications to provide services in the Plan Vital and fairly complied with the financial requirements of this RFP. In addition, they all received overall good references wherein essentially, all the responses to questions related to overall performance, responsiveness, quality of service, and compliance with contract requirements fluctuated among "Very Satisfied" and "Satisfied". In the same vein, the Material Subcontractors announced by these Offerors also received overall good recommendations and there were no negative remarks provided.

On the other hand, as shown in Tables 1 & 2 above, the difference between first and second place (MMM and SSS) and second and third place (SSS and PSM & FMHP) are less than 7%. See Table 2. Furthermore, the scores in Sections 6.2 & 6.3 (two of the core components of Plan Vital) were highest among PSM and FMHP who are tied in third place. As Table 3 shows, the majority of the responses to individual questions of all four (4) Offerors received a score of 2 or 3 (Satisfactory and More than Satisfactory) where none of the Offerors received a -0- score (Absent

⁴ Some examples of the compliance issues of the other Offerors were:

- a. Submission of statutory financial statements instead of GAAP audited statements— requested the GAAP audited financial statements.
- b. Difficulty identifying required information regarding insurance policies and corresponding limits – requested to provide exact page in proposal, as well as the title of the specific document where the evidence could be located.
- c. References of material subcontractors were from related parties of the subcontractor or the Offeror – requested substitution for independent resources.
- d. SAM registration in process – requested updates.
- e. Certain documents signed by individuals not included in the corporate resolution – requested ratification of signatures.
- f. RUP certification of some subcontractors – requested status updates and evidence of documentation submitted.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD
RFP #MCO-2022

or Unresponsive). In sum, the overall technical scores are not materially different among each Offeror.

Sections 1.7 and 4.1 of the RFP provide that ASES' preference is to contract with no more than four (4) qualified MCOs for the contract terms resulting from this RFP. The final number of awardees will be based on Technical Response scores and ASES' consideration of the following guiding principles: (1) ensuring all lives are safely covered, encouraging competition among MCOs to provide the best experience for Enrollees, (2) administrative efficiency, and (3) sustainability of the program should an MCO fail to complete a contract term. In consideration of all of the above, it is in the best interest of the enrollees of Plan Vital for enrollees to be able to choose among these four (4) qualified and responsive Offerors and such an award is in line and promotes the applicable guiding principles above stated.

As per the RFP rules, whereas multiple MCOs will be selected to cover all other populations, ASES will select one (1) MCO through the evaluation process to provide coverage to the foster children and abuse victims population. See Sections 1.6.2 & 4.1 of the RFP. Accordingly, pursuant to Section 4.1 of the RFP the MCO with the highest Technical Score will be selected to provide coverage to foster children/domestic violence victims. As shown in Table 1 above, MMM is the Offeror with the highest Technical Score.

EMR
VI. Notice of Final Determination:

In view of all of the above, the successful Offerors of RFP #MCO 2022 are MMM MultiHealth, LLC; Triple S Salud, Inc.; Plan de Salud Menonita, Inc.; and First Medical Health Plan, Inc. Pursuant to Sections 4.5.1 & 2.2.11 of the RFP, you are hereby notified of said selection and ASES' determination to:

1. Disqualify Golden Cross Health Plan, Corp.;
2. Award contracts for all enrollees of Plan Vital, except Foster Children and Abused Victims to: MMM MultiHealth, LLC; Triple S Salud, Inc.; Plan de Salud Menonita, Inc.; and First Medical Health Plan, Inc.
3. Award a contract to MMM MultiHealth, LLC for the Foster Children and Abused Victims population and conduct a robust and comprehensive readiness review of MMM's policies and procedures, staffing, systems, and internal operations related to serving the needs of the foster children and abused victims' population, and take any remedial actions as needed to ensure high quality services for this special population.

WARNINGS REGARDING RECONSIDERATION AND JUDICIAL REVIEW:

Any Offeror who understands that it has been affected by the final determination of ASES in the adjudication of this RFP may submit to the ASES' Board of Directors a Petition for Reconsideration within twenty (20) calendar days from the date of the mailing of this notice.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD
RFP #MCO-2022

Failure to timely present the petition will preclude ASES from considering the same. The petition must comply with the requirements stated in Section 2.2.12 of the RFP and be filed at the following addresses:

**Attention of: ASES Board of Directors
Urb. Caribe Sector El Cinco
1549 Calle Alda
San Juan, PR 00926-2712**

Or

ghprfp2022@asespr.org

The Offeror seeking the reconsideration of this decision must notify all other Offerors who participated in the RFP with a copy of the Petition of Reconsideration within the same twenty (20) day term to file the petition. This is a requirement of strict compliance. ASES shall consider the Petition for Reconsideration within thirty (30) calendar days of the filing of the petition. ASES may extend said term only once, for an additional term of fifteen (15) calendar days. Failure to consider the Petition for Reconsideration shall be deemed as an outright rejection of the petition and thereafter, shall run the twenty (20) calendar day's term to request a judicial review before the Court of Appeals. If a determination is made in its consideration, the term for requesting judicial review will begin from the date on which a copy of the notification of the decision of ASES was deposited in the mail, resolving the petition.

Likewise, the party adversely affected by a decision on reconsideration filed before ASES, may request judicial review before the Court of Appeals within a jurisdictional period of twenty (20) calendar days from the date of the mailing of notice of the final order or resolution on reconsideration.

REGISTER AND NOTIFY



Edna Y. Marín Ramos, MA
Executive Director

NOTIFICATION

I CERTIFY that today this Notice of Award was registered and filed in the administrative file of this process and a true and exact copy was sent and notified by federal certified mail and email to all parties in this process, as noted below:

A. Golden Cross

Luis F. Hernández Vélez, Esq.
President
Cond. San Juan Health Centre
150 Ave. De Diego Ste. 509
San Juan, PR 00907
lfhlaw@gmail.com

B. PSM

Mr. Pablo Almodovar Scalley
Plan Administrator
PO Box 364668
San Juan, PR 00936-4668
palmodovar@mghpr.org

C. Triple S Salud

Mr. Juan R. Serrano
President & CSO
PO Box 363628
San Juan, PR 00936-3628
Juan.serrano@ssspr.com

D. MMM

Orlando González, Esq., CPA
President
PO Box 72010
San Juan, PR 00936-7710
Orlando.gonzalez@mmmhc.com

E. First Medical

Mr. Francisco Javier Artau Feliciano
President
PO Box 191580
San Juan, PR 00919-1580
j.artau@firstmedicalpr.com

EMR

NOTICE OF INTENT TO AWARD
RFP #MCO-2022

EMR
Mr. José A. Pagán Torres
Senior Executive VP
j.pagan@firstmedicalpr.com

In San Juan, Puerto Rico, on August 29, 2022.



Gloria Auffant
Managerial Affairs Assistant
Executive Office