Responding Firm Name: Milliman

Reviewed By: All Max Points **Points Proposal Evaluation Summary:** Allowed Awarded I. Firms understanding of contract responsibilities 10 10 19 II. Approach & Work Plan 20 III. Firm's Qualifications 25 24 IV. Assigned Actuary's Qualifications 30 27 V. Cost 15 13 **TOTAL** 100 93 VI. Add 6% if a targeted vendor **GRAND TOTAL** 93 **Comments/Questions:**

| l. | FIRM / ACTUARY EXPRESSED UNDERSTANDING OF CONTRACT RESPONSIBILITIES | Max Points Allowed 10 | Points Awarded |
|--------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| | CONSIDERATIONS: | 10 | |
| | How well does the proposal respond to the specifications of the RFP? | | |
| | Is respondent's restatement of engagement scope & objectives consistent with RFP? | | |
| | Are responsibilities and deliverables clearly stated? | | |
| | If the responder's understanding of responsibilities differs from RFP, are those differences highlighted and rationale given? | | |
| | TOTAL POINTS | 10 | 10 |
| Commer | nts / Concerns / Questions: | | |
| magnit Milliman | has had this contract for the past 13 years. They under under of the work and would be able to pick up where the understands the challenges each of our funds face and to with the funds and logislature about some of those | ey left off with d have already | out delay. |
| ulalogi | ue with the funds and legislature about some of those of | nalienges. | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| II. | APPROACH & WORK PLAN | Nax Points Allowed | Points Awarded |
|-------|---|--------------------------|-------------------|
| | CONSIDERATIONS: | 20 | |
| | Is the work plan realistic? Are timetables and tasks attainable, both the first year and subsequent years? | | |
| | Can the respondent accommodate extemporaneous requests by the funds or LCPR? | | |
| | Has the responder proposed an adequate number of personnel with appropriate skills to effectively provide expected contract deliverables? | | |
| | If applicable, how well do proposed additional tasks or activities improve services? | | |
| | Can the firm accommodate earlier deadlines? | | |
| | TOTAL POINTS | 20 | 19 |
| Comme | nts / Concerns / Questions: | | |
| | e been working with Milliman to move deadlines up a co | uple of weeks. | They |
| | een unable to do that in the past. | 1. (| -1.1. (. |
| | would not have to do a parallel review with last year's o | ata, so wiii be a | able to |
| | up quicker than any other respondent. s quite a bit of time freed up to handle the Minnesota ac | count as his R | |
| | ended in May. | count, as ms b | Jaiu |
| | already has data for the experience studies due in June | e 2005 and kno | ws our |
| | xperience. | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| IV. | ACTUARIAL FIRM QUALIFICATIONS | Max Points Allowed 25 | Points Awarded |
|--------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| | CONSIDERATIONS: | 20 | |
| | Are key personnel able to begin work 7/1/05? | | |
| | Is firm stable? Good reputation? Experience working with large public pension plans? | | |
| | Does the firm have a suitable organization structure to ensure completion of contract obligations if key personnel leave? | | |
| | Is the firms' location suitable to promote timely exchange of information and service delivery? | | |
| | Is the technological infrastructure adequate? | | |
| | TOTAL POINTS | 25 | 24 |
| Commer | nts / Concerns / Questions: | | |
| | is a large firm that specializes in actuarial work. works with most of the states in one way or another. | | |
| | requires limits on what they would pay in lawsuits over | their work. | |
| | has worked with MN for 13 years and done work for M | | |
| | es in the state. Because of that, however, they do not | provide a fresh | look |
| at the | challenges faced by each of our funds. | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| | Points Allowed 30 | Points Awarded |
|---|--|--|
| | | |
| • • | | |
| 5 5 | | |
| overbooked"? | | |
| s in place? | | |
| ible for meetings? | | |
| h to the funds regarding d changes/developments | | |
| | 30 | 27 |
| | | |
| sentation skills or ability to dent in the skills of remainir | think on his fee ng staff assigne | ed to MN. |
| | | |
| | esentation skills or ability to dent in the skills of remainin | Allowed 30 have public plan eputation? Is engagement experience? overbooked"? Is in place? Is i |

Max

| V. | COST | Points Allowed | Points Awarded |
|-----------|---|----------------|----------------|
| | CONSIDERATIONS: | 15 | |
| | Is the proposal financially affordable? | | |
| | How does the bid compare to other firms bidding on this contract? | | |
| | Are there any "hidden costs" that could escalate? Does the proposal include all costs, including set-up fees, database maintenance, etc? | | |
| | | | |
| | TOTAL POINTS | 15 | 13 |
| Comme | nts / Concerns / Questions: | | |
| | lowest cost of the 4 responders. | | |
| Hourly ra | ates are among the highest of the 4 responders. | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |