Opioid Antagonist Procurement

Florida Department of Children and Families

Office of Substance Abuse and Mental Health

January 1, 2026

Taylor N. Hatch
Secretary

Ron DeSantis
Governor

Introduction

In State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2025-26, Senate Bill (SB) 2500, General Appropriations Act (GAA) line 359, required the Department of Children and Families (Department) to competitively procure emergency opioid antagonist products, including but not limited to naloxone, for the purpose of distribution to eligible entities engaged in opioid overdose prevention and response efforts. The Department shall conduct the procurement in accordance with section 287.057, Florida Statutes (F.S.), ensuring that the selection process prioritizes cost-effectiveness, product efficacy, timely availability, the use of generic and name brand products and products that have a shelf life of at least 30 months. A request for proposal shall be issued no later than August 1, 2025, with contract execution occurring no later than November 30, 2025.

The GAA further requires the Department to submit a report detailing the procurement process, vendor selection, and distribution strategy by January 1, 2026. This report fulfills that requirement.

Background

Since 2016, the Department's Overdose Prevention Program has aimed to reduce opioid overdose deaths by increasing access to naloxone for people in the community most likely to experience or witness an overdose through a network of over 630 enrolled distributors. Over 2,125,000 kits have been distributed over the life of the program. Over 90,380 individuals have been trained on overdose recognition and response, with over 65,440 overdose reversals reported.

Solicitation Timeline

The Department conducted the procurement in accordance with the GAA-mandated deadlines. The key solicitation and contract execution activities, shown below, occurred within the required timeframes.

- **Request or Proposals (RFP) Advertisement:** August 1, 2025
- **Posting of Intended Award:** November 21, 2025
- **Execution of Agreements:** November 24, 2025

Solicitation Approach

The Department structured its evaluation methodology to balance cost-effectiveness, product efficacy, timely availability, and operational capability, consistent with the GAA directive and Florida Statutes. In compliance with section 287.057(1)(b), F.S., cost is a significant but not exclusive evaluation factor. RFP Section 5.2.2 (Financial Scoring) allocates 40 points out of 160 total (25%), making it the most heavily weighted single criterion. This ensures cost-effectiveness is prioritized alongside product performance, reliability, and timely statewide delivery. The remaining 120 points (75%) are distributed across 15 Programmatic Scoring criteria (RFP Section 5.2.1), which assess product quality, distribution capacity, shelf-life compliance (≥30 months), and readiness to perform without delay. This framework aligns with the GAA, which directs the Department to prioritize cost-effectiveness, product efficacy, and timely availability. Florida procurement law authorizes awards to the vendor "most advantageous to the state," not strictly the lowest bidder (section 287.057(1)(b)(4), F.S.). The Department's weighting structure therefore meets legislative intent as well as statute, whereas cost is heavily weighted to promote fiscal stewardship while maintaining the flexibility to ensure safety, efficacy, and continuity of service.

Both generic and name-brand products are expressly permitted under this procurement. RFP Appendix V: Cost Proposal and Purchase Order Scope of Work Section 5.3.5.5 each state: *"The Department will consider both FDA-approved generic and name-brand products to promote access, affordability, and continuity of care."* This language was intentionally included to ensure full and open competition, consistent with § 287.057, F.S., and the Legislature's directive in Specific Appropriation 359 to prioritize cost-effectiveness, product efficacy, and timely availability. Accordingly, generic formulations are explicitly eligible and encouraged, ensuring that vendors offering FDA-approved generics can compete on equal footing with brand-name manufacturers.

The solicitation and corresponding Purchase Order Scope of Work included the following components:

Product & Formulation	***Service Delivery & Performance Expectations***
• FDA-approved generic and brand-name products accepted to promote access, affordability, and continuity of care	*• Statewide delivery to approximately 1,300 Enrolled Distributors with capability for two-day standard and overnight emergency shipping*
• Multiple dosage strengths – 2.7 mg, 3 mg, 4 mg, and 8 mg intranasal formulations; plus, injectable and auto-injector options (10 mg prophylactic use only)	*• Products must maintain at least 30-month shelf life and include QR codes for tracking recipient and ZIP code distribution*
• Intake options: intranasal (two doses per kit), prefilled syringes (Luer Lock and IM needle attached), auto-injector, and vial formulations	*• Monthly reporting and data analysis on purchases, shipments, and county/ZIP distribution trends to support program oversight*
• Inclusion of educational materials (posters, flyers, stickers, signs, demonstrational devices) available in English, Spanish, and Haitian Creole	*• Online Ordering and Reporting Portal providing PO-level budget tracking, shipment history, invoice downloads, and automated monthly shipments*
	• Defined performance standards and financial consequences for late delivery, incomplete reports, and non-compliant products

Receipt of Responses

Four vendors submitted timely, responsive proposals:

- Amneal Pharmaceuticals, LLC
- Emergent Devices, Inc.
- Padagis US, LLC
- Wine Barrel Holding, LLC (d/b/a Greenwood Brands)

All responses were determined to be responsive and responsible.

Evaluation Process

The Evaluators conducted an independent, comprehensive review of all responsive proposals, applying their subject-matter expertise and detailed understanding of the program's operational and service requirements. Scoring was performed in accordance with the evaluation criteria prescribed in RFP Section 5.2, each of which aligns with specific components of the solicitation's Scope of Work. The table below presents the evaluation criteria:

Evaluation Criteria
Executive Overview • Provide a brief Executive Overview demonstrating an understanding of the solicitation purpose and the needs specified in this solicitation. The Executive Overview includes a brief description of the Respondent's organization, and qualifications to complete the work as outlined in the Contract. • Adequacy of the Respondent's approach and philosophy, including mission statement, core values, and vision. • Adequacy of the Respondent's organization and governance structure, depicting clear lines of authority including corporate affiliations; describe how the structure represents a lean, efficient, and effective administrative model; describe experience and achievements in developing a governance model is designed to avoid conflicts of interest.

Evaluation Criteria
• How well does the Respondent demonstrates the ability to successfully complete the work described in this solicitation and its appendices, attachments, exhibits, and referenced supporting documentation. The Respondent's and any proposed subcontractor(s)' information shall be shown separately?
Core Team Qualifications • Adequacy of the Respondent's qualifications and credentials of their leadership team with an explanation of why the leadership team is qualified to lead their organization in meeting the needs of this solicitation. Adequacy of the Respondent's résumés for key leadership personnel describing their work experience, education, and training as it relates to the requirements of this solicitation and the Contract. • Adequacy of the Respondent's operational approach to the recruitment, training, supervision, and retention of qualified personnel as described in the Contract. The Response should address all applicable personnel grievance and conflict resolution practices. The Respondent should explain how it's organization, subcontractors, and staffing levels will best meet the performance standards required to perform properly. It is also important to describe the credentials for human resources, quality assurance, financial, information technology, and other key professional level employees.
Service Capability • How well does the Response demonstrate the Respondent's capability in providing processes, approaches, and tools to perform requested services? • How well did the Response articulate a proposed staffing plan to successfully deliver the services outlined in the PO Scope of Work? • For 4mg product only, did the Respondent provide documentation of shipping history of their competency to ship at least 65,000 of the ordered Emergency Opioid Antagonist Product to over 1,300 addresses in varying quantities within a single month, at least ten months per year? • For 4mg product only, did the Respondent provide documentation of shipping history of their competency to ship at least 150,000 of the ordered Emergency Opioid Antagonist Product to over 1,300 addresses in varying quantities within a single month, at least two months per year? • Did the Respondent submit a sample report with redacted information, demonstrating the ability to provide the requested reporting information outlined in the PO Scope of Work, Section 5.3.4., Reports? • How well does the Response demonstrate the Respondent's capability in meeting the specifications for the product proposed as listed in PO Scope of Work, Section 5.3.5.?
Project Approach • How adequately does the Response detail the Respondent's Project Approach to meet the requirements as described in the PO Scope of Work including addressing proposed approaches or models, implementation plans (including timelines and activities), barriers or challenges, industry standards (such as required accreditations, certifications, etc.), and best practices? • How well did the Respondent document their ability to provide an Ordering and Reporting Portal with the features outlined in the PO Scope of Work, Section 5.3.3.? • Did the Respondent include screenshots of each portion of the proposed Ordering and Reporting Portal outlined in the PO Scope of Work, Section 5.3.3. that the Respondent can accommodate?
Prior Similar Projects

Evaluation Criteria
• How well does the Response detail three similar projects for which similar or identical services were performed within the past five years?

Financial Review Summary
In accordance with the methodology prescribed in the solicitation, the Department applied a formula-based evaluation to determine the financial portion of the overall score. The formula utilized for financial scoring was: $(N \div X) \times Y = Z$

Where:

- N = the lowest cost received for all responses,
- X = the Respondent's cost,
- Y = the maximum cost points available (40 points), and
- Z = the points awarded for the financial scoring portion.

This approach ensures that the Respondent offering the lowest cost for each product receives the maximum financial points, while all other Respondents receive proportionally fewer points based on their relative cost. Financial scores were calculated by product and dosage, ensuring that pricing differences were evaluated fairly across comparable product configurations.

Upon completion of the Evaluators' scoring and the Procurement Officer's calculation of the financial scores, the Procurement Officer compiled the results into a final overall score. Programmatic evaluation scores served as the primary measure of each Respondent's technical capability, while financial scores, calculated using the standardized formula described above, provided a proportional assessment of pricing competitiveness. Considered together, these components produced the overall rankings used in determining award recommendations.

Award Determination

Upon completion of the evaluation and scoring process, three vendors—Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC, Emergent Devices Inc., and Padagis US LLC—submitted responsive proposals for the 4mg intranasal emergency opioid antagonist product. The overall evaluation results demonstrated that all three Respondents met the Department's requirements and are capable of fulfilling statewide distribution needs.

Given the competitive nature of the top three Respondent's responses, the high statewide demand for the 4mg formulation, and the program's need to ensure a reliable, uninterrupted supply of life-saving products, the Department awarded contracts to all three Respondents—Amneal Pharmaceuticals, Emergent Devices Inc., and Padagis US LLC—for the 4mg intranasal emergency opioid antagonist product. This multi-award approach will:

- Enhance supply chain stability by diversifying sourcing and mitigating risk of shortages or backorders.
- Ensure equitable statewide access by enabling flexible product distribution aligned with distributor preferences.
- Support continuity of operations under the Overdose Prevention Program and maintain readiness for emergency response.

For all other product formulations in which only one response was received, the Department awarded to the sole responsive vendor for each product, as follows:

- Intranasal Emergency Opioid Antagonist Product – 3mg (2 doses per kit)

    - Vendor: Greenwood Brands LLC
- Intranasal Emergency Opioid Antagonist Product – 8mg (2 doses per kit)
    - Vendor: Emergent Devices, Inc.

This approach ensures that all responsive and qualified vendors received an award in accordance with section 287.057, F.S., and fulfills the intent of the GAA to sustain and expand the availability of opioid antagonist products statewide.

Distribution Model

The Overdose Prevention Program evaluated multiple strategies to ensure the efficient and equitable statewide distribution of the Intranasal Emergency Opioid Antagonist (4 mg) among all three awarded Respondents—Amneal Pharmaceuticals LLC, Emergent Devices Inc., and Padagis US LLC. The objective was to maintain program continuity, minimize disruption, and align distribution logistics with operational realities such as ordering frequency, distributor preferences, and reporting requirements.

Three potential options were identified and analyzed:

1. Split Orders by Type and Timing
2. Distributor Choice by Product Type
3. Geographic Split by County

After reviewing the operational impacts, stakeholder feedback, and implementation considerations associated with each option, the Department has elected to proceed with Option 2 – Distributor Choice by Product Type. Under the Distributor Choice by Product Type model, Enrolled Distributors will be able to select their preferred product through the ordering portal, choosing the brand that best fits their operational and logistical needs. This flexibility accommodates differences in storage, packaging, and deployment methods across distribution partners. Orders without a designated preference will continue to be split as evenly as possible between the three awarded vendors, ensuring supply balance and preventing backlogs. No individual orders will be divided.

Advantages of the Distributor Choice Model include:

- Supports Local Operational Flexibility: Distributors can select the product type best suited for their setting, such as wall-mounted units or portable kits, promoting efficient on-the-ground deployment.
- Minimizes Disruption: Enables a seamless transition between vendors and product types without interrupting ongoing distribution efforts.
- Reduces Waste and Improves Utilization: Allows distributors to account for factors such as expiration dates, packaging configurations, and compatibility with dispensing devices (e.g., wall-mounted gravity-fed machines).
- Enhances Equity and Access: Provides equal opportunity for distributors across the state to access the product that aligns with their service delivery needs.
- Streamlined Ordering and Reporting: The existing portal can support preference selection and tracking, simplifying data collection and performance monitoring.