

# HIRC Resiliency Scorecard

Updated 1.2024

Category	0 points	4 points	8 points	12 points	Sum
<a href="#">Supply Chain Mapping</a>	Provided no location data	Provided limited location information	Meets Level 1 mapping standard	Meets Level 2 mapping standard	
	<i>Additive evidence and/or discussion</i>	Some evidence of redundancy or similar capability	Moderate evidence of redundancy or similar capability	HIRC Transparency Partner Badge achieved	
Event Communication	Provided no emergency contact, or contact is unresponsive	Emergency contact responsive only to direct outreach	Emergency contact responsive to both automated and direct outreach	Supplier consistent in providing candid and actionable supply disruption intel	
<a href="#">BCM Assessment</a>	Did not complete the assessment	Calculated score of <=2.5	Calculated score of 3 to 4.5	Calculated score of 5 with evidence	
	<i>Additive evidence and/or discussion</i>	Artifact provided to validate response	Live discussion meaningfully addresses supply continuity topics	Provided meaningful assessment of resiliency continuous improvement	
KPI	Provides no reporting of service levels	Periodically reports service levels	Routinely reports service levels of 95%+	Routinely reports service levels of 99%+	
	<i>Additive evidence and/or discussion</i>	Limited backorders	Limited recalls or quality issues	Supplier proactive in mitigating supply disruptions	
Live Discussion	<i>Additive evidence and/or discussion</i>	Provided overview of resiliency program	Provided clear understanding of preparedness and response strategies	Provided specificity in the discussion relative to products of interest	
		Actively collaborates on resiliency initiatives	Followed through on resiliency growth plan	Member of resiliency industry group	
Score = Points Achieved / Total Possible Points (exclude any categories that are not relevant)					
Results	Unsatisfactory <50%	Conventional 50-60%	Strategic 70-80%	Partner 85%+	

## Procedural Notes

- If a request for 1 or more elements has not yet been placed with the Supplier, exclude those element(s) from the scorecard and rebalance the maximum possible points.
- It is recommended to allow Suppliers ample time to meaningfully satisfy all categories. Satisfaction of the categories can be done concurrently.

Category	Description	Max Points
Supply Chain Mapping		
Provided no location data	Supplier given reasonable time and context but failed to satisfy the request.	0
Provided limited location information	Supplier has shared some geographic information, such as country of origin, but the level of transparency fails to meet “layer 1” of the HIRC mapping and monitoring standard <a href="#">link</a>	4
Meets Level 1 mapping standard	Supplier has shared “layer 1” location information, including final assembly to distribution for all essential and critical products and services.  Locations (addresses) are preferred to be shared via Supply Risk Solutions (SRS) as a secure and no cost option to the supplier. This method is well adopted within healthcare.  <a href="#">Mapping Standard</a>	8
Meets Level 2 mapping standard	Supplier has shared “layer 2” location information, including final assembly to distribution for all essential and critical products and services. In addition, supplier has shared key direct contributors to final assembly.  Locations (addresses) are preferred to be shared via Supply Risk Solutions (SRS) as a secure and no cost option to the supplier. This method is well adopted within healthcare.  <a href="#">Mapping Standard</a>	12

Some evidence of redundancy or similar capability	Based upon additional evidence and/or discussion, Supplier successfully demonstrated flexibility of assets, operations, planning, or other capabilities that establishes a reasonable level of confidence in its resiliency capabilities.	4
Moderate evidence of redundancy or similar capability	Examples: redundant facilities or operations; geographic diversity; channel strength including excess materials (raw or finished) and the capability to deploy them; interchangeability of parts or production lines; pre-identified alternate sources; active monitoring of natural hazards; robust sub-tier qualification; Provider-specific resiliency strategy such as VMI, etc.  Choose Some, Moderate, or Strong based upon your verdict. Consider past performance as something that should be in alignment with this score.	8
HIRC Transparency Partner Badge achieved	Supplier has earned the <a href="#">HIRC Transparency Partner Badge</a> .	12

Event Communication		
Provided no emergency contact, or contact is unresponsive	Supplier given reasonable time and context but failed to satisfy the request. Or the emergency contact provided by the Supplier is typically unresponsive.	0
Emergency contact responsive only to direct outreach	Emergency contact rarely responds to automated event alert notifications via the Provider's preferred third-party platform. However, emergency contact typically responds to direct outreach by the Provider.	4
Emergency contact responsive to both automated and direct outreach	Emergency contact is responsive to all forms of communication including automated notifications via the Provider's preferred third-party platform.	8
Supplier consistent in providing candid and actionable supply disruption intel	Supplier sets a high standard of excellence in being proactive, candid, and timely in providing actionable information regarding potential disruptions.	12

BCM Assessment		
Did not complete the assessment	Supplier given reasonable time and context but failed to satisfy the request	0
Calculated score of $\leq 2.5$	Supplier satisfied the request, including entry or permission to upload into the Provider's preferred third-party platform.  Calculated score of 1 to 2.5	4

Calculated score of 3 to 4.5	Supplier satisfied the request, including entry or permission to upload into the Provider's preferred third-party platform.  Calculated score of 3 to 4.5	8
Calculated score of 5 with upload of evidence	Supplier satisfied the request, including entry or permission to upload into the Provider's preferred third-party platform.  A score of 5 points requires some level of evidence (see below)  Calculated score of 5	12
Artifact provided to validate response	Preferred to provide a redacted copy of the Supplier business continuity plan (BCP).	4
Live discussion meaningfully addressed Provider critical supply concerns	A primary objective of the BCM assessment activity is to foster live dialogue between Supplier and Provider. As such, a successful dialogue should meaningfully address Provider concerns regarding the reliability of supply, particularly pertaining to products defined by the Provider as critical.	4
Provided a meaningful assessment of resiliency continuous improvement	Supplier proactively identified continuous improvement opportunities for supply chain resiliency and clearly communicated those plans to the provider.  A good starting point may be addressing any opportunities identified during the BCM assessment process.	4

KPI		
Provides no reporting of service levels	Supplier given reasonable time and context but failed to satisfy the request	0
Periodically reports service levels	Supplier periodically reports service levels. The reporting cadence and/or reporting scope partially meets expectations.	4
Routinely reports service levels of 95%+	Supplier routinely reports service levels. The reporting cadence and/or reporting scope fully meets expectations, and service level $\geq 95\%$	8
Routinely reports service levels of 99%+	Supplier routinely reports service levels. The reporting cadence and/or reporting scope fully meets expectations, and service level $\geq 99\%$	12
Limited backorders	As defined by the Provider and clearly understood by both parties, Supplier demonstrates strong order fill rate.	4

Limited recalls or quality issues	As defined by the Provider and clearly understood by both parties, Supplier demonstrates strong product performance (limited recalls or quality issues)	4
Supplier proactive in mitigating supply disruptions	Supplier sets a high standard of excellence in proactively communicating potential supply chain disruptions and coordinating with the Provider to mitigate as needed.	4

Live Discussion		
Did not participate in live discussion regarding Supplier resiliency program	Supplier given reasonable time and context but failed to satisfy the request	0
Provided overview of resiliency program	Supplier engaged in meaningful dialogue with the provider and offered appropriate level of scope and detail.	4
Provided clear understanding of preparedness and response strategies	Supplier successfully communicated to the provider a clear understanding of the Supplier's preparedness and response strategies.	8
Provided specificity in the discussion relative to products of interest	Supplier successfully integrated clear understanding of how the Supplier's resiliency strategy applies to products of interest as defined by the Provider.	12
Actively collaborates on resiliency initiatives	Supplier routinely engages in one or more meaningful strategies to improve service level and overall supply chain resiliency respective of the provider.	4
Followed through on resiliency growth plan	Supplier demonstrated and communicated meaningful progress regarding continuous improvement in resiliency.	4
Member of resiliency industry group	Supplier is a formal member of the Healthcare Industry Resilience Collaborative (HIRC) or similar group. We wish to recognize those suppliers who have committed additional time and energy to this effort.	4

## Summary

---

Supply disruption is perhaps the most significant external threat to continuity of healthcare services. Scorecarding is one method of reinforcing resiliency in trading relationships to protect continuity of patient care. Healthcare providers and suppliers wish to elevate resiliency as a key selection criteria.

3 out of 5 HIRC members are likely or very likely to award business on the basis of demonstrated superiority in supply chain resiliency. Resiliency ranked #3 in importance for selection criteria overall. The model promotes conversation and provides guidance conducive to a more resilient supply chain. Output may be standalone or integrated into existing balanced scorecarding.

Providers are encouraged to apply this model in selection and evaluation of supplier relationships. Suppliers are encouraged to self-evaluate and to work towards continuous improvement.

The model is not intended to validate resiliency practices, but rather, to offer a consistent baseline for healthcare to apply as a standard method of semi-quantitative analysis in the context of healthy dialogue.

## Problem

---

No standard for resiliency scorecarding exists. Communication and evaluation of resiliency attributes are inconsistent. Without standards, customers are less able to select for and reinforce resiliency attributes. Without selection, suppliers are less able to identify and prioritize customer interests in this space. A standard for retrospective and prospective assessment of resiliency attributes is needed.

## Objective

---

Establish a standard for resiliency scorecarding to enable thoughtful selection and evaluation of attributes conducive to business continuity practices. Foster industry-wide adoption and continuous improvement.

Explore how to rebalance the value proposition in sourcing practices to appropriately consider resiliency characteristics in the selection and evaluation of supplier partners.

## Design

---

Include retrospective and prospective signals of resiliency. Develop semi-quantitative measures for Transparency, Communication, Preparedness, Performance, and Partnership. Provide clear, balanced, and supportive interpretive guidelines. Drive toward continuous improvement, not perfection. Consider future opportunities for additional criteria and dual scorecarding.

## Value

---

Offer stability in clarifying customer expectations and aligning efforts to support the development of greater overall resiliency maturity.

Standardize expectations, encourage dialogue, inform decision making, incentivize resiliency, and improve patient care outcomes.