

RFP Question and Answer Document

External Quality Review Organization (EQRO) RFP #20150123

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
1.	1.2	8 of 70	The RFP states that DOM will issue an RFP in Jan. 2015 for 2 or more CCOs to manage the State's separate CHIP. In pricing the scope of work, should the tasks be priced for two Medicaid CCOs in year 1 and 2 Medicaid CCOs <u>PLUS</u> 2 CHIP CCOs in subsequent years?	Yes.
2.	1.4.2	11 of 70	The RFP states that the first review for the Mississippi CHIP program will not be conducted until 2016 to allow one year of program operation under the new contract. Beginning in Year 2 of the contract, will the scope of work for the CHIP CCOs include all the same activities as those required for the Medicaid CCOs?	Please refer to RFP Section 1.4.2.
3.	1.4.2 (1)	11 of 70	How many PIPs are required from each Medicaid CCO and each CHIP CCO annually?	Four (4).
4.	1.4.2 (2)(b)	11 of 70	The RFP states "see Appendix B for a list of performance measures and their related specifications." Appendix B is a list of 2015 Mississippi CHIP Performance Measures. Can DOM provide a list of performance measures applicable to the MSCAN CCOs?	Please refer to Amendment 1 to the RFP incorporating Appendix C. This information is posted on DOM's procurement website.
5.	1.4.3 (1)	12 of 70	The RFP states that the EQRO contractor will be required to participate in the State's Quality Leadership Committee and Quality Task Force Meetings. What is the frequency of the meetings? Is in-person attendance required or can attendance be via telephone?	Quality Leadership Team is quarterly and the Quality Task Force is monthly. By phone or in person whatever the contractor chooses to do. No requirement one way or the other.
6.	1.4.3 (2)	12 of 70	DOM requires that the EQRO validate consumer surveys on quality of care. Are the CCOs required to have consumer surveys conducted by a certified CAHPS vendor? Are both Child and Adult CAHPS conducted?	Yes and Yes.

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
7.	1.4.3 (2)	12 of 70	DOM requires that the EQRO validate provider surveys on quality of care. Are the provider surveys administered by the CCO/ CCO vendor?	Yes.
8.	1.7.4	17 of 70	<p>Section 1.7.4 Travel states...All travel performed in conjunction with performing the responsibilities of this contract shall not include any profit for the Contractor. Travel costs should be included in the implementation and operations costs as necessary. All travel must be pre-approved by DOM prior to the travel occurring.</p> <p>A fee is a percentage of total costs that is based within the range as specified in FAR 15.404-4 © (4) (i) (B). Fee is applied to all costs on a modified total cost basis, costs that includes travel, pursuant to federal regulation.</p> <p>As this Medicaid RFP is administered using Federal funding, will DOM allow a fee to be applicable to travel, as per the standards of the Federal FAR regulations and funding of Federal contracts?</p>	No.
9.	4.13.1 and 4.13.2-6	43-44 of 70	Section 4.13 Ownership and Financial Information requests disclosure by the Contractor; however, the applicable statute 42 CFR §455.104-106 applies to entities who are Providers for Medicaid services. As a contractor, we do not provide patient care services and we do not submit Medicaid claims. Therefore, is this information request applicable to non-Provider types?	Please refer to sections 4.13.1 and 4.13.2-6. This section is a requirement for all contractors and subcontractors, whether providers or not.
10.	5.4.3 (6)	54 of 70	Under corporate experience the RFP requires that the offeror provide personnel requirements for each experience. Please clarify what is required. Is DOM asking for types of staff positions and FTE or something else?	This section refers to Staff positions and FTEs.

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
11.	6.3.4	58 of 70	<p>Section 6.3 Proposal Content states....</p> <p>4. All proposals submitted by corporations must contain certification by the secretary or other appropriate corporate official, other than the signer of the corporate proposal, that the corporate official signing the corporate proposal has the authority to obligate and bind the corporation to the terms, conditions and provisions of the proposal.</p> <p>Does a signed document of Mississippi's Certificate of Current Cost or Pricing Data comply with this section?</p>	Please submit a notarized statement for this section.
12.	6.3.1	58 of 70	<p>Section 6.3 Proposal Content states...</p> <p>1. Appendix A - Budget Summary - A detailed worksheet by line item of all costs as it pertains to the Contractor Responsibilities and Deliverables as found in Section 1.0 of the RFP.</p> <p>In regards to the Detailed Worksheet, does DOM require detail for these (3) price levels from RFP Section 1.7 Contractor Payment page 16; <i>Implementation, Operations and Turnover?</i></p>	Yes.
13.	6.3.1	58 of 70	<p>Section 6.3 Proposal Content states...</p> <p>1. Appendix A - Budget Summary - A detailed worksheet by line item of all costs as it pertains to the Contractor Responsibilities and Deliverables as found in Section 1.0 of the RFP.</p> <p>In regards to the Detailed Worksheet, does DOM require detailed pricing for each task within the scope of work?</p>	Yes.
14.	1.4.4	13	Other Medicaid programs have expanded their monitoring programs to further emphasis the financial performance aspects of their programs, and have used the services of Certified Public Accounting firms to	It is appropriate to propose suggested activities and "best practices" and independent program oversight activities. Please price each additional service separately. Appendix A has been

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
			<p>accomplish these objectives. In addition to the "additional suggested activities" listed, is it appropriate to propose other "best practices" and independent program oversight activities that have been used successfully in other nearby states, such as (but not limited to):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Program Support and Contract Compliance <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Monitoring for denial of service trends or patient dumping B. Testing member files and capitation payments for: duplicates, overlapping segments, inaccurate rate cells, etc. C. Analyzing program integrity oversight and effort within the plan and identifying opportunities for improvement within the plan and within the State's contract(s) with the health plans. D. Testing for compliance with timely payment requirements, including evaluating the definitions used by the health plans regarding "clean claims" E. Monitoring plan oversight of, and contracting with subcontractors and delegated vendors F. Conduct performance reviews of plan operations and identify potential vulnerabilities or compliance issues for corrective action plans G. Analyzing the health plans' efforts to improve the quality and efficiency of services, payments, and operations 2. Testing of inputs used for Actuarial rate setting process including attestations made by CPA <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Testing administrative expenses. B. Independent analysis of health plan costs, including medical loss ratios C. Identification of duplicate and invalid encounters 	<p>amended to allow for separate pricing.</p>

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
			If one or more of these additional services are of interest to the Medicaid program, please confirm they be priced separately (added to the price proposal as "additional services"), so that price comparability can be preserved between competing proposals?	
15.	General		What is the dollar value of the current EQRO contract?	For additional information regarding this Contractor, you may refer to Mississippi's transparency site or submit a request for information through DOM's RFI process.
16.	General		What is the approved budget for the federally mandated EQRO activities and the additional activities required by DOM under the contract that results from this RFP?	The budget submitted by the successful Offeror will be the budget discussed for this project.
17.	1.2	7	<p>What is the enrollment in the following programs?</p> <p><u>MississippiCAN</u> Magnolia Health Plan, Inc. UnitedHealthcare, of Mississippi, Inc.</p> <p><u>MississippiCHIP</u> Magnolia Health Plan, Inc. UnitedHealthcare, of Mississippi, Inc.</p>	<p>Please refer to the following link:</p> <p>http://www.medicaid.ms.gov/resources/</p>
18.	1.2	8	<p>The last paragraph in this section indicates that DOM will issue an RFP in January 2015 for two or more CCOs to manage the State's separate Children's Health Insurance Program.</p> <p>a. What is the target start date for these new CCOs to be incorporated into the scope of work described in this RFP?</p> <p>b. Will these new CCOs be added to the contract resulting from this RFP via an amendment and will the compensation be adjusted accordingly?</p>	<p>a) July 1, 2015.</p> <p>b) Please see Question #1. Offerors should price their proposals accordingly.</p> <p>c) Please refer to Question #1.</p> <p>d) They both will be reviewed in 2016. Please see Question #1.</p>

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
			<p>c. If the answer to b. above is no, what assumption should all bidders make as to the number of CCOs and start date of these CCOs for pricing this RFP?</p> <p>d. Or, have these already been incorporated into the RFP and are the MississippiCHIP CCOs which will first be reviewed in 2016 (as indicated in section 1.4.2.)?</p>	
19.	1.3.3, 5.1, and 5.6	9-10, 51, and 56	<p>Proposal Submission Requirements: RFP instructions in Sections 1.3.3 and 5.1 say one full copy of the entire technical proposal should be submitted on CD in a single searchable document in either Microsoft Word or Adobe Acrobat. However, RFP Section 5.6, item #3 says the Methodology section must include a high-level project plan submitted in Microsoft (MS) Project.</p> <p>Please advise if the MS Project Plan should be submitted on its own CD, or if it can be included as a separate file on the same CD containing the "single searchable document in either Word or Acrobat."</p> <p>Also, would DOM consider allowing Offerors to provide Appendix Materials in a separate file on the CD as well?</p>	<p>It is preferable that the proposals and appendices or attachments are submitted on one (single) CD. The offeror may create separate files.</p> <p>Please do not include any business proposal material on the technical proposal's CD.</p>
20.	1.4.2	11	<p>Per the item below, how many focused studies/performance improvement projects have each CCO conducted during the preceding 12 months?</p> <p>1.4.2 Federally Mandated Activities</p> <p>Validation of performance improvement projects required by the State to comply with requirements set forth in 42 CFR 438.240(b) (1) that were underway during the preceding twelve (12) months.</p>	<p>For MSCAN- four (4) focused studies required by contract.</p>

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
21.	1.4.2, Item 3	11-12	Please confirm that DOM expects the EQRO to perform full compliance reviews and address topics such as enrollee rights, grievances, appeals, and program integrity.	Yes.
22.	1.4.2	11-12	We understand there are two CCOs and each have MississippiCAN and MississippiCHIP programs. In considering the EQR activities, should we assume the MSCAN and MSCHIP as two separate programs that will require its own review/validation of PIP, performance measure validation, compliance review, etc.?	Yes they are two separate programs and must be reviewed and validated as two separate programs.
23.	1.4.2	11-12	<p>Will the EQRO complete the reviews listed below for MississippiCAN in 2015, 2016, 2017?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Validation of performance improvement projects... 2. The CCOs will have annual audited HEDIS data available for review. The Contractor shall follow CMS's most current Validating Performance Measures protocol.... 3. A review, conducted within the previous three-year period, to determine the CCO's compliance with standards [except with respect to standards under 42 CFR § 438.240 (b)(1) and (2) Quality assessment and performance improvement program.... 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes. 2. Yes. 3. Yes.
24.	1.4.2	11-12	<p>Will the EQRO complete the reviews listed below for MississippiCHIP in 2016 and 2017?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Validation of performance improvement projects... 2. The CCOs will have annual audited HEDIS data available for review. The Contractor shall follow CMS's most current Validating Performance Measures protocol.... 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes. 2. Yes. 3. No- Offeror should include proposal for 2018 and any subsequent extensions.

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
			3. A review, conducted within the previous three-year period, to determine the CCO's compliance with standards [except with respect to standards under 42 CFR § 438.240 (b)(1) and (2) Quality assessment and performance improvement program....	
25.	1.4.3	12	Does the EQRO representative need to attend the State's Quality Leadership Committee and Quality Task Force meetings in person?	No.
26.	1.4.3	12	Will the Mississippi CCOs be expected to conduct CAHPS surveys and have a CAHPS vendor? Similarly, will the EQRO be expected to have a certified CAHPS vendor as part of its team?	Yes, the Mississippi CCOs will be expected to conduct CAHPS surveys and have a CAHPS vendor. No, the EQRO will not be expected to have a certified CAHPS vendor as a part of its team.
27.	1.4.3	12-13	Additional Activities Required by DOM. What types and how many surveys are currently conducted by the CCOs?	Provider and beneficiary surveys yearly.
28.	1.4.3.2	12	The RFP asks for a validation of consumer and provider surveys on quality of care. May we ask what the CCOs' provider survey requirements are for 2015-2017?	They must conduct yearly provider surveys and submit questions to DOM prior to performance of provider survey for approval and must submit provider survey results to DOM yearly.
29.	1.4.4	13	Does the Division of Medicaid (DOM) have funding available for additional activities suggested by the Contractor?	Yes.
30.	1.4.4	13	How many records will the EQRO validate for encounter data, if they propose to perform that task?	DOM expects the contractor to propose this information.
31.	1.4.4	13	For Corrective Action Plans (CAPS), will the EQRO be monitoring both CAPS from the previous year, or will they be only developing CAPS starting in year 1 of the program and only monitoring the CAPS that they developed?	Only monitoring CAPS they develop.

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
32.	1.4.4	13	For the “additional reports” under the additional suggested activities, are there certain types of reports that the DOM has in mind for these activities?	These would be additional reports where the Contractor has had previous experience with Medicaid CCO’s and can produce and substantiate additional benefit to DOM.
33.	1.4.5	13	<p>The important date table in this section indicates that the start date of the contract is June 1, 2015 and the Annual Program Evaluation due from the CCOs is “Yearly August”. Please clarify the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the “Annual Program Evaluation Due from CCOs” of August 2015 mean the date the CCOs will provide their data to the Contractor or does it represent the date the Contractor needs to complete their CCO compliance validation? b. If the date represents the date the Contractor needs to complete their CCO compliance validation, will a majority of the work on this task be completed by the incumbent Contractor? c. If the answer to b. above is Yes, what work will remain for the new Contractor to perform on this task? 	DOM does not have sufficient information for a response at this time.
34.	1.4.5	13	<p>This section describes additional services Contract may suggest to DOM. Appendix A – Budget Summary does not include a line to breakout the pricing for such potential services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Will these services be added at a later date as an amendment to the Contract? b. If the answer to a. above is No, should all bidders show this on a separate line in Appendix A? 	Appendix A, Budget Summary will be amended to allow pricing for each additional CCO and to allow pricing separately for each additional activity proposed – whether pricing proposal is by hour or activity.
35.	1.4.5	13	The Important Dates table indicates that the start date of the contract is June 1, 2015, and the Audited HEDIS data and other performance data due from CCOs is “Yearly July 31.” Please clarify the following:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The date the HEDIS data and other performance data is due to DOM. b. Not applicable as it is the date due to DOM. c. Not Applicable.

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
			<p>a. Does the “Audited HEDIS data and other performance data due from CCOs” due “Yearly July 31” mean the date the CCOs will provide their data to the Contractor or does it represent the date the Contractor needs to complete their CCO review of the HEDIS data?</p> <p>b. If the date represents the date the Contractor needs to complete their review of the HEDIS data, will a majority of the work on this task be completed by the incumbent Contractor?</p> <p>c. If the answer to b. above is Yes, what work will remain for the new Contractor to perform on this task?</p>	
36.	1.4.5	13	<p>The Important Dates table indicates that the start date of the contract is June 1, 2015, and the and the Focused Study reports/PIPs due from CCOs is “Yearly August.” Please clarify the following:</p> <p>a. Does the “Focused Study reports/PIPs due from CCOs” due “Yearly August” mean the date the CCOs will provide their data to the Contractor or does it represent the date the Contractor needs to complete their review of the Focus Study Reports/PIPs data?</p> <p>b. If the date represents the date the Contractor needs to complete their review of the Focus Study Reports/PIPs data, will a majority of the work on this task be completed by the incumbent Contractor?</p> <p>c. If the answer to b. above is Yes, what work will remain for the new Contractor to perform on this task?</p>	<p>a. This is the date the data is due to DOM for review.</p> <p>b. Not Applicable.</p> <p>c. Not Applicable.</p>
37.	1.4.5	13	<p>Due to the timing of the start of this contract (June 1, 2015), will the Incumbent Contractor have a role in the report or will all work on the EQR Annual Report be done by the new Contractor?</p>	<p>DOM does not have sufficient information for a response at this time.</p>

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
38.	1.4.5	13	If the option years are not elected, what role, if any, will the Contractor have beyond the contract end date of May 31, 2018? Will the Turnover Phase (transition to the new Contractor) be completed by May 31, 2018?	DOM does not have sufficient information for a response at this time.
39.	1.5	14	The RFP states, "Key personnel positions cannot be vacant for more than ninety (90) calendar days...DOM may impose penalties if any key management personnel positions remain vacant for greater than 90 days." a. What positions are considered to be "key personnel"? b. What, if any, are the difference between "key personnel" and "key management personnel"	a. The vendor proposes their key personnel and key management personnel. We did not qualify these in the contract. b. This will be determined once the project has been awarded and initiated.
40. 6	1.6.1	15	What is the expected frequency of the written program progress reports?	DOM expects the Offeror to propose these.
41.	1.6.3	15	We were not able to find any EQRO Reports on DOM's website. Please provide an example of a detailed technical report submitted to DOM within 30 business days after the completion of the annual review of each CCO.	Please refer to Appendix C.
42.	4.2	29	Has the DOM assessed damages to the incumbent Contractor in the past for the services described in this RFP?	This information can be obtained through DOM's RFI process.
43.	4.3	29	Please specify the number of MississippiCAN CCOs and MississippiCHIP CCOs that should be assumed for Renewal Year 1 and Renewal Year 2?	Please refer to Question 1.
44.	4.7.5	36	Given the time it can take to retrieve appropriate documentation would the state please revise the wording to read: "All records, including training records, pertaining to the Contract must be readily retrievable within 10 workdays for review at the	The language in the RFP Stands.

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
			request of DOM and its authorized representatives.”	
45.	4.9.4	38	This section indicates that “the rate of payment for changes or amendments completed per contract year shall be at rates specified by the Contractor’s proposal. Appendix A – Budget Summary just has one line for Operation Cost. Can we modify Appendix A to provide pricing for each additional CCO or hourly rates for additional services?	Appendix A, Budget Summary will be amended to allow pricing for each additional CCO and to allow pricing separately for each additional activity proposed – whether pricing proposal is by hour or activity.
46.	4.10	39–40	In order to provide clarity of responsibility in this section would the state consider adding the following, or similar language to the end of each of the first four paragraphs? <u>“This provision shall not apply to liability of any nature arising solely from DOM’s failure to meet its duties under this Contract or solely from any actions or omissions undertaken in compliance with DOM’s directions or requests.”</u>	Contract language changes will be addressed after award of contract.
47.	5.1 and 4.13	51 and 43–45	Section 5.1 says the Technical Proposal must include eight sections and that Section 4 is to include "Ownership and Financial Disclosure Information (section 4.13 of the RFP)." Section 4.13.2 specifies that disclosures are due upon submitting a proposal in accordance with the State's procurement process. However, Section 4.13.5, Information Related to Business Transitions, states that the Contractor must submit, within 35 days of the date of a request by the Secretary or DOM, full and complete information about: (1) the ownership of any subcontractor with whom the Contractor has had business transactions totaling more than \$25,000 during the 12-month period ending on the date of the request; and (2) any significant business transactions between the Contractor and any wholly owned supplier or between the Contractor and any	Please submit this information in the Offeror’s Technical Proposal Response.

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
			<p>subcontractor during the 5-year period ending on the date of the request."</p> <p>Please clarify if the information related to business transactions identified in 4.13.5 needs to be provided with the RFP response or if it is sufficient for an Offeror to agree to provide this information within 35 days of a request for it by the Secretary or DOM.</p> <p>Further, if the information does need to be submitted with the Technical Proposal, please provide a definition as to what constitutes a "significant business transaction."</p>	
48.	5.4.3	54	<p>The RFP says to describe details of "the Offeror's experience with the type of service to be provided by this RFP and Medicaid experience." It goes on to state "a minimum of three corporate references are required for this type of experience." Please clarify if the three required corporate references must be for EQRO work only, or if the references can be for other types of work performed for Medicaid agencies (e.g., utilization management, care management, quality control) as well.</p>	Please limit response to this section to only EQRO related experience.
49.	5.8 and 1.6.1	57 and 14	<p>RFP Section 5.8 is asking for a work plan and schedule broken down by tasks and subtasks included in each phase of the contract. Are the contract phases "Implementation," "Operations," and "Turnover" as discussed in RFP 1.6.1? If not, what are the contract phases?</p>	Yes.
50.	Business Associate Agreement Section III e.	DOM BAA Page 3 of 9	<p>Given the nature of unsuccessful access attempts which fall under the definition of "Security Incidents," would the Department please consider the following, or similar, language so that neither party is hindered by the having to report "Access Attempts"?</p>	DOM is open to negotiate this suggested modification with the winning offeror.

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
			<p>Definition of “Access Attempts” Access Attempts. Information Systems are the frequent target of probes, scans, “pings” and other activities which may or may not indicate threats, whose sources may be difficult or impossible to identify and whose motives are unknown, and which do not result in access or risk to any Information System or Protected Health Information (“Access Attempts”).</p> <p>and</p> <p>Notification of Access Attempts. Access Attempts are recorded in various system logs, and fall under the definition of “Security Incident” in the Security Rule. Because PHI is not Used or Disclosed in an Access Attempt, they do not fall under the definition of Unauthorized Use or Disclosure, but Access Attempts do fall under the definition of Security Incident and the Vendor is required to report them to Qualis Health. The parties recognize however that Vendor’s reporting and Qualis Health’s review of records of Access Attempts would be materially burdensome to both parties without reducing risks to Information Systems or PHI. Therefore, provided that (i) Vendor ensures that there is an appropriate review, by Vendor, of logs and other records of Access Attempts, and (ii) Vendor investigates events where it is not clear whether or not an Access Attempt was made to determine if: (i) the Access Attempt was in fact a “successful” unauthorized Access to, modification or destruction of electronic PHI subject to this Contract, resulting in material interference with the Vendor’s Information System used with respect to electronic PHI subject to this Contract, or (ii) the Access Attempts caused an Unauthorized Use or Disclosure, then this provision shall serve as Vendor’s notice to Qualis Health that Access Attempts occur and are anticipated to continue in the future with respect to the</p>	

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
			Vendor's Information Systems. Qualis Health acknowledges this notification, and that Vendor shall not be required to provide further notification of Access Attempts, unless they constitute Security Incidents as modified by this Subsection.	
51.	BAA Section VII e.	DOM BAA Page 7 and 8 of 9	Given the obligations of both parties under the Privacy Act and HIPAA would the state consider adding the underlined to the end of this clause? <u>"This provision shall not apply to liability of any nature arising solely from DOM's failure to meet its duties under this Agreement or solely from any actions or omissions undertaken in compliance with DOM's directions or requests."</u>	DOM is open to discussing the language of this clause with the winning offeror.
52.	BAA Section VII m.	DOM BAA Page 9 of 9	For clarity would the state modify the language in this section as underlined? "...in the event of litigation or administrative proceedings being commenced against DOM, its directors, officers, or any other workforce member based upon claimed violation <u>by User</u> of HIPAA, the Privacy Act, 42 C.F.R. Part 2, their implementing regulations, or other laws relating to security and privacy..."	DOM is open to negotiate this suggested modification with the winning offeror.
53.	Data Use Agreement Section V. f.	DOM DUA Page 6 of 8	Given the obligations of both parties would the state consider adding the underlined to the end of this clause? <u>"This provision shall not apply to liability of any nature arising solely from DOM's failure to meet its duties under this Agreement or solely from any actions or omissions undertaken in compliance with DOM's directions or requests."</u>	DOM is open to discussing the language of this clause with the winning offeror.
54.	Data Use Agreement Section VM n.	DOM DUA Page 7 of 8	For clarity would the state modify the language in this section as underlined? "...in the event of litigation or administrative proceedings being commenced against DOM, its directors, officers, or any other workforce member based upon claimed violation <u>by User</u> of HIPAA, the Privacy Act, 42 C.F.R. Part 2, their implementing regulations, or other laws relating to	DOM is open to negotiating the language of this clause with the winning offeror.

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
			security and privacy..."	
55.	Data Use Agreement Attachment D- Notification of Breach	DOM DUA Attachment D, pages 1-2	The terms of this Notification of Breach attachment appear to be in conflict with some of the similar terms in the Business Associate Agreement. For clarity would the state consider deleting the Notification of Breach attachment and instead referencing the Business Associate Agreement?	DOM will not delete Attachment D.
56.	Data Use Agreement Attachment D- Notification of Breach	DOM DUA Attachment D, pages 1-2	<p>Given the nature of unsuccessful access attempts which fall under the definition of "Security Incidents" would the department please consider the following, or similar, language so that neither party is hindered by the having to report "Access Attempts" ? Definition of "Access Attempts" Access Attempts. Information Systems are the frequent target of probes, scans, "pings" and other activities which may or may not indicate threats, whose sources may be difficult or impossible to identify and whose motives are unknown, and which do not result in access or risk to any Information System or Protected Health Information ("Access Attempts").</p> <p>and Notification of Access Attempts. Access Attempts are recorded in various system logs, and fall under the definition of "Security Incident" in the Security Rule. Because PHI is not Used or Disclosed in an Access Attempt, they do not fall under the definition of Unauthorized Use or Disclosure, but Access Attempts do fall under the definition of Security Incident and the Vendor is required to report them to Qualis Health. The parties recognize however that Vendor's reporting and Qualis Health's review of records of Access Attempts would be materially burdensome to both parties without reducing risks to Information Systems or PHI. Therefore, provided that (i) Vendor ensures that there</p>	DOM is open to negotiate this suggested modification with the winning offeror.

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
			is an appropriate review, by Vendor, of logs and other records of Access Attempts, and (ii) Vendor investigates events where it is not clear whether or not an Access Attempt was made to determine if: (i) the Access Attempt was in fact a “successful” unauthorized Access to, modification or destruction of electronic PHI subject to this Contract, resulting in material interference with the Vendor’s Information System used with respect to electronic PHI subject to this Contract, or (ii) the Access Attempts caused an Unauthorized Use or Disclosure, then this provision shall serve as Vendor’s notice to Qualis Health that Access Attempts occur and are anticipated to continue in the future with respect to the Vendor’s Information Systems. Qualis Health acknowledges this notification, and that Vendor shall not be required to provide further notification of Access Attempts, unless they constitute Security Incidents as modified by this Subsection.	
57.	General		Will DOM accept and consider attachments to an Offeror’s proposal during the evaluation process or does everything need to be within the main body of the proposal?	DOM requires any offeror to submit a full response that meets all requirements by close of business on the proposal due date.
58.	1.2	8	You mentioned on page 8 of the RFP that DOM was issuing an RFP for two or more CCOs to manage the CHIP program. How many CCOs should be included in the cost?	Please Refer to Question 1.
59.	1.4	10	Number 2 states “Assure quality of data collected from CCOs for both programs as addressed in the Business Associate Agreement.” Could you provide the Business Associate Agreement?	The Business Associate Agreement can be found on DOM’s procurement website.
60.	1.4.1	11	The 3 rd bullet states “For the MississippiCAN program review, within the previous three (3) year period , determine CCO compliance with State standards for access to care, structure and operations and quality	No- as the CHIP program did not officially become a managed care program in Mississippi until 1/1/15. Therefore, there is not a three year previous period upon award of this contract

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
			measurement and improvement.” Does this also apply to the MississippiCHIP program?	
61.	1.4.2	11	First paragraph states, “The first review for the MississippiChip program will not be conducted until 2016 to allow one year of program operation under the new contract.” Does DOM anticipate that the MississippiCHIP EQR reviews will begin in the second year of the contract?	It will begin in 2016.
62.	1.4.2	11	We understand that the first review for the MississippiCHIP program will not be conducted until 2016 to allow one year of program operation under the new contract. Is DOM requesting separate EQRs of the CAN and CHIP health plans even if a plan serves both programs, or can the reviews of the plan’s CAN and CHIP be combined into one review?	Yes, they are separate, as it is two distinct and separate programs and are treated as such.
63.	1.4.2.1.	11	The EQRO will validate the Performance Improvement Projects (PIPs).” How many performance improvement projects are the CCO’s expected to have running at one time? Is validation expected to be done on all projects or just a subset?	Contractually they are required to conduct four (4) per year. Yes, validation is expected to be done on all projects.
64.	1.4.2.1.b.	11	Verify actual Focused Study/PIP study findings.” This is an optional activity in the CMS protocols. Can you confirm that DOM is requesting the optional activity be performed for each PIP validated?	Yes- DOM wants this conducted.
65.	1.4.2.2.b	11	For other performance measures, DOM will provide specification for data collection (see Appendix B for a list of performance measures and their related specification).” Are any of the plans using medical record abstractions to calculate any of the non-HEDIS measures in their programs?	Please refer to Amendment 1 Appendix C.

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
66.	1.4.3	12	<p>Number 1 state "Participate in the State's Quality Leadership Committee and Quality Task Force."</p> <p>Will DOM consider allowing the contractor to participate by phone?</p>	Yes.
67.	1.4.3.2.	13	<p>The protocol specifies the following activities that the Contractor must undertake to assess the methodological soundness of a given survey:" The seven activities for survey validation were updated in the current version of the CMS protocol and no longer match the activities listed in the RFP. The new activities / steps are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1: Review Survey Purpose(s), Objective(s) and Intended Use 2: Assess the Reliability and Validity of the Survey Instrument 3: Review the Sampling Plan 4: Review the Adequacy of the Response Rate 5: Review Survey Implementation 6: Review Survey Data Analysis and Findings/Conclusions 7: Document Evaluation of Survey <p>Which set of activities is DOM requiring the vendor to use for this contract?</p>	DOM does not have sufficient information to respond to this question at this time.
68.	1.6.3	16	# 2 says the tracking report of progress on annual reviews shall be transmitted electronically and updated bi-weekly. Does DOM mean for the report to be sent every two weeks?	Yes, DOM intends for this report to be sent every two (2) weeks.
69.	4.13.1	43	<p>If the Contractor is not owned or under controlling interest of another company or individual does the contractor have to provide any information related to item 4.13.1?</p> <p>The specific confusion is around item 4.13.1 6. Do we</p>	Please refer to section 4.13.1. At minimum, contractors must comply with the applicable federal regulations.

Question #	RFP Section #	RFP Page #	Question	DOM Response
			only need to provide the name, address, date of birth, and Social Security Number of any managing employee if we have an individual or corporation with an ownership or controlling interest?	