

**RFQ Question and Answer Document**

| Question # | RFQ Section # | RFQ Page # | Question  | DOM Response   |
|------------|---------------|------------|---|--|
| 1.         | 1.2.3         | 9          | Is it permissible to use as low as 8 point font size for highlight boxes and graphics/diagrams?   | Yes.<br><br>A minimum of eight (8) point font is allowed for exhibits/graphics, tables, diagrams, headers/footers. It is not allowed for RFQ requirement text. |
| 2.         | 1.2.3         | 9          | Is it permissible to use as low as 9 point font size for headers/footers and tables?  | Yes.<br><br>A minimum of eight (8) point font is allowed for exhibits/graphics, tables, diagrams, headers/footers. It is not allowed for RFQ requirement text. |
| 3.         | 1.2.3         | 9          | Is it permissible to adjust the margins to .5 inch on the outside and .7 inch on the inside, to allow for room to hole-punch without impacting response text/graphics?  | Yes.   |
| 4.         | 1.2.3         | 9          | Please confirm that the response can be page numbered by section.   | The qualification's page numbers should continue from section to section.  |
| 5.         | 1.3.3         | 13         | Within the last paragraph of RFQ Section 1.3.3, "Mississippi CHIP" has been changed to "MississippiCAN" and now states: "For foster care children, without adoptive assistance enrolled in the MississippiCAN Program, CPS selects the Contractor in which Members will be enrolled." Please confirm that the MS CHIP program still includes children in Foster Care. | DOM confirms that the Mississippi CHIP program includes children in foster care. The word "MississippiCAN" should be replaced with "Mississippi CHIP."         |

RFQ #: 20180831

Date: September 28, 2018

| Question # | RFQ Section #        | RFQ Page # | Question  | DOM Response  |
|------------|----------------------|------------|---|---|
| 6.         | 5.3                  | 61         | Please confirm that the documentation requested within the Transmittal Letter items (such as a copy of the Offeror's license) should be attached immediately behind the Transmittal Letter in the response. | Confirmed.  |
| 7.         | 5.5.2                | 65         | Due to the size of the financial documents required in this section, will the State allow submission of these documents as electronic files only on the required CD?  | Yes, electronic copies of the audited financial statements will be accepted.  |
| 8.         | 5.7                  | 68         | The Division requests the Offeror should repeat each statement/question and then follow with the response. Please confirm the repeated statement/question does not count toward the specified page limit.   | The required repetition of the statements/questions in the Methodology/Work Statement section does not count against the specified page limits.   |
| 9.         | 5.7, Figure 6, Q. 45 | 76         | Due to the size of provider list, would the State be willing to accept the list on electronic CD only?  | Yes, please provide the information on a CD with each copy of your technical binder.  |
| 10.        | 5.9                  | 83         | Within RFQ Section 5.9, Work Plan and Schedule, the Division asks for a network diagram. Please confirm that we can submit this electronically.   | Yes, please provide a network diagram. If submitted electronically, reference the electronic submission in the qualification.   |
| 11.        | Appendix F           | 94         | Please clarify where in the proposal response the Certifications and Assurances form should be provided.  | The Certification and Assurances form should be included as an attachment to the Management Qualifications (Marked) binder, after the transmittal letter and associated documentation in the Offerors response. |
| 12.        | General              |            | Please provide the number of members by age category (e.g., 0-1, 1-6, 7-19).  | The approximate CHIP enrollment by age is as follows:<br>Age 0-1        56<br>Age >1-6      12,841<br>Age >6-19    33,753   |

Date: September 28, 2018

|     |                                    |       |  |  |
|-----|------------------------------------|-------|--|--|
| 13. | General                            |       | In Amendment 2 to the previously released Mississippi CHIP RFQ #20180608, the Division clarified what is considered identifying information in the technical binder by adding the following language: "Information which identifies an Offeror as an incumbent is considered identifying information." Please confirm this language is still applicable to this RFQ #20180831. | This language is not applicable to RFQ #20180831. DOM considers the following as identifying information: names; logos; watermarks; and company colors.  |
| 14. | RFQ, Section 1.2 and Section 1.4.1 | 8, 13 | Section 1.2 of the RFQ states that, "The Division intends to contract with at no more than two (2) entities", however, Section 1.4.1 states that, "The Division intends to contract with at least two (2) entities". Can the Division please clarify the number of intended awards?  | DOM intends to award two (2) contracts.  |
| 15. | RFQ, Section 4.11.3                | 52    | In Section 4.11.3, can the Division please define "Immediate family members"?<br>Additionally, would the Division consider removing or revising this statement to not inadvertently impact a Contractor's ability to employ qualified candidates?  | Section 4.11.3 states, ". . . and no immediate family members of Medicaid providers shall be employed by the Contractor." The Mississippi Code, Section 25-3-95 states, "For the purpose of this subsection (3), the immediate family is defined as spouse, parent, stepparent, sibling, child, stepchild, grandchild, grandparent, son- or daughter-in-law, mother- or father-in-law or brother- or sister-in-law. Child means a biological, adopted or foster child, or a child for whom the individual stands or stood in loco parentis."<br><br>DOM will not be removing or revising this statement. |
| 16. | RFQ, Section 1.2.3                 | 9     | Given the page limitations, will the Division consider a smaller font size (minimum 8 or 10 point) for graphics, tables, diagrams, headers/footers, and the RFQ question/requirement?  | A minimum of eight (8) point font is allowed for exhibits/graphics, tables, diagrams, headers/footers. It is not allowed for RFQ requirement text.   |
| 17. | RFQ, Section 1.2.3                 | 9     | Is it permissible to use larger margins (instead of the required 0.5 inch margins) on the side margin closest to the binding, to ensure enough spacing for 3-hole punching without impacting the content of the page?  | Yes.   |
| 18. | RFQ, Section 1.2.3                 | 10    | The RFQ requires electronic submission on CD, is it permissible to use USB or Flash Drives for the electronic submissions?   | No. Please use CDs for the electronic submissions.   |

Date: September 28, 2018

|     |                       |    |  |   |
|-----|-----------------------|----|--|---|
| 19. | RFQ, Section 5.5.2    | 65 | Due to the length of audited financial statements, is it permissible for the respondent to submit the requested financials in electronic-only format on the required CD?   | Yes, this is allowed.   |
| 20. | RFQ, Section 1.2.3    | 10 | The Division is requesting a single PDF of the qualifications. Does the Division want a separate PDF of the marked response and a separate PDF of the unmarked response on one CD, or should the Respondent submit the marked and unmarked on separate CDs?  | Please submit the marked and unmarked on separate CDs.  |
| 21. | RFQ, Section 3.3, 3.4 | 30 | Section 3.3 of the RFQ states that the “contract will not exceed four (4) years with an option to renew for one (1) year” while section 3.4 states “three (3) years with two (2) optional one (1) year renewals”. Can the Division please confirm the contract period.                                     | The contract period is for three (3) years with two (2) optional one (1) year renewals.   |
| 22. | RFQ, Section 5.5.3    | 66 | Section 5.5.3 asks for a minimum of three (3) corporate references. In order to ensure that references supplied will be “available for interview”, could the Division please elaborate on the method (e.g. phone, email, or questionnaire) and estimated timeframe they will be contacting the references? | DOM will conduct interviews with references using multiple methods at DOM’s discretion. This may include email and/or telephone.                                  |
| 23. | RFQ, Section 5.5.3    | 66 | Please confirm section 5.5.3.11 is intended to say “Direct Contact” rather than “Direct Contract” and that the reference to “(see Appendix A)” is intended to refer to Appendix E.   | Number 11 in Section 5.5.3 states “Direct Contact”.   |
| 24. | RFQ, Section 1.4      | 13 | Has the state prepared a summary of how the program is expected to change relative to the current program? If yes, can this be distributed to all potential bidders?   | No summary has been prepared. The CHIP program change referenced is the change in the benchmark from the State Employee Coverage to Medicaid State Plan coverage. |
| 25. | RFQ, Section 1.4.1    | 13 | Has the Division determined the time-limited auto-assignment methodology’s minimum threshold? If so, please provide the threshold?   | No, DOM has not determined an initial auto-assignment methodology threshold. The special enrollment will be determined by the contract awards.                    |
| 26. | RFQ, Section 1.4.1    | 14 | Please explain what types of situations would cause modifications to the Enrollment and Auto Enrollment rules to be necessary.   | These modifications may be due to changes in state, federal or agency regulations.  |

Date: September 28, 2018

|     |                     |       |   |   |
|-----|---------------------|-------|---|---|
| 27. | RFQ, Section 1.4.9  | 22-23 | What circumstances would require the Division to update the required Performance Measures and Targets?  | Annually, or as needed, DOM will evaluate the Performance Measures and Targets. Targets may be updated when CCOs do not meet/meet/exceed identified goals. Performance Measures may be replaced or changed due to population needs or agency demands. |
| 28. | RFQ, Section 1.4.9  | 23    | Is there a projected date in mind for the potential phase in implementation of the value-based purchasing initiative?   | DOM does not have a set timeframe for the phase in of value-based purchasing.   |
| 29. | RFQ, Section 1.4.10 | 23    | This section states, "The Division will develop the monthly capitation rates, and the selected Contractors must accept the rates as a condition of their qualifications." If the rates are not actuarially sound, do the chosen Contractors have the option to exit?  | Please see Appendix A, CHIP Model Contract, Section 15. H. "Option to Terminate". DOM does not provide rates that are not actuarially sound.  |
| 30. | RFQ, Section 1.4.10 | 23    | Will contracts be signed before rates are known?  | Yes.  |
| 31. | RFQ, Section 1.4.10 | 23    | This section states, "These rates are negotiable only at the discretion of the Division and with cooperation by the Contractors." Please explain what would cause such a negotiation.   | For information to be provided to DOM that is material to the calculation of the capitation rates.  |
| 32. | RFQ, Section 2.3    | 27    | This section states, "Neither shall such inaccuracy constitute a basis for renegotiation of any payment after Contract award." Does this mean that the rates will not be updated even if the use of inaccurate data causes a material impact to the rate development? | DOM is required to pay actuarially sound Capitation Rates under the contract. If/when those rates are shown to require material adjustment due to errors, the rates are adjusted for actuarial soundness.   |
| 33. | RFQ, Section 6.2.2  | 87    | Please confirm that there are no submission requirements associated with the 35 points awarded for Price. It is our expectation that all entities submitting a qualifying bid will receive all 35 points?   | DOM can confirm that there is no submission requirement associated with the 35 points awarded for price. All entities submitting a qualifying bid will receive 35 points.   |
| 34. | RFQ                 | 92    | Our analysis of current rates and "potential" projected costs will be predicated on the SFY19 CHIP rates released by the State to participating MCO's on 6/26/18. Does the State have any objections to this approach?  | No.   |
| 35. | RFQ                 | 92    | When does the State anticipate FINAL capitation rates for the new contract period will be made available to successful bidders?   | DOM anticipates the Capitation Rates to be available between May and June, 2019.  |

|     |                                |        |  |   |
|-----|--------------------------------|--------|--|---|
| 36. | RFQ, Section 2.1, 5.3          | 27, 63 | <p>Given the extensive oversight that state and federal agencies perform over Medicaid Managed Care Plans and operations, and the federal requirements that all Medicaid Managed Care contracts include potential sanctions, it is extremely unlikely that any Offeror would qualify to bid as any entity with experience in contractual services providing the type of services described in the RFQ would likely have received sanctions over the course of their experience.</p> <p>If the intent of this requirement is to prevent Offerors with major violations. Therefore, to ensure the state has the opportunity to evaluate bids from the most qualified Offerors with the most relevant experience covering these populations and services, recommend removing this restriction or revising it to require "Offer has not been debarred by a state or Federal government within the last 10 years." The same recommendation goes for question 5 of 5.3 Transmittal Letter as well.</p> | <p>It was not DOM's intention to exclude an entity that has been sanctioned from submitting a qualification. Neither the federal regulations nor DOM's Contracts equate sanctions with LDs. The Transmittal Letter has been amended as follows: The Division requests what all, if any, sanctions Offeror's have received during their operational years in managed care. The Division further requests a statement from all Offerors that they abide by the prohibited affiliation with individuals debarred, suspended, or otherwise excluded from participation as a director, officer, partner, or person with ownership of more than 5%.</p> |
| 37. | RFQ, Section 5.7               | 68     | <p>Regarding Section 5.7 of the RFQ, does the required repetition of the statements/questions in the Methodology/Work Statement section count against specified page limits for each question/statement?</p>   | <p>The required repetition of the statements/questions in the Methodology/Work Statement section does not count against the specified page limits.</p>  |
| 38. | Appendix A, Section E, Table 9 | 181    | <p>In Table 9. Monetary Damages, can the Division please confirm that in the "Business Associate Agreement/Protected Health Information" section, "MississippiCAN" was incorrectly referenced and it should be replaced with "MississippiCHIP"?</p>  | <p>DOM confirms this is a typographical error.</p>  |
| 39. | Appendix A, Model Contract     | 57     | <p>Please confirm in which situation the Contractor should suspend a review for services vs. technically deny the services?</p>  | <p>Technical denial should occur when (1) the request does not conform to Federal and State laws and regulations, DOM policies and/or formal memorandums or is technically insufficient.</p> <p>Order of operation if additional information is needed by the Contractor to make a review determination: pend, suspend, (2) technically deny.</p> <p>Example: Contractor shall pend a service authorization review request if the Provider submits</p>  |

|  |  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
|  |  |  |  | <p>a request for authorization with incomplete, inadequate, or ambiguous information. The Contractor notifies the Provider that additional information is needed, the review is in pend status, and the provider has X number of days to submit the information.</p> <p>If the Provider does not submit the information in X number of days, the Contractor shall then suspend the authorization review request. The Contractor notifies the Provider that the information was not submitted timely, the review is now in suspend status, the Provider has Q number of days to submit the information, and upon Q day the service authorization review request will be technically denied for failure to submit additional information required to perform the review.</p> <p>NOTE: During suspend status, the Contractor shall afford the Provider the opportunity to submit additional information when the request for authorization has incomplete, inadequate, or ambiguous information.</p> <p>Contract Language:<br/>The Contractor shall pend a service authorization review request if the Provider submits a request for authorization with incomplete, inadequate, or ambiguous information. The Contractor shall seek clarification or request that the Provider submit all required information, including additional supporting clinical information as necessary. The Contractor shall initiate a process of placing a request on hold (pending) until additional information has been received.</p> <p>The Contractor shall suspend a review for services when the review has been pended because</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|

Date: September 28, 2018

|     |   |       |   |  |
|-----|---|-------|---|--|
|     |   |       |   | additional information is required and the requested information is not submitted by the due date. (2) If the requested information is not submitted by the due date, the Contractor must have a process for technically denying the services for failure to submit additional information required to perform the review.   |
| 40. | Appendix A, Model Contract                              | 58-59 | <p>Please provide definitions of the following terms as stated in Appendix A, Model Contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• service authorization review request</li> <li>• review determination</li> <li>• reconsideration of review outcome</li> <li>• reconsideration request</li> <li>• reconsideration determinations</li> <li>• Independent External Review</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><u>Service authorization review request</u></b> – utilization management service which must comply with Federal and State laws and regulations, DOM policies and formal memorandums</li> <li>• <b><u>Review determination</u></b> – outcome of a service authorization request</li> <li>• <b><u>Reconsideration of review outcome</u></b> – responsibility of the contractor to re-review the outcome of the service authorization</li> <li>• <b><u>Reconsideration request</u></b> – request for an alternate outcome to the review determination</li> <li>• <b><u>Reconsideration determinations</u></b> –outcome of the re-review</li> <li>• <b><u>Independent External Review</u></b> – a review of an Adverse Determination conducted by a vendor not under contract with the Contractor other than the Contractor responsible for the matter subject to external review. In accordance with 42 C.F.R. §457.1150</li> </ul> |
| 41. | 5.7 Methodology/ Work Statement (Unmarked); Question 42 | 76    | Printed copies of our standard provider contracts would total nearly 400 pages. Can the requested contracts be submitted electronically on the requisite CD? If so, will DOM confirm that the scoring evaluation of this attachment will be the same as if it was printed?  | Yes, please provide the information on a CD with each copy of your technical binder.   |



**RFQ #: 20180831**

**Date: September 28, 2018**

|     |  |    |   |  |
|-----|--|----|---|--|
| 42. | 5.7<br>Methodology/<br>Work<br>Statement<br>(Unmarked);<br>Question 45 | 76 | A printed listing of all providers will be nearly 900 pages long. Can this requested listing be submitted electronically on the requisite CD? If so, will DOM confirm that the scoring evaluation of this attachment will be the same as if it was printed? | Yes, please provide the information on a CD with each copy of your technical binder. |
|-----|--|----|---|--|