



Amendment #12 to RFQ 20211210: Responses Regarding Amendment 9

RFQ #: 20211210 / RFX#3150003991

Date: February 16, 2022

RFQ Name: Mississippi Division of Medicaid Coordinated Care

This document contains all questions submitted by Potential Offerors in response to Amendment #9: Clarification of Amendment 4 Responses, issued on February 10, 2022.

As stated in Amendment #9, Potential Offerors may not submit any further questions, other than those necessary to ensure that the Offeror has access to the SharePoint submission site. Those questions should be submitted to both Christopher.Shontell@medicaid.ms.gov and MSCAN_CHIP@medicaid.ms.gov. Those questions are handled on an ad hoc basis, and technical assistance given is not considered an amendment to this process

As additionally stated in Amendment #9, the Division has sole discretion as to whether a question submitted complies with the requirements stated in Amendment #9. The Division is not obligated to provide an answer to a question submitted if, in the Division's judgment, there is an answer that has already been given through Amendment #4 that addresses the submitted question. The Division may respond to such a question with the previously stated answer.

Receipt of Amendment 12 Acknowledged:

(Signature)

(Printed)

(Title)

(Company)

Question #	RFQ Question #	Page #	RFQ Question	DOM Response
1.	1	1	"The response to Question #1 in the RFQ-Specific Questions and Answers states the following: "The requirement to provide Work Plans and Schedules has been removed from the RFQ. (Corrected in Amendment 5.)"	"Work plan" in this instance refers to a summary of the Offeror's approach and philosophy in designing a coordinated care solution for the Division. It should not include information that would violate the rule against Identifying Information.
2.	3	1	We understand that there is no minimum file size for SharePoint submission, but is there a maximum file size?	There is not maximum file size.
3.	7	2	In Amendment 4, the State noted that "Reiteration of the question will count towards page limits." With this in mind, would the state consider allowing an Offeror to format question reiterations as 9-point black Times New Roman font?	Offerors may reiterate the question in 9 pt. black Times New Roman font.
4.	9	2	May graphics in the Marked/not blind section contain colors other than black?	The Offeror must use black, Times New Roman 12 pt. font for responses, and black, Times New Roman font no smaller than 9 pt. for any tables, graphics, charts, figures, footnotes, callouts, and headers/footers. The Offeror may otherwise use company images and company colors in the Marked/not blind responses.
5.	12	2	Are the State's Appendix forms that are in table format considered tables for purposes of font size? It appears that the State's Word version of the Appendix tables are in 11pt Times New Roman. May our responses in the State-provided Appendix tables be in 11pt Times New Roman?	The Offeror may submit responses in Word documents provided by the state in 11 pt. black Times New Roman font.
6.	10	3	In Amendment 4, the State noted that "Tables, graphics, charts, figures, footnotes, callouts, and headers/footers may contain font smaller than 12-point. The font may not be smaller than 9-point font. The font must be in black Times New Roman." Some graphics, such as screen-captures, contain content that	Yes. Ancillary materials (such as audits that are created by a third party and reports developed by the Offeror) submitted in response to marked/unblind portions can be submitted in the original format.

Question #	RFQ Question #	Page #	RFQ Question	DOM Response
			the Offeror is incapable of altering the appearance of due to previously-designed system interfaces. Does the requirement for text in graphics to be (at minimum) 9-point black Times New Roman font apply to screen-captures?	<u>ALL</u> materials submitted in response to the Technical/blind portion must be submitted in the prescribed format, even if this requires reformatting by the Offeror.
7.	13	3	In response to question #13, the Division indicated that items such as sample reports and templates have to follow RFP format requirements. Please confirm this does not apply to the voluminous audited financial statements which must be submitted in response to 4.3.2.6.	Ancillary materials (such as audits that are created by a third party and reports developed by the Offeror) submitted in response to marked/unblind portions can be submitted in the original format. <u>ALL</u> materials submitted in response to the Technical/blind portion must be submitted in the prescribed format, even if this requires reformatting by the Offeror.
8.	13	3	Regarding the Division's answer to question #13, please confirm that Offerors do not need to reformat documents provided by the Division (e.g., red font in amendments, 11pt font in appendices) and are to use the exact version the Division provided?	The Division does not intend for Offerors to reformat the Word documents provided. 11 pt. font is permissible in these documents. The Division does not intend for Offerors to reformat Amendments.
9.	13	3	<p>The response to Question #13 in the list of RFQ-Specific Questions and Answers states the following: “No. The Offeror should reformat the document to conform with RFQ requirements.”</p> <p>Requirement 4.3.2.6: Audited Financial Statements and Pro Forma Financial Template requires us to provided our audited financial statements for the past 3 years and documentation of available lines of credit. Given that these are formally audited statements or documents provided by a third party as documentation, we do not believe these items should be manipulated to fit the font restrictions. Can the State please confirm that there is an exception to this requirement for the audited financial statements and documentation of available lines of credit?</p> <p>In an effort to demonstrate our capabilities, Offeror’s may want to include non-identifying screenshots of reports and</p>	<p>Ancillary materials (such as audits that are created by a third party and reports developed by the Offeror) submitted in response to marked/unblind portions can be submitted in the original format.</p> <p><u>ALL</u> materials submitted in response to the Technical/blind portion must be submitted in the prescribed format, even if this requires reformatting by the Offeror.</p>

Question #	RFQ Question #	Page #	RFQ Question	DOM Response
			<p>dashboards in their responses (where applicable). It is difficult to conform to the font and size restrictions on screenshots. Is it generally acceptable for Offeror's to provide screenshots of dashboards and like capabilities as long as it's non-identifying? If so, would the State consider an exception to the font restrictions for these types of graphics?</p> <p>Would the State please consider releasing an addendum with more clarity on what documentation is required to be reformatted versus what can be submitted in its original format?</p>	
10.	13	3	<p>Please confirm that the requirement to reformat samples, templates, and appendices does not apply to items produced by a third-party, such as 4.1 Copy of Insurance License and 4.3.2.6 Audited Financial Statements.</p>	<p>Ancillary materials (such as audits that are created by a third party and reports developed by the Offeror) submitted in response to marked/unblind portions can be submitted in the original format.</p> <p><u>ALL</u> materials submitted in response to the Technical/blind portion must be submitted in the prescribed format, even if this requires reformatting by the Offeror.</p>
11.	13	4	<p>Section 1.2.3: Qualification Submission Requirements, Figure 1.2: Format of Qualification-- Font & Margins states that appendices, as well as samples and templates required of the qualification, must comply with font restrictions, which is black Times New Roman font size 12. Some requested items, such as sample reports, may output in a different font/font size than what is required by the State and cannot be changed. Will these documents be acceptable for submission?</p> <p>Do attachments such as Marketing Materials (requested in Section 4.2.2.1 E) require reformatting to meet the mandate of black Times New Roman font - size 12? These marketing materials have been designed using the offeror's existing brand guidelines that differ from the requested specifications and have been previously used for other medicaid programs.</p>	<p>Ancillary materials (such as audits that are created by a third party and reports developed by the Offeror) submitted in response to marked/unblind portions can be submitted in the original format.</p> <p><u>ALL</u> materials submitted in response to the Technical/blind portion must be submitted in the prescribed format, even if this requires reformatting by the Offeror.</p>

Question #	RFQ Question #	Page #	RFQ Question	DOM Response
12.	13	4	<p>Section 1.2.3: Qualification Submission Requirements, Figure 1.2: Format of Qualification-- Font & Margins states that appendices, as well as samples and templates required of the qualification, must comply with font restrictions, which is black Times New Roman font size 12. Some requested items, such as sample reports, may output in a different font/font size than what is required by the State and cannot be changed. Will these documents be acceptable for submission?</p> <p>Do attachments such as Member ID Cards (requested in Section 4.2.2.11) require reformatting to meet the mandate of black Times New Roman font - size 12? These ID cards have been designed using the offeror's existing brand guidelines that differ from the requested specifications and have been previously used for other medicaid programs.</p>	<p>Ancillary materials (such audits that are created by a third party and reports developed by the Offeror) submitted in response to marked/unblind portions can be submitted in the original format.</p> <p><u>ALL</u> materials submitted in response to the Technical/blind portion must be submitted in the prescribed format, even if this requires reformatting by the Offeror.</p>
13.	23	5	<p>In response to question #23 about identifying information, the Division states that "An Offeror, incumbent or otherwise, cannot name staff members, cite known in-state programs associated with that Offeror, identify local experience, or identify local partners and/or partnerships by name." Please clarify if any of the restrictions listed above are intended for the marked/unblinded sections. If restrictions do apply, please clarify if photos of staff or photos of locations in MS are also precluded from being in the marked/unblinded sections.</p>	<p>Section 1.2.3.3.2 of the RFQ states, "When a response requires description of a potential partnership with a community-based organization, the Offeror may name that organization and describe the contemplated partnership. The Offeror must not describe any current or prior relationship with the organization, and the Offeror must not reference any other line of business or any relationship at all that the Offeror or its owner, subcontractors, subsidiaries, or other related entities has had, will have, or desires to have with a named community-based organization, other than the partnership contemplated for this qualification."</p> <p>In response to the Technical/blind portion, the Offeror may discuss partnerships that the Offeror expects to utilize should it be selected in this procurement. The Offeror may not refer to current or past relationships with partners. The Offeror may not describe current relationships with partners. The Offeror may only speak in the future tense regarding partnerships.</p> <p>These restrictions do not apply to the marked/unblind sections.</p>

Question #	RFQ Question #	Page #	RFQ Question	DOM Response
14.	23	5	<p>In response to question #23 about identifying information, the Division states that "An Offeror, incumbent or otherwise, cannot name staff members, cite known in-state programs associated with that Offeror, identify local experience, or identify local partners and/or partnerships by name." Please clarify if bidders are restricted from naming other state agencies, such as the Mississippi Department of Child Protection Services, and national organizations, such as the National Alliance on Mental Illness, that may play a key role to address the question. Please also clarify if bidders are restricted from naming key provider partners that may play a role in the bidder's future solutions. If both are prohibited, please provide guidance on what details related to these types of partnerships will be allowed.</p>	<p>Section 1.2.3.3.2 of the RFQ states, "When a response requires description of a potential partnership with a community-based organization, the Offeror may name that organization and describe the contemplated partnership. The Offeror must not describe any current or prior relationship with the organization, and the Offeror must not reference any other line of business or any relationship at all that the Offeror or its owner, subcontractors, subsidiaries, or other related entities has had, will have, or desires to have with a named community-based organization, other than the partnership contemplated for this qualification."</p> <p>In response to the Technical/blind portion, the Offeror may discuss partnerships that the Offeror expects to utilize should it be selected in this procurement. The Offeror may not refer to current or past relationships with partners. The Offeror may not describe current relationships with partners. The Offeror may only speak in the future tense regarding partnerships.</p> <p>These restrictions do not apply to the marked/unblind sections.</p>
15.	23	5	<p>The response to Question #23 in the RFQ-Specific Questions and Answers states the following: "An Offeror, incumbent or otherwise, cannot name staff members, cite known in-state programs associated with that Offeror, identify local experience, or identify local partners and/or partnerships by name. An Offeror should name potential partnerships in 4.2.3.9, Potential Partnerships."</p> <p>Incumbents and non-incumbents can and should be contracting with Providers in the State in anticipation of managing these populations. Can the State please confirm Offeror's are allowed to cite numbers of contracted Providers demonstrating our ability to serve this program? Can the State please also confirm that Offeror's are allowed to mention significant Providers by name and indicate that we</p>	<p>Section 1.2.3.3.2 of the RFQ states, "When a response requires description of a potential partnership with a community-based organization, the Offeror may name that organization and describe the contemplated partnership. The Offeror must not describe any current or prior relationship with the organization, and the Offeror must not reference any other line of business or any relationship at all that the Offeror or its owner, subcontractors, subsidiaries, or other related entities has had, will have, or desires to have with a named community-based organization, other than the partnership contemplated for this qualification."</p> <p>In response to the Technical/blind portion, the Offeror may discuss partnerships that the Offeror expects to utilize should it be selected in this procurement. The Offeror may not refer to</p>

Question #	RFQ Question #	Page #	RFQ Question	DOM Response
			<p>have already established a contract or letter of intent with specific impactful Providers in the state?</p>	<p>current or past relationships with partners. The Offeror may not describe current relationships with partners. The Offeror may only speak in the future tense regarding partnerships.</p> <p>The Offeror should not cite the number of Providers it has already contracted with, nor should the Offeror supply the Division with contracts or Letters of Intent with providers.</p> <p>These restrictions do not apply to the marked/unblind sections.</p>
<p>16.</p>	<p>23</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Does this requirement mean that we cannot name any provider or vendor that we will work with in any respect? For example, “We will refer Members to UMMC’s CHAMP program for...”. Can we name UMMC in this example?</p>	<p>Section 1.2.3.3.2 of the RFQ states, "When a response requires description of a potential partnership with a community-based organization, the Offeror may name that organization and describe the contemplated partnership. The Offeror must not describe any current or prior relationship with the organization, and the Offeror must not reference any other line of business or any relationship at all that the Offeror or its owner, subcontractors, subsidiaries, or other related entities has had, will have, or desires to have with a named community-based organization, other than the partnership contemplated for this qualification."</p> <p>In response to the Technical/blind portion, the Offeror may discuss partnerships that the Offeror expects to utilize should it be selected in this procurement. The Offeror may not refer to current or past relationships with partners. The Offeror may not describe current relationships with partners. The Offeror may only speak in the future tense regarding partnerships.</p> <p>The Offeror should not cite the number of Providers it has already contracted with, nor should the Offeror supply the Division with contracts or Letters of Intent with providers.</p> <p>These restrictions do not apply to the marked/unblind sections.</p>

Question #	RFQ Question #	Page #	RFQ Question	DOM Response
17.	23	5	May we name State agencies that we intend to work with, such as the Department of Health and the Mississippi Department of Child Protective Services?	<p>Section 1.2.3.3.2 of the RFQ states, "When a response requires description of a potential partnership with a community-based organization, the Offeror may name that organization and describe the contemplated partnership. The Offeror must not describe any current or prior relationship with the organization, and the Offeror must not reference any other line of business or any relationship at all that the Offeror or its owner, subcontractors, subsidiaries, or other related entities has had, will have, or desires to have with a named community-based organization, other than the partnership contemplated for this qualification."</p> <p>In response to the Technical/blind portion, the Offeror may discuss partnerships that the Offeror expects to utilize should it be selected in this procurement. The Offeror may not refer to current or past relationships with partners. The Offeror may not describe current relationships with partners. The Offeror may only speak in the future tense regarding partnerships.</p> <p>These restrictions do not apply to the marked/unblind sections.</p>
18.	23	5	May we name Providers whom we intend to contract with as part of our Provider network?	<p>Section 1.2.3.3.2 of the RFQ states, "When a response requires description of a potential partnership with a community-based organization, the Offeror may name that organization and describe the contemplated partnership. The Offeror must not describe any current or prior relationship with the organization, and the Offeror must not reference any other line of business or any relationship at all that the Offeror or its owner, subcontractors, subsidiaries, or other related entities has had, will have, or desires to have with a named community-based organization, other than the partnership contemplated for this qualification."</p> <p>In response to the Technical/blind portion, the Offeror may discuss partnerships that the Offeror expects to utilize should it be selected in this procurement. The Offeror may not refer to</p>

Question #	RFQ Question #	Page #	RFQ Question	DOM Response
				<p>current or past relationships with partners. The Offeror may not describe current relationships with partners. The Offeror may only speak in the future tense regarding partnerships.</p> <p>The Offeror should not cite the number of Providers it has already contracted with, nor should the Offeror supply the Division with contracts or Letters of Intent with providers.</p> <p>These restrictions do not apply to the marked/unblind sections.</p>
19.	23	5	<p>May we name entities that we intend to include as part of a stakeholder engagement process (e.g., to develop the PCMH proposal)?</p>	<p>The RFQ states, "When a response requires description of a potential partnership with a community-based organization, the Offeror may name that organization and describe the contemplated partnership. The Offeror must not describe any current or prior relationship with the organization, and the Offeror must not reference any other line of business or any relationship at all that the Offeror or its owner, subcontractors, subsidiaries, or other related entities has had, will have, or desires to have with a named community-based organization, other than the partnership contemplated for this qualification."</p> <p>In response to the Technical/blind portion, the Offeror may discuss partnerships that the Offeror expects to utilize should it be selected in this procurement. The Offeror may not refer to current or past relationships with partners. The Offeror may not describe current relationships with partners. The Offeror may only speak in the future tense regarding partnerships.</p> <p>The Offeror should not cite the number of Providers it has already contracted with, nor should the Offeror supply the Division with contracts or Letters of Intent with providers.</p> <p>These restrictions do not apply to the marked/unblind sections.</p>

Question #	RFQ Question #	Page #	RFQ Question	DOM Response
20.	23	5	To further clarify DOMs response to question #23, can the Offeror identify partnerships (past or future) by category? For example, Community Action Agency, FQHC, Academic Institution etc.?	<p>The RFQ states, "When a response requires description of a potential partnership with a community-based organization, the Offeror may name that organization and describe the contemplated partnership. The Offeror must not describe any current or prior relationship with the organization, and the Offeror must not reference any other line of business or any relationship at all that the Offeror or its owner, subcontractors, subsidiaries, or other related entities has had, will have, or desires to have with a named community-based organization, other than the partnership contemplated for this qualification."</p> <p>In response to the Technical/blind portion, the Offeror may discuss partnerships that the Offeror expects to utilize should it be selected in this procurement. The Offeror may not refer to current or past relationships with partners. The Offeror may not describe current relationships with partners. The Offeror may only speak in the future tense regarding partnerships.</p> <p>The Offeror should not cite the number of Providers it has already contracted with, nor should the Offeror supply the Division with contracts or Letters of Intent with providers.</p> <p>These restrictions do not apply to the marked/unblind sections.</p>
21.	53	11	Can DOM provide additional pages for the HRS and CHA in order to allow Offerors to include the full sample documents as requested?	The page limit of five (5) pages each for responses to 4.2.2.3.B.1. and 4.2.2.3.B.2. are removed so that Offerors may supply complete samples for the HRS and CHA.
22.	55	12	In order to accurately prepare our Pro Forma in response to 4.3.2.5 and organizational charts and FTE counts in response to 4.3.3, can DOM provide additional membership assumptions about the assumed enrollment of 125,000? We will need to know the percentage of Members expected to be categorized as medium- and high-risk (i.e. how many foster children, pregnant women, persons with SED/SMI etc.) in order to accurately estimate how many care management FTEs we will need to maintain a 40:1 ratio.	The Division has provided membership months per rate cell for SFYs 2019 – 2021 at the end of this document to assist Offerors in answering this question. The Offeror may provide additional assumptions made in the Assumptions tab of the template.

Question #	RFQ Question #	Page #	RFQ Question	DOM Response
23.	60, 61	14	In Amendment 4, in response to questions #60 and #61 which asked about a pharmacy data file, the Division responded "assume that a winning Contractor will have access to real-time pharmacy claim information for all of its Members." Can the Division please confirm that in addition to being able to view claims through a web portal application, Contractors will also be able to download the historical and real-time pharmacy claims data file?	The Offeror may assume that they will have that information as well for the purposes of preparing its qualification.
24.	64	14	For ease of review, would the Division prefer that we keep the system diagram in the narrative if the additional space of the appendix granted is not needed?	The Division has no preference. This is at the discretion of the Offeror.
25.	82	18	Amendment 4, Question 82 specifies that the PIP forms are to be limited to 1 page each. Does this same limit apply to the forms for other questions in section 4.2.3, such as Health Literacy Campaigns, VABs, and Potential Partnerships?	Yes.
26.	82-84	18	Should the CCOs submit PIP topics based on the 4 required topics identified by the state for MississippiCAN and CHIP and/or the 4 new proposed topics (Improving Diabetes Through the Lens of Health Equity, Reducing Infant Mortality among Black women living in the Mississippi Delta Region, A Focus on EPSDT: Increase Child and Adolescent Well-Care Visits, Improving Follow-Up Care for Children and Adolescents with Mental Health Providers)	Topics of PIPs are at the discretion of the Offeror.
27.	95	22	In the Division's response to the question #95 regarding the naming of staff in organizational charts in Section 4.3.3.1, the Division states that the "The Offeror is not allowed to list the name of staff in its response." Please clarify if this means that staff names as well as any staff photos should be removed in all other marked/un-blinded sections (including cover pages and tabs) as well. If all names should be removed from all marked/un-blinded sections, please clarify if previous work experience, including roles held in MS and relevant	The Division is seeking information about what the Offeror will require for key positions if the Offeror is chosen. The Offeror is not allowed to list the name of staff in its response. Staff pictures should not be included. Previous work experience and staff education and training should not be submitted. Requirements for work experience, education, training, and special certifications should be submitted.

Question #	RFQ Question #	Page #	RFQ Question	DOM Response
			educational degrees or certifications, would be allowed to describe the qualifications of current or proposed staff.	
28.	96	23	Please clarify what is meant by "sufficient support staff to conduct daily business in an orderly manner". What types of job descriptions would DOM like to see?	The Division expects the Offeror to make its own determination regarding what sufficient support staff would be needed for daily business based on its knowledge of its own needs for operation.
29.	116	26	The Division's response regarding the inclusion of testimonial or quotes from community-based organizations in the Technical Qualifications, question #116, is "Quotes may not be included in the Offeror's qualification." Please clarify if this means that testimonial or quotes from community-based organizations should be removed in marked/un-blinded sections (including cover pages and tabs) as well.	Quotes may appear in the marked/unblind submissions.
30.	116	26	Our interpretation of the State's response to this question is that quotes cannot be used in the blind/unmarked Technical Qualifications portion of our submission, but that they may be included in the marked sections of our response (e.g., 4.3). Is our interpretation correct?	Quotes may appear in the marked/unblind submissions.
31.	117	26	Amendment 4, Question 117 removes the work plan requirements from sections 4.2.2.1 – 4.2.2.11. Does the Division intend to also remove the "work plan" portion of section 4.2.1, Executive Summary?	"Work plan" in this instance refers to the Offeror's approach and philosophy in designing a coordinated care solution for the Division. It should not include information that would violate the rule against Identifying Information.

[REST OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

Additional Information in response to Question # 22			
Membership Months by Rate Cell			
SFY 2019 to SFY 2021			
Rate Cell	SFY 2019	SFY 2020	SFY 2021
Non-Newborn SSI / Disabled	766,450	764,512	756,254
Breast and Cervical Cancer	1,150	1,242	1,740
MA Adult	493,333	490,054	575,590
Pregnant Women	136,544	136,424	128,526
SSI / Disabled Newborn	6,432	6,144	5,314
Non-SSI Newborns 0 to 2 Months	75,383	74,514	70,999
Non-SSI Newborns 3 to 12 Months	256,516	251,641	245,587
Foster Care	78,305	82,414	81,077
MYPAC	7,007	8,545	9,909
MA Children	3,066,013	3,053,244	3,440,812
Quasi-CHIP	326,868	339,618	368,721
CHIP	559,365	563,395	577,612

This table provides the total member months for each of the twelve months periods of the state fiscal years ended 2019, 2020 and 2021.

[END OF DOCUMENT]