

HSD Responses to Questions Submitted on RFP #18-630-800-0005

External Quality Review Organization (EQRO)

Section II: Conditions Governing the Procurement				
Item	Title	Page	Offeror Question	HSD/MAD Response
1.	Explanation of Events: #1, Issuance of RFP	7	The link given for the RFP and amendments (http://www.hsd.state.nm.us/Centennial_Care-RFP.aspx) leads to a procurement library for the MCO RFP, and the EQRO RFP is not within the library. Is there a different designated location for the EQRO RFP and its amendments, will there be one, or will it be included at the given link in the future?	HSD verified the link and the information is located as stated in the RFP. Please follow this path: Click on link, 1. select Looking for Information, 2. Select General Information, 3. Select Requests for Proposals (RFPs), 4. Select open RFPs.
2.	Explanation of Events: #3 Pre-Proposal Conference	8	The RFP states that a public log will be kept of the names of potential Offerors that attend the pre-proposal conference. Where and when will that log be made available?	Available on NM HSD website. http://www.hsd.state.nm.us/Centennial_Care-RFP.aspx
3.	Explanation of Events: #6 Submission of Proposal	9	Can you please clarify the apparent contradiction seen on page 9 verses page 21 (Section II. Response Format and Organization, Note at End of Section whether certain electronic submissions of proposal are allow?	See amendment 2.
4.	Explanation of Events: #8 Selection of Finalists	9	How will the State notify vendors of award, e.g. email notification, posting on procurement website, etc.? If the State will notify vendors directly, will all vendors be notified or only the selected vendor?	Written notification. All vendors will be notified.
5.	General Requirements: #27 Use of electronic versions of RFP.	15	The RFP and amendments are not located at the linked web page. Is there an official web page for the RFP and its amendments?	See Question #1 and amendment 2. http://www.hsd.state.nm.us/Centennial_Care-RFP.aspx
6.	General Requirements: #28 New Mexico	15	Q1: The RFP provides a directive that Offerors of a particular size are to provide health coverage to their employees and advise them	R1: Yes

	Employees Health Coverage		of New Mexico State healthcare coverage programs. Does this requirement apply to out-of state Offerors? Q2: Please confirm requirement 28.c. is applicable only if the awarded contractor has employees in New Mexico and similar to Section C.30, Pay Equity Reporting Requirements, does not apply to out-of-state contractors with no facilities and no employees working in New Mexico.	R2: Yes
Section III: Response Format and Organization				
Item	Title	Page	Offeror Question	HSD/MAD Response
7.	B: Number of Copies	19	Q1: Is a spreadsheet file required as part of the digital media of the Cost Proposal? Q2: The RFP requires a compact disk (CD) of the Technical Proposal and a compact disk (CD) of the Cost Proposal. Is the State willing to accept a searchable PDF version of these documents?	R1: No R2: No
8.	C: Confidential/Proprietary Materials	19	Please clarify this requirement “a file of the response(s) with only the confidential/proprietary information from that response.” Is it your intention to have the Offeror’s pull fragments and pieces from the response to submit in this file, as this is what most of the marked/redacted information will be?	Yes
9.	D: Proposal Format	19	Are appendices allowed for resumes, organization certification, etc.?	R1: Yes
10.	D: Proposal Format, Proposal Content and Organization: Technical Proposal (Binder 1)	19	Q1: Is there a page limit for the Proposal Summary? Q2: Is there a page limit for Other Supporting Material?	R1: No R2: No

			Q3: Is the 25- page limit referenced in Section IV applicable for item A only (Detailed Scope of Work- Deliverables, pages 23-27) or for Items A through F (pages 23-32)?	R3: The 25-page limit is applicable to Section IV items A through F (pages 12-32).
11.	D: Proposal Content and Organization: Cost Proposal (Binder 2),	20	What other documents or information is required in the Cost Proposal in addition to the completed cost response form?	All discussion of proposed costs, rates or expenses should occur on the cost proposal form.
12.	D: Proposal Content and Organization: Letter of Transmittal	20	Please confirm the Letter of Transmittal Form is to be provided in both the Technical Proposal, section 1, and Cost Proposal, section 5.	The letter of Transmittal Form is to be provided with the Technical Proposal Section and Cost Proposal.
13.	D: Note at End of Section	21	Q1: Please Clarify whether the state is providing an “either-or” option for submitting proposal documents. The Offeror need submit only a single electronic copy of each binder of the single proposal, Or is the state asking for a single electronic copy submitted to the State Purchasing electronic submission system and, in addition to that electronic copy, also submit (as described on page 19) the printed Binder 1, Binder 2, a Technical Proposal CD and a Cost Proposal CD? Q2: Is this statement referring to an alternative to submission of hard copy binders? I.e., could an Offeror submit a proposal to this portal instead of delivering hard copy binders? Q3: If the bidder has the option of just sending the proposal via the State Purchasing’s electronic submission portal, does the state have a preference in the manner of proposal submission, paper vs electronic?	R1: Refer to amendment 2, Refer to Section III, Response Format and Organization,
Section VI: Specification				
Item	Title	Page	Offeror Question	HSD/MAD Response

14.	Specifications: A detailed Scope of Work, Deliverables, 1. Compliance review	23	<p>Q1: What is the expected frequency for all items in Subpart D to be completed?</p> <p>Q2: Can the state confirm that a full EQRO compliance review is conducted annually versus tri-annually? If a tri-annual comprehensive review is required can the State provide in which year the review would occur and for which MCOs?</p>	<p>R1: Annually</p> <p>R1: A comprehensive Compliance Review will be conducted annually for each MCO.</p>
15.	Specifications: A. Detailed Scope of Work, Deliverables, 1. Compliance Review	23	<p>Q1: How does HSD define “peer review”?</p> <p>Q2: Most of the deliverables in this section require a peer-reviewed final written report. Please provide HSD/MAD’s requirements for a “peer reviewed” report.</p> <p>Q3: Deliverables 1-6, the RFP states that the EQRO will deliver peer reviewed final written reports. Please clarify HSD/MAD’s expectations for peer review in this context. Is this to be internally conducted peer review, and what elements of the report should be reviewed? (e.g. grammar, format, etc.)?</p> <p>Q4: What is an example of a corrective action step from a previous compliance review?</p>	<p>R1: See amendment 2</p> <p>R2: As above</p> <p>R3: As above</p> <p>R4: Not available as this is a new requirement</p>
16.	Specifications: A. Detailed Scope of Work Deliverables, 2. Validation of Performance Measures	23 & 24	<p>Q1: What is the frequency of the ISCA?</p> <p>Q2: Is the ISCA to be performed every fiscal year?</p> <p>Q3: Can the state confirm that the ISCA is conducted on a tri-ennial basis? In which year was the last ISCA conducted?</p>	<p>R1: The ISCA should be completed annually in conjunction with the Performance Measure Validation project.</p> <p>R2: Yes</p> <p>R3: See R1 and R2 above. The last ISCA was conducted in 2016.</p>

			<p>Q4: Please confirm how many performance measures must be validated as part of the performance measure validation activity.</p> <p>Q5: Are the Performance Measures to be validated HEDIS measures, Adult and /or Child Core Set measures, or State-defined measures?</p> <p>Q6: How many validated Performance Measures are expected to be reported using the hybrid methodology?</p> <p>Q7: Can the state confirm the number of PMs that must be validated annually for each MCO? Of the number of PMs that must be validated, can the state indicate how many use hybrid versus administrative data collected?</p> <p>Q8: How many of the Performance Measures that require validation follow HEDIS specifications?</p> <p>Q9: Do the MCOs contract with a licensed HEDIS audited organization to conduct an audit of their HEDIS measure reporting?</p>	<p>R4: There are 9 (nine) Performances Measures Please refer to Centennial Care 2.0 Managed Care Contract. Section 4.12.8.2 http://www.hsd.state.nm.us/Centennial_Care</p> <p>R5: HEDIS</p> <p>R6: Validation methodology should align with the methodology reported by measure on each MCOs annual audited HEDIS reports.</p> <p>R7: See R3 and R5 above</p> <p>R8: All 9 (nine) of the Performance Measures follow HEDIS specification.</p> <p>R9: Unknown if all do</p>
17.	Specifications: A. Detailed Scope of Work, Deliverables, 3. Validation of Performance Improvement Projects	24	<p>Q1: How many PIPs are required for validation per MCO:</p> <p>Q2: How many PIPs per MCO will require annual validation?</p>	<p>R1: There are 5 (five) Performance Improvements to be validated per MCO. Please refer to Centennial Care 2.0 Managed Care Contract. Section 4.12.4.10 http://www.hsd.state.nm.us/Centennial_Care</p> <p>R2: See R1.</p>

18.	Specifications: A, Detailed Scope of Work, Deliverables, 4. Validation of Network Adequacy	24-25	<p>Q1: The RFP states that annual validation activities must adhere to the protocols upon CMS development. Please confirm the EQRO will be expected to start the activities using the HSD/MAD standards in advance of the release of the CMS protocol.</p> <p>Q2: Can the State provide the current network adequacy requirements?</p> <p>Q3: What are HSD/MAD’s anticipated sources of data for the evaluation?</p> <p>Q4: Will the MCOs submit provider data directly to the EQRO, or will data be provided by HSD/MAD or another vendor?</p> <p>Q5: Please describe the frequency and format/layout (e.g., 274 files) of data submitted to the EQRO.Q5: Is the EQRO expected to produce results for each MCO or any other geographic level (e.g., county, region)? If so, which levels?</p> <p>Q6: Please confirm the following data items are available in the provider data or confirm the EQRO will have to collect them independent of the data files:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator for accepting new patients • Available languages at the provider’s office • Physical accessibility features of the provider’s office • Availability of triage lines or screening systems 	<p>R1: Yes the EQRO will be expected to start the Validation of Network Adequacy in advance of the release of the CMS protocol. Please refer to Centennial Care 2.0 Managed Care Contract. Section 4.8 Provider Network http://www.hsd.state.nm.us/Centennial_Care</p> <p>R2: Please refer to CFR cited for in this section and to the Centennial Care 2.0 Managed Care Contract. Section 4.8 Provider Network http://www.hsd.state.nm.us/Centennial_Care</p> <p>R3: Submissions by the MCO of Policy and Procedures and possibly documents supporting adherence to internal Policy and Procedures.</p> <p>R4: The data should be provided by the MCOs directly to the EQRO.</p> <p>R5: The EQRO will determine the frequency, format/layout of data to be delivered by the MCO. The EQRO will produce results for each MCO. Charles?</p> <p>R6: The EQRO will need to collect them independent of the data files.</p>
-----	--	-------	---	--

			<p>Q7: Will the EQRO deliver one report per MCO or one aggregate report for the Network Adequacy task?</p> <p>Q8: Does the State anticipate the need for medical chart review as a component of the Encounter Data Validation? If yes do you have a defined sampling methodology that can be shared?</p>	<p>R7: The EQRO will be required to deliver one report per MCO</p> <p>R8: Yes HSD/MAD would anticipate a medical chart review. No sampling methodology is available at this time.</p>
19.	Specifications: A. Detailed Scope of Work, Deliverables, 5. Validation of Encounter Data	26	<p>Q1: Will the EQRO deliver one report per MCO or one aggregate report for the Encounter Data Validation Task?</p> <p>Q2: Will the EQRO receive claims/encounter data from the MCOs or with the EQRO also receive files from the State?</p> <p>Q3: What will be the calendar year of review for the Validation of encounter data?</p> <p>Q4: What are HSD/MAD's expectations regarding the frequency of the encounter data validation activity? Based on the cost response form in Appendix D, it appears the encounter data validation activity is required for FY19 only. Please confirm.</p> <p>Q5: Will MCOs submit encounter data directly to the EQRO, or will data for the MCOs, and HSD/MAD be provided by HSD/MAD? Please describe the frequency, format/layout, approximate total volume of claims and encounters, and type of data (for example, claims/encounters, member data, provider data) submitted to the EQRO.</p>	<p>R1: The EQRO should be prepared to deliver one aggregated report (summary of activities and findings) and one report per MCO, (detailed). See amendment 2</p> <p>R2: The EQRO will receive claims/encounter data from both MCOs and State.</p> <p>R3: The EQRO will be required to conduct an Encounter Data Validation in CY 2021 of CY2020 encounter data. See amendment 2.</p> <p>R4: Refer to R3 above.</p> <p>R5: The MCO will submit encounter data directly to the EQRO. The frequency, format/layout, will be determined by the EQRO as part of the project development.</p>

			<p>Q6: Does HSD/MAD anticipate the need for medical record review as an additional verification of encounter data? If so please identify any expectations surrounding sampling parameters (e.g., confidence level, margin of error) and anticipated sub-strata.</p>	<p>R6: Yes HSD/MAD does anticipate the need for medical record review. To be determined and dependent on completeness of encounter data.</p>
20.	Specification: A. Detailed Scope of Work, Deliverables, 7. Nursing Facility Level of Care (NF LOC)	27	<p>Q1: Please provide a sample monthly report of NF LOC activities.</p> <p>Q2: Please provide an expected sample size for the NF LOC activities</p> <p>Q3: Are the NF LOC activities required to be conducted on site?</p> <p>Q4: On average, how many NF LOC determination are made per year and/or per month per MCO?</p> <p>Q5: Does HSD/MAD have an expected number of sample cases to be selected per MCO per month?</p> <p>Q6: In addition to approved and denied NF LOC determinations, are there any additional stratifications the vendor should account for in its sampling methodology (e.g., high-NF, low-NF)?</p> <p>Q7: Where will the EQRO obtain the NF LOC determination data necessary for sampling; from the MCOs, from the HSD/MAD, or via a direct connection to HSD/MAD's data systems?</p>	<p>R1: See amendment 2.</p> <p>R2: Estimated sampling population will be 1,000 NF LOC determinations per calendar year. (Approximately 40% should be facility based and 60% should be Home and Community Based Services.)</p> <p>R3: NF LOC activities are not required to be conducted on site.</p> <p>R4: See R2 above</p> <p>R5: See R2 above (estimated to be 84 per month)</p> <p>R6: The review should account for additional elements including; Timeliness of determinations, Accuracy of determinations, Reason for denials, Medical Director Review when applicable, Policy and Procedure review (annual review)</p> <p>R7: Directly from the each MCO.</p>

			<p>Q15: For NF LOC determinations that were denied, does a Physician attest to this and subsequently testify in a Fair Hearing?</p>	<p>R15: The MCO is required to have a Medical director review denials, and would testify if requested to do so during a Fair Hearing.</p>
21.	Specifications: A. Detailed Scope of Work, Deliverables 8. Communications and Meetings	27-28	<p>Q1: We believe there is a typo and this section should be numbered 8.</p> <p>Q2: Is this section (1. Communications and Meetings) part of the deliverables section and thus subject to the 25-page limit?</p> <p>Q3: What is the anticipated frequency of on-site meetings with HSD/MAD vs. telephone or video conferences?</p>	<p>R1: Yes, this should be 8, not 1. Please see amendment 2.</p> <p>R2: Yes</p> <p>R3: At a minimum the EQRO should plan to attend quarterly on-site meetings.</p>
22.	Specifications: B. Mandatory Specifications	28- 29	<p>Q1: Would the State consider an EQRO without CMS certification as a QIO (-like) entity, if the EQRO maintained a subcontractor relationship with a QIO (-like) entity to perform the non-EQRO mandated/optional activities?</p> <p>Q2: Please confirm the high-level work plan includes only milestone activities and not all tasks within the activity.</p>	<p>R1: No</p> <p>R2: HSD/MAD confirms the high-level work plan should consist of only milestone activities.</p>
23.	Specifications: C. Organizational Experience	29	<p>Q1: Will the State accept both EQRO and EQRO-like experience as part of the Organizational Experience?</p> <p>Q2: What is HSD expecting from the statement of work?</p> <p>Q3: What type of documentation and detail are expected in response to the statement of work?</p> <p>Q4: Can HSD/MAD please clarify the difference between the “project description” of the work for each agency and the “statement of work completed” on all projects?</p>	<p>R1: Yes</p> <p>R2: Refer to #3 Section for details</p> <p>R3: To be determined by the Offeror.</p> <p>R4: Project description should address projects outside of the EQR scope. Statement of work should detail projects within the EQR scope.</p>

			<p>Q5: Please confirm HSD/MAD will accept an attestation that the Offeror met all deliverable timelines.</p> <p>Q6: Does HSD expect Offeror will include all prior government experience within the past five (5) years, including federal, state (non-EQRO), and EQRO related contracts in this section?</p>	<p>R5: Yes HSD/MAD will accept an attestation</p> <p>R6: Yes if applicable</p>
24.	Specifications: D Organizational References	30	<p>Q1: Please confirm that the Reference Questionnaire is due on or before April 5th.</p>	<p>R1: See amendment 2</p>
25.	Specifications: F. Business Specifications,	31	<p>Q1: Please clarify the content and organization of the Cost Proposal (Binder 2). In section III. D. 1 p. 20 there are only 2 requirements for the Cost Proposal binder, yet on p. 31 there are requirements for IV. F. 1-8 that appear to be a part of the Cost or Business Specification.</p> <p>Q2: Please confirm responses to the following items are to be included in the Cost Proposal (binder 1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost • Resident Business or Residential Veterans Preference • Financial Stability • Pay Equity Reporting <p>Should the Offeror document this justification and evidence of need in the Technical or Cost Proposal?</p> <p>Q3: Please provide an example of the level of detail expected for the documentation of justification and evidence of need?</p> <p>Q4: Is it permissible to submit proof of financial stability in the Technical Proposal (Binder 1)</p>	<p>R1: The Cost Proposal (binder 1) should contain only Appendix D and a letter of Transmittal. All other documents listed in section F. should be submitted with the Technical Proposal</p> <p>R2: See R1 above</p> <p>R3: Minimal detail required refer to the specifications in RFP for each element.</p> <p>R4: Yes</p>

			<p>Q5: If the Financial Stability response is included in the Technical Proposal, can the audited financial statements be provided in Section 9</p> <p>Q6: If an Offeror is a privately held for-profit company and does not have a 10K, is it required to submit other documentations besides audited financial statements?</p> <p>Q6: Is the resident business preference applicable to this proposal?</p> <p>Q7: If the resident business preference is applicable to this proposal, how is the business preference calculated and applied to the evaluation point summary?</p> <p>Q8: Is the state's expectations that there be a budget narrative in each section of the response for each deliverable?</p>	<p>R5: Yes</p> <p>R6: See RFP Section F #3, page 31.</p> <p>R6: No</p> <p>R7: N/A</p> <p>R8: Not for this section. Narrative should be contained in documentation supporting cost proposal.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

Section V: Evaluation

Item	Title	Page	Offeror Question	HSD/MAD Response
26.	Evaluation: General Question	32	Who are the members of the evaluation committee?	The members of the Evaluation Committee is confidential. The names will be released once the contract is awarded.
27.	Evaluation Factors B:	35	<p>Q1: This item for Demonstrate Policy is listed twice-once in item 7. Of this section, which references work plans for EQRO activities and again in item 8. Does this item belong in item 7 since Demonstrate Policy is not a CMS EQR activity?</p> <p>Q2: Please clarify how the scores for Organizational References will be affected if the reference Questionnaires are not received or are incomplete.</p> <p>Q3: How will the topics from the questionnaire be tied to the rows in the scoring table?</p>	<p>R1: See amendment 2</p> <p>R2: Evaluation methodology is determined by evaluation committee members which is not detailed or discussed in the RFP.</p> <p>R3: See R1 above</p>

			<p>Q4: How will the rating from the three questionnaires be mapped to scores in the scoring table?</p>	<p>R4: See R1 above</p>
28.	Appendix C, Sample Contract, 19	Page 45 Of Appendix C.	<p>Q1: Will the independent audit in accordance with 2 CFR 200 change to an independent financial audit for a for-profit company?</p> <p>Q2: Will the requirement for a single audit be removed for a for-profit company?</p> <p>Q3: Will the approved latter rates from CMS meet the requirement for a single audit for a for-profit company?</p> <p>Q4: We supply CMS with an incurred cost submission annually. There is a provision that allow other contractors to request their contracts be reviewed during the same audit, and then we can release the results of that portion of the audit to the client. Will this be acceptable in place of the single audit for a for-profit company?</p>	<p>R1: Yes</p> <p>R2: No</p> <p>R3: No</p> <p>R4: No</p>
29.	Appendix D: Cost Response Form		<p>Q1: Is it permissible to edit the cost response form for formatting purposes?</p> <p>Q2: Should the quantity noted in the example form be adjusted based on the additional information provided in response to the questions above? If there are 3 PIPs to be validated is the Quantity changed to three, but cost per Milestone is for 1 PIP and the total cost is the product of the Quantity x Cost per Milestone?</p>	<p>R1: Yes</p> <p>R2: Quantity refers to the number of projects completed for each EQR activity for each review year. For example: The EQRO will conduct one (1) PIPs validation per year, this validation is inclusive of all contracted MCOs and all PIPs. The EQRO determines the project Milestones. The purpose of the Milestones is to allow the EQRO to submit invoices upon completion of each project Milestone. The Cost per Milestone is determined by the EQRO and should be based on the number of Milestones identified in the work plan for each project. The total cost per Project</p>

			<p>Q3: What does “Quantity” represent? Does it represent one MCO?</p> <p>Q4: Explain Milestone?</p> <p>Q5: Can the state provide additional direction on how the Cost Response Form should be completed?</p> <p>Q6: Can the state confirm that the Encounter Data Validation activity will only be performed in FY19?</p>	<p>per year will be determined by adding up the costs of each Milestone.</p> <p>R3: see R2 above</p> <p>R4: See R2 above</p> <p>R5: See R2 above</p> <p>R6: The Encounter Data Validation activity will be performed once during this contract. HSD/MAD has determined the Validation will occur in FY2019.</p>
30.	Appendix F: Letter of Transmittal		<p>Q1: The signature year on the Letter of Transmittal Form is pre-printed with the year 2014. Is it permissible to edit this electronically?</p> <p>Q2: It is permissible to edit the Letter of Transmittal Form for formatting purposes?</p>	<p>R1: Yes.</p> <p>R2: Yes</p>
31.	Appendix G: Reference Questionnaire		Is it permissible to edit the Reference Questionnaire for formatting purposes and to remove the RFP page number?	Yes.
32.	General Question		Are progress payments allowed? For example, will we be able to bill monthly our costs?	Please refer to item 29: Appendix D: Cost Response Form. Q2/R2.