

2022 Families and Children Procurement Questions and Answers (Q&A)

New question with DHS response:

1. **Question:** We would like to request a list of all entities that responded to the 2022 7-County Metro Families and Children RFP that closed on Friday, March 19. As you stated in Section 5.1.2 of the 2022 7-County Metro Families and Children Request for Proposal (RFP) states “During the evaluation process until the 2022 contracts are executed, all information concerning the Proposals submitted, except for the name of the Responder(s), will remain non-public and will not be disclosed to anyone whose official duties do not require such knowledge.”

DHS Response: Per your request, the names of the 2022 7-County Metro Families and Children Responders are listed provided below.

Name of Responder
HMO Minnesota d/b/a Blue Plus
HealthPartners
Hennepin Health
Medica Health Plans
UCare
UnitedHealthcare of Illinois, Inc

Previous Questions with DHS Responses:

1. **Question:** The DHS response in the RFP QA document for element #11 appears to be for the Geographic Access Maps Specifications and not the Provider Network Listing. How should responders populate Column K in the Network County List for Appendix E? Do you want only the seven county codes that this RFP is for or all county codes in the responder’s current service area? Are you able to clarify if DHS want the seven county codes (002; 010; 019; 027; 062; 070; 082) specific to the RFP in element #11 or is DHS asking for the seven county codes, plus any additional county codes in the responders current service area?

DHS Response: Column K is asking for a list of the counties included in the network’s service area (the counties in which the network is marketed to enrollees). Accordingly, Responders’ entries for Column K should be the same for all rows.

Column AM, “Provider County” should include the county location of a given provider. Responders should include all providers included in a network who are available to enrollees, regardless of whether those providers are located in the proposed service area. In other words, entries in Column AM could include any of the 88 county codes.

For example, for a Hennepin County (027) member who can access services through XYZ Provider in St. Louis County (069), the provider listing should be listed as follows:

- Column K should read 002; 010; 019; 027; 062; 070; 082 (for all rows)
- Column AM should read 069

2. **Question:** An additional clarifying question regarding the DHS response to the question below submitted for the January 25 Responders' conference:

1.3 Background

Question: If there is a new market entrant in a county where a current MCO will remain, how will DHS distribute enrollment to the new entrant in that county?

DHS Response: Annual health plan selection (AHPS) allows members to select a new entrant for enrollment effective the first of the New Year. Membership is generally distributed via member selection throughout the year and rotating the assignment of the default plan. The structure for member default will be determined as part of the contract awards.

Follow-up question: If a plan wishes to submit information about a proposed structure for member default, how should this proposal be included in the response? Can it be referenced in the submission letter or Executive Summary with the proposal itself included as an addendum or appendix to the response?

DHS Response: The structure for member default will be finalized as part of contract negotiations. Per section 3.2.6 Exceptions to Model Contract and RFP Terms, Responders should indicate if they are not willing to be the sole contractor awarded default enrollment in any specific county and provide rationale for requesting an exception.

3. **Question:** We have noted the great number of embedded documents (not links to DHS forms, but documents within the RFP document) found within this RFP. With challenges opening some of these documents, HealthPartners is requesting that DHS please post all RFP-related documentation separately, or outside of the document.

DHS Response: DHS posted all RFP embedded documents to the Open Grants, RFP, and RFIs Website at <https://mn.gov/dhs/partners-and-providers/grants-rfps/open-rfps>.

4. **Question:** Section 4.4 Responders' Questions of the RFP states that Responders' questions regarding this RFP must be submitted in writing prior to 4:00 p.m. Central Time on January 15, 2021. On page 2 of the RFP, it states Final RFP Questions due February 26, 2021. Can you confirm that Responders may ask questions to the State regarding this RFP until February 26, 2021?

DHS Response: Questions that Responders' would like to have addressed at the Responders' Conference on January 25, 2021, must be submitted in writing prior to 4:00 p.m. Central Time on January 15. Any additional questions that Responders' have after the Responders' Conference received between January 15 and

February 26, 2021 will be posted on the DHS web site at the following location MCO contract information, forms and resources / Minnesota Department of Human Services.

5. **Question:** Related to the January Request for Proposal (RFP), can the Department of Human Services (DHS) provide any comment on the interest/discussions around including a competitive price bid?

DHS Response: DHS has not made a decision on whether there will be a competitive price bid. The RFP will reflect the final decision.

6. **Question:** Related to the January RFP, can DHS provide any comment on interest/discussions around incorporating page limits for RFP proposals received?

DHS Response: DHS is considering incorporating page limits. The RFP will reflect the final decision.

7. **Question:** Related to the January RFP, can DHS provide any comment on interest/discussions around the length of time DHS intends to allow responders to submit proposals?

DHS Response: DHS is developing the RFP timeline. DHS intends to allow Responders sufficient time to submit their proposals. The RFP will reflect the final timeline.

8. **Question:** Related to the January RFP, can DHS provide any further detail on when in January DHS is targeting the RFP release?

DHS Response: DHS intends to release the RFP in early January 2021.

9. **Question:** Will the RFP require Responders to submit providers with whom the plan has Medicaid contracts or, instead, if the Responder can submit its providers with whom the plan has commercial contracts with an attestation that it will expand those contracts for Medicaid if selected for contract negotiations by the state.

DHS Response: Responders must submit a list of providers that will meet the RFP requirements for Provider Network Adequacy. The State may require proof of contract status (i.e. intent to contract, signature pages, etc.) for any or all provider types. The RFP will reflect the final requirements.

10. **Question:** In regards to the 2022 Metro Families & Children RFP, what portions of the RFP will counties be reviewing and scoring? Previously counties only reviewed and scored their region's responses. Will this be expanded?

DHS Response: DHS and the metro counties will work collaboratively in the review and evaluation of the responses to the RFP.

11. **Question:** Ensuring program sustainability requires health plans with viable membership. How will the state distribute membership upon award to ensure that all awarded health plans have sufficient membership with equal risk distribution to support financial sustainability – particularly if the state were to issue an award to a new entrant?

DHS Response: Currently, membership is generally distributed via member selection and rotating the assignment of the default plan. The structure for member default will be determined as part of the contract awards.

12. **Question:** Achieving improved outcomes requires effective partnerships between health plans and providers in which there are mutually aligned incentives. To achieve this, plans may consider developing networks with targeted providers to which may create unique APMs. Will the state allow awarded plans to leverage a targeted, value-driven network?

DHS Response: All networks must meet the criteria for network adequacy established in Minnesota Statutes, §62D.124 and the Families and Children contracts (§6.13).

13. **Question:** Long term program sustainability requires both health plan funding adequacy as well as sufficient transparency into funding assumptions – including the underlying provider payment rates that serve as the basis for community rating and managed care savings. How will the state provide transparency into the assumptions as well as ensure rate setting best practices such as mid-year collaboration and adjustments?

DHS Response: Responders who are issued a notice of intent to contract will be invited to participate in contract and rates negotiations. The rate memo accompanying previous years' final rates is available for Responders to review in order to understand the current rate development process. Each year, plans are provided with preliminary contract rates and invited to provide questions and commentary at or following a rates plenary typically held in July. Each plan meets separately with DHS to discuss contracts and rates following the plenary. Rates are then finalized in September for the following calendar year. Rates may be adjusted throughout the year to address any significant developments such as legislative changes.

14. **Question:** Sec. 3.2: Service Delivery Plan, item L - For Population Health Management, please provide further clarification and describe the type of information to include in the response for "health experience."

DHS Response: Please see the response to this question in the Responders Conference Q&A documented posted on the DHS Procurement Website. [MCO contract information, forms and resources / Minnesota Department of Human Services.](#)

15. **Question:** 5. Proposal Evaluation and Selection - How will DHS determine Individual County scores for each responder? Will the same overall score be applied to all counties? How will DHS differentiate the scores between counties?

DHS Response: DHS and the metro counties will collaboratively review and score the responses to the RFP.

16. **Question:** 5. Proposal Evaluation and Selection - We are confused about DHS's responses to a couple questions under the Proposal Evaluation and Selection section. The response to the first set of questions is that "DHS and the metro counties will collaboratively review and score the responses to the RFP." However, in response to the 8th question under that same section DHS states, "Metro counties have been given the opportunity to have county representation on the evaluation and scoring team. The evaluation and scoring team will review and score all questions in section 5 'Performance and Service Deliverables.'" Does this mean the counties will only be scoring the Performance and Service Deliverables section?

DHS Response: DHS will perform the initial review and evaluation of the pass/fail questions except for the provider network adequacy review performed by the Minnesota Department of Health. The county evaluators will be given the opportunity to consult with DHS on the pass/fail questions that DHS reviews and evaluates.

17. **Question:** 5. Proposal Evaluation and Selection - In the written responses DHS seems to distinguish between the evaluation team and the evaluation and scoring team. Is it a correct statement that the counties have been given the opportunity to review and score section 5, but the counties will not evaluate entire RFP responses?

DHS Response: DHS will perform the initial review and evaluation of the pass/fail questions except for the provider network adequacy review performed by the Minnesota Department of Health. The county evaluators will be given the opportunity to consult with DHS on the pass/fail questions that DHS reviews and evaluates.

18. **Question:** Can DHS provide a date by which the updated version of the RFP will be released with the changes indicated in the Responders Conference QA? Specifically about the RFP itself reflecting these changes:

- Question 5 and Question 6 should be combined into one question. DHS will be issuing a revised RFP reflecting this change.
- DHS will move up the deadline when RFP questions are due to February 19, with answers posted by February 26. The State will include this revision in the revised RFP.
- It is anticipated that the Notices of Intent to Contract will be issued May 10, 2021. The RFP will be revised to indicate that successful Responders will be selected approximately seven (7) weeks after the Proposal submission due date. Responders selected will be notified in writing of their selection and the State's desire to enter into contract negotiations.

DHS Response: The RFP Addendum was posted on the Open Grants, RFP, and RFIs Website at <https://mn.gov/dhs/partners-and-providers/grants-rfps/open-rfps> on Monday, February 8, 2021

19. **Question:** At the responders' conference on January 25, it was mentioned an updated/amended RFP would be released. Is there a date by which responders can expect this?

DHS Response: The RFP Addendum was posted on the Open Grants, RFP, and RFIs Website at <https://mn.gov/dhs/partners-and-providers/grants-rfps/open-rfps> on Monday, February 8, 2021

20. **Question:** Sec. 3.2, #3 (Professional Responsibility and Data Privacy), item ii (Data Privacy). For the Minnesota Information Technology Services (MN.IT) Vendor Security & Compliance Questionnaire - Outsource, Version 1.0), please confirm that questions 8, 9, 17, 22, and 32 are N/A.

- #8 - The system/solution/service has capability to integrate with the State of Minnesota's Identity and Access Management (IAM) system.

- #9 - No data of any kind shall be transmitted, exchanged or otherwise passed to or accessed by other vendors or interested parties except on a case-by-case basis as specifically agreed to in writing by the State of Minnesota.
- #17 - The system/solution/service has capability to integrate with the State of Minnesota's Security Incident Event Management (SIEM) system.
- #22- Online transactions must conform to reasonable commercial security standards and measures. Temporary files for all secure online transactions must be securely and permanently deleted when said transaction is complete
- #32 - In the event of termination of the agreement, the organization shall implement an orderly return of State of Minnesota assets and the subsequent secure disposal of State of Minnesota assets. During any period of suspension, the organization will not take any action to intentionally erase any State of Minnesota Data.

DHS Response: See the following responses in regards to questions #8, 9, 17, 22, and 32 on the Minnesota Information Technology Services (MN.IT) Vendor Security & Compliance Questionnaire:

- #8 - Responders may mark this section "Not Applicable."
- #9 - Responders may mark this section "Not Applicable." DHS expects that Responders, if awarded a contract, will comply with data transmission requirements in Article 3 of the model contract, as well as all other subcontractor privacy and security requirements.
- #17 - Responders may mark this section "Not Applicable."
- #22- Responders may mark this section "Not Applicable." DHS expects that Responders verify their security compliance with the rule titled "Security Standards for the Protection of Electronic Protected Health Information", found at 45 CFR Part 160 and Part 164, Subparts A and C.
- #32 - Responders may mark this section "Not Applicable." DHS expects that Responders will comply with the model contract at section 13.10 as well as other termination procedures in Article 5.

21. **Question:** Sec. 3.2, #3 (Professional Responsibility and Data Privacy), item ii (Data Privacy). For the Minnesota Information Technology Services (MN.IT) Vendor Security & Compliance Questionnaire - Outsource, Version 1.0), please confirm that for question 25 responders must attach a copy of their "detailed disaster recovery continuity of operations plan."

- #25 - The organization will coordinate disaster recovery and business continuity processes and plans with the State of Minnesota and will provide the State of Minnesota with a detailed disaster recovery continuity of operations plan as part of their response.

DHS Response: See the following responses in regards to question #25 on the Minnesota Information Technology Services (MN.IT) Vendor Security & Compliance Questionnaire:

- #25 - Responders may mark this section "Not Applicable." DHS expects that the Responders will comply with the requirement for Contingency of Operations Planning in section 6.G. of the RFP.

22. **Question:** Section 3.2(6) f Human Rights Compliance, requires the submission of Workforce Certificate Information [State of Minnesota Workforce Certificate Information- DHS-7016-ENG](#)). As part of a county, a Responder is not required to have an affirmative action plan or a certificate of compliance when doing business with the State of Minnesota. A responder intends to submit information supporting the exemption, however, there is not an option on the form to claim this exemption. How would DHS advise a Responder to complete this form when submitting its proposal?

DHS Response: The Responder in the above question would be exempt as the Minnesota Statute defines business to include, “any partnership, association, corporation, legal representative, trustee, trustee in bankruptcy, or receiver, but excludes the state and its departments, agencies, and political subdivisions.” The Responder is required to fill out the form, but should choose box C for exempt and include the documentation for exemption.

23. **Question:** This pertains to page 25 of the RFP on Trade Secret Data Notification. If DHS determines that the information a responder asserted to be a trade secret is not trade secret, would the information simply become public? In this instance, would DHS notify the responder that the identified information is not considered trade secret by DHS?

DHS Response: Before a Responder’s trade secret information is made public, DHS will work with the Responder if the State disagrees with a trade secret determination.

24. **Question:** Sec. 3.2. Service Delivery Plan, item N. For this question, DHS notes five bulleted topics. Please confirm that DHS wants responders only to address the five bulleted topics -- not a comprehensive description of the responder's Quality Management Program.

DHS Response: Responders must address the five bullet points in the response.

25. **Question:** Sec. 3.2. Service Delivery Plan, item N. For the third bullet on performance improvement projects (PIPs), is DHS looking for responders to describe all of their PIPs in one paragraph or provide single paragraph descriptions for all of their PIPs?

DHS Response: Responders should include a one paragraph summary of the Responders’ Performance Improvement Projects (PIPs).

26. **Question:** Sec. 3.2. Service Delivery Plan, item N. Does DHS want responders to provide PIP information for CY 2021 or a different (longer) timeframe?

DHS Response: Responders should provide information on all Performance Improvement Projects (PIPs) that are currently in progress as of January 1, 2021.