

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Utilization Review & Authorization of Services OPASS #14-10960

1. **Section 3.4.1.b.1), page 27. Please confirm that the Authorization of Service Review is not of all requests for add-ons but approximately 4,000 high utilization add-ons. Can the Department clarify the parameters for “high utilization?”**

High-utilization refers to services such as 1:1 staffing ratios, awake overnight (AON) staffing, behavioral support staffing, and clinical staff such as nurses – please see section 3.4.1.b.1.

2. **Section 3.4.1.b.2) page 27. Is the quarterly sample of existing services part of the anticipated 4,000 reviews?**

Yes, the quarterly, random sample is part of the 4,000.

3. **Section 3.4.1.b.3) page 27. This item indicates that the Contractor will be able to review all existing add-ons at the Administration’s request. Could the Department clarify the current number of add-ons and what you anticipate the timeframes would be to conduct such a review?**

Please see Section 3.2.5 for numbers, and the Department will develop a timeframe, most likely, completion of reviews w/in 1 month.

4. **Attachment F, Page 82. Given that the Authorization of Service component will be a new process, there may be a greater level of effort in year one associated with requests for additional information and requests for fair hearings/appeals. Would the Department prefer respondents to provide a single blended rate that takes this level of effort into account and averages it across all three years, or provide differential pricing for each year?**

The Department prefers respondents to use the price sheet in the RFP Attachment F to submit a single unit price that will be valid for the three year period. Because the contract type will be “indefinite quantity,” the Contractor will be paid based on the number of units accomplished which accounts for variations in quantities from year to year (and for month to month as well).

5. **Attachment R provides the format and data elements for the Request for Service Changes. Under the heading “Team Meeting Consensus” in the middle of page 1 there is a question regarding team consensus. If the response is “No,” does the Contractor have a responsibility to resolve the lack of consensus?**

No, the Contractor will not have to resolve a lack of consensus.

6. **General: Does the Department anticipate that the Contractor will meet in person with the Team to discuss the request, or review the written request and engage with the Team in the event additional information is needed.**

No, the Contractor will not need to meet in person with the Team.

7. **General: Does the Department anticipate that the Contractor would conduct an assessment of the consumer as part of the Authorization of Service process?**

In general, the Contractor should be able to review all supporting documentation, but if the Contractor feels further review is necessary, then they may conduct an assessment.

8. **General: Please confirm or correct our understanding that the contractor should propose a system to collect data on and manage the process and results of conducting Authorization of Service requests.**

Yes, you are correct.

9. **Given the amount of information requested concerning this important component, the fact prospective bidders are recruiting MBE and VOSB sub-contractors using contact information included in the Q&A from the pre-proposal conference, and that we will not receive responses to questions until the week of March 25, would the Department consider delaying the due date?**

No, there will not be a delay in the due date.

9. **What is the dollar value of the current contract for these services?**

Approximately \$3,600,000 (base contract – 3 yrs)

Additional Questions

1. Section 2.2, page 24. Can bidders provide a certification of performance for contracts that are not cited as a reference?

The Offeror must provide proof **OR** certification of conducting at least 500 performance audits per year **AND** the Offeror's 3 references must certify past experience **which can go as far back as 5 years.**

2. Section 3.2.5, page 25, Request for Service Change (RFSC) and add-on reviews. We have several questions about these elements of the scope of work.

- a. **Are these reviews currently conducted by the State? If not, please identify the contractor conducting the reviews.**

No, these RFSC reviews are not currently being conducted, only the RFSC process is current.

- b. **How do providers submit requests for review, that is, by telephone, fax, hardcopy mail, or electronically?**

Providers do not submit requests, Resource Coordinator's submit a **Request for Service Change form** (not a review)(to change services), having said that; Resource coordinators, or family/guardians must submit the request in written form, to the Regional Office, via hard copy mail **OR** electronically.

- c. **Can the Contractor notify providers electronically for approved requests?**

The Contractor can notify **Resource Coordinators** electronically for approved requests.

- d. **Please provide an estimate of the amount of time required for RFSC and add-on reviews.**

After a request for a team meeting has been made to update the IP and to complete the RFSC form, the team must submit the written request to the Regional Office within 20 days of the meeting. The RO makes a decision within 45

<p>days or sooner of receipt of written response & either: The complete RFSC package must within 45 days.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approval of services 2. Denial of services 3. Request for additional information 4. Combination of these based on # of requests submitted. <p>e. Does the State negotiate modifications of requests and approve fewer services than requested? If so, are these modifications considered partial denials and therefore susceptible to appeal?</p> <p>The State may not approve all services requested, depending on extent / type of services requested. These are considered a partial denial and any part of the denial can be appealed.</p> <p>f. Requests for RFSC seem to be increasing fairly rapidly, for example, an 83% increase between 2012 and a 57% increase between 2012 and 2013 (taking the 2,073 RFSCs to date in 2013 and extrapolating for 4 quarters). Does DDA investigate RFSCs to evaluate if the initial IP was adequate and developed appropriately?</p> <p>No, it is to evaluate the need of further services (is the change requested necessary). The only review of existing services (to check on need from IP) is due to a highly utilized add-on and the continuing need for it.</p>
<p>3. Section 3.4.1.b.2), page 27. Please provide additional information about the quarterly sample of existing services. Is this review the same as the audit specified in 3.4.2?</p> <p>Will revise language to clarify via RFP amendment.</p>
<p>4. Section 3.4.1.d, page 27. Are all decisions in the RFSC process subject to appeal?</p> <p>As stated in RFSC protocol, on DDA's website and the RFSC process form, all denials in the RFSC process are subject to appeal.</p>
<p>5. Section 3.4.2.3, Should be 3.4.2.(e) page 28. We have several questions about audit samples.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Are the samples per quarter independent of each other? That is, is the consumer part of the sample universe in each quarter or excluded if previously selected for audit? <p>The samples are pulled randomly, however, consumers from the past 3 quarters are excluded from the current sample.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> b. DDA desires the audit results to be reliable and generalizable to consumers. Is DDA considering reliability and generalizability at the State or Region level? By way of background, a random sample of 377 selected from a population of 22,000 individuals has a 5% margin of error and a 95% confidence level – so highly reliable and generalizable to the population. <p>The requirements in the RFP stand as written in Section 3.4.2.e (there is no 3.4.2.3 as noted in question).</p>
<p>6. Section 3.4.2.f, page 28. Does this item require the contract to complete on-demand audits within 30 days of request from the Department?</p> <p>Yes, completed within 30 days from the date of notification is received.</p>
<p>7. Section 3.4.2.g, page 29. Would DDA accept a super-rater or “Gold Standard” reliability process in lieu of an inter-rater reliability process? Inter-rater reliability is time-consuming and expensive, and best used when the most important issue is the agreement between two raters – for example, in abstracting demographic elements from a chart. This type of reliability evaluation does not take into account whether the response is correct, so if two responses are compared and both are wrong, the reliability is still 100%.</p> <p>The RFP language / requirement for the Contractor stands as written in Section 3.4.2.g</p>
<p>8. Section 3.6.1, page 29. Please note that the RFSC form is Attachment R, not Attachment Q. Are verbal notifications of Emergency Requests followed by notification in writing?</p> <p>Necessary revision noted, will fix via RFP amendment. The Emergency Requests which the contractor considers and authorizes (or denies) should be documented (written form), then the results are to be verbalized to the</p>

Resource Coordinator / or person making request. After the decision is verbalized then the documentation should be sent to both the Resource Coordinator / or requestor and the Regional Office.

9. Section 3.6.3, page 30. Please provide information about the PCIS2, for example, a point of contact, so that we can reflect this process in our proposal.

The Contractor can refer to the following DDA website link for any information related to PCIS2. No point of contact can be provided prior to award. <http://dda.dhmh.maryland.gov/SitePages/pcis2.aspx>