Additional Questions and Answers
DHMH OPASS - 14-13835.
ISSUED: March 18, 2014

Question	RFP Section	Response
Please provide additional information to augment the response in the original Response to Questions document: 1. Is "evidence of pre-approval" still required or is the requested information to be submitted with the proposal? 2. If pre-approval is still required, please indicate to whom the information must be submitted 3. If pre-approval is still required, please provide the date by which information must be submitted to ensure that the preapproval can be returned and included in the proposal. Please note that most companies begin proposal production at least five working days before the proposal deadline 4. If information supplied by a bidder is insufficient to address DHMH concerns, will the Department provide further clarification about its specific questions so the bidder can address them individually?	2.1.3 and Initial Response To Questions	Pre-approval is required. Please submit the following in writing: specific details about how the vendor proposes to resolve any potential conflicts; a corporate organization chart and an explanation of all corporate affiliations affecting the provider, including lines of authority between the two organizations; and details regarding any firewalls that the vendor will construct as well as details about any other means of preventing a conflict to Queen Davis, CPPB, Agency Procurement Specialist, Supervisor, Office of Procurement and Support Services, 201 W. Preston Street, Room 416D, Baltimore, MD 21201 email: queen.davis@maryland.gov by March 21, 2014. As stated previously, the Department may ask for follow-up information if information supplied is insufficient to address DHMH concerns.

Please define what constitutes a “financial interest” under Section 2.1.3 of the RFP. Please provide examples of when a “financial interest” exists under Section 2.1.3 of the RFP such that state-pre-approval would be required. Please confirm that a “financial interest” under Section 2.1.3 of the RFP does not exist solely because an MCO and the Offeror are corporate affiliates or because an MCO and the Offeror have an existing contractual relationship.	2.1.3	Financial interest includes any financial interest an MCO may have in the Contractor. Such an interest *could* exist solely because an MCO and Offeror are corporate affiliates or because an MCO and the Offeror have an existing contractual relationship. The Department therefore encourages any potential offeror with doubts about their status to submit following in writing: specific details about how the vendor proposes to resolve any potential conflicts; a corporate organization chart and an explanation of all corporate affiliations affecting the provider, including lines of authority between the two organizations; and details regarding any firewalls that the vendor will construct as well as details about any other means of preventing a conflict to Queen Davis, CPPB, Agency Procurement Specialist, Supervisor, Office of Procurement and Support Services, 201 W. Preston Street, Room 416D, Baltimore, MD 21201 email: queen.davis@maryland.gov by March 21, 2014.

Because of the nature of our business as a national provider of behavioral health management services, we are frequently made party to a variety of legal actions and regulatory inquiries, few (if any) of which are material to our business or to our ability to perform services. Section 4.4.2.14 requests information regarding legal actions against the Offeror over the past five (5) years. • Would it be acceptable to respond to this request by providing information only regarding legal actions which may materially impact the Offeror's ability to perform this contract if it was awarded to Offeror? • Alternatively, would it be acceptable to respond to this request by providing information only regarding legal actions against the Offeror in Maryland over the past five (5) years? • Finally, we do not maintain comprehensive data regarding judgments against the Offeror. Would it be acceptable to respond to request 4.4.2.14(c) with data from judgments within the past year?	4.4.2.14	No. Section 4.4.2.14 is clear in its designation of 5 years as the term for : (a)"any outstanding legal actions" ; (b) "any settled or closed" (c) "any judgments."
It is understood there will be an authorization telephone number that providers and participants can access 8 AM to 6 PM and there will be capacity to process inpatient authorization requests 24 hours per day, 7 days a week. Are these standards (95% of all calls must be answered within three minutes etc…) applicable outside of the 8AM to 6 PM call time?	3.2.3.1 and 3.2.4.1	Yes, the same standard must apply at all times of the day/week. To clarify the requirement in the RFP, 'For 95% of the incoming calls, the on hold time standard is 95% of 2 minutes or less.' and not 95% of all calls must be answered within three minutes as stated in the question. (Page 70 Sections 3.2.3.1 and 3.2.4.1)

Please confirm that this section does not require a live answer, but that an automated answering system (not an answering machine) is allowable so long as a staff member responds within two minutes of the time the caller indicates his or her selection.	3.2.3.1 and 3.2.4.1	Yes, an automated call pick up system, which places the calls in a queue is allowable, - the on hold standard is 95% of the calls must be answered by a staff member within 2 minutes or less of the caller indicating his/her selection.
Please detail the procedures related to the MMIS/FFP match process. ("...assist the Department in the prompt and total recoupment of all available Federal Fund Participation (FFP)….")	1.1.1	The specifics of the processes involved in this requirement will be jointly developed during the transition process. Item 41 above contains valuable information regarding this process. ASO responsibilities will include, but not be limited to: Reconcile the 837 and 835 files, Identify reasons for denials, Correct and resubmit claims the ASO can appropriately correct, Retract incorrectly paid claims from providers, Identify issues the ASO does not have the ability to resolve and promptly describe those issues and provide a suggested resolution, and Maintain a log detailing issues, amounts, actions, dates, and accountable individuals for tracking all processes.

Please detail the data to be received from the State on provider data files. Is veteran status an included field? ("Screen providers for veteran status or experience working with veterans and report quarterly. Report includes provider name and contact information.")	3.2.10.1(c)	The details of the provider data files will be provided upon award of contract. Veteran status is not a field in the Medical Assistance Provider File. The Contractor will have to collect this information as part of provider registration/credentialing.
The exchange of information between MCOs, ACOs and providers of mental health and substance use disorder services is sometimes difficult due to confidentiality requirements. Does DHMH have inter-organizational agreements that ensure confidentiality and facilitate data sharing? What restrictions are there on sharing PHI, especially related to mental health and substance use disorder diagnoses and treatment? Do providers typically request broad releases of information to facilitate joint treatment planning and service coordination?	3.2.9.5(g)	The sharing of information and data among providers is not an area of direct concern for the ASO. DHMH expects all partners to maintain and exchange confidential data appropriately and in accordance with the Department's data security and confidentiality policies (see http://doit.maryland.gov/support/Pages/SecurityPolicies.aspx and data library) as well as any applicable state and federal laws. Exact details of required data exchanges, and any necessary agreements, will be determined during implementation. All bidders are expected to have competent legal counsel on staff who are familiar with appropriate confidentiality and data security laws.
Our IT Security team has attempted to access the DHMH "Information Technology Security Policy and Standards" from the provided links, but report that these document appear to be located on the client's "INTRANET" and not accessible to the public. Please provide this document.	Section 3.2.9.1(b) and (f), page 51	Please see http://doit.maryland.gov/support/Pages/SecurityPolicies.aspx and data library

In response to the question "Will the contract be responsible for any claims payment for dates of service prior to January 1, 2015," uploaded to eMM on March 14, 2014, the State responds that the ASO will be responsible for any claims payments/adjustments that were not complete at the time of assumption of the contract. Is the ASO also responsible for dates of service prior to January 1, 2015 in which payments/adjustments have not been completed for SUD claims, which are currently the responsibility of the MCOs under their capitated rate?		The MCOs will be responsible for payment for SUD services delivered on or before December 31, 2014.