



**STATE OF WASHINGTON
HEALTH CARE AUTHORITY**

RFP NO. 3866

Amendment #2

PROJECT TITLE: External Quality Review Organization (EQRO)

PROPOSAL DUE DATE: September 10, 2019 by 2:00 p.m. Pacific Time, Olympia, Washington, USA.

Faxed bids will not be accepted.

ESTIMATED TIME PERIOD FOR CONTRACT: January 1, 2020 to December 31, 2023

The Health Care Authority reserves the right to extend the contract for up to three (3) additional years at the sole discretion of the Health Care Authority.

The above referenced RFP is amended as follows:

1. Section 2.2, Estimated Schedule of Procurement Activities, is updated to extend the Proposal Due Date to September 10th, 2019, as below:

Issue Request for Proposals	August 5, 2019
Pre-Bidder Conference	August 9, 2019 – 4:00 to 5:00 p.m.
Response to Questions from Pre-Bidder Conference	August 13, 2019
Bidder Questions Due	August 14 2019 – 2:00 p.m.
Letter of Intent Due	August 15, 2019 – 2:00 p.m.
Answers Posted	August 23, 2019
Bidder Proposals Due	September 10, 2019 – 2:00 p.m.

Evaluate Proposals	September 11 – 27, 2019
Conduct Oral Interviews with Finalists, if required	October 1 – 4, 2019
Announce “Apparent Successful Bidder” and send notification via e-mail to unsuccessful Bidders	On or Before October 8, 2019
Hold Debriefing Conferences (if requested)	October 9 – 11, 2019
Final Contract(s) Signed	November 15, 2019
Begin Contract Work	January 1, 2020

2. HCA’s responses to the submitted questions, as attached.

RFP 3866 – External Quality Review Organization – Amendment 2

Question #	Document Reference (RFP, Exhibit, Attachment etc.)	Section or Subject Matter #/Title	Page # or Location	Bidder Question	HCA Response
1	RFP	1.3.11	21	Minimum Qualifications: We are a bit confused by the wording of "NCQA-Licensed licensed" description for a HEDIS auditor. Can you please clarify what this line item is referring to?	This requirement is being amended to read as follows: "The Bidder must be an organization, or subcontract with a vendor, that is licensed by NCQA to conduct HEDIS® audits."
2	RFP	1.3.3	20	Minimum Qualifications: What is an "equivalent" to a SOC2 report? Does the audit have to be done by an independent organization, or is an internal audit acceptable?	HCA would prefer a SOC 2 Type 2, FISMA, or FedRamp in depth report done by an independent reviewer, to ascertain if the Bidder complies with trust services criteria. This provides HCA with a vast majority of the information needed to conduct the Security Design Review. Security Design Review approval is required to contract with HCA. HCA is willing to accept internal audits, policies, and processes, however this will take additional time to achieve the required Security Design Review approval and may result in the Bidder not being named an Apparent Successful Bidder or awarded a contract for this work.
3	Exhibit A		1	<p>The first paragraph states, "Bidder must respond to all questions in the space provided below. If you need additional space to provide answers, you may use a separate page; please identify the question number and corresponding question that you are responding to and attach that document to this Exhibit B."</p> <p>Is this a typo and should it say, "attach that document to this Exhibit A?"</p>	Yes. This is a typographical error. Please see attached, updated Exhibit A-1 with the correction to state: "Bidder must respond to all questions in the space provided below. If you need additional space to provide answers, you may use a separate page; please identify the question number and corresponding question that you are responding to and attach that document to this Exhibit A."

RFP 3866 – External Quality Review Organization – Amendment 2

4	Exhibit A		2, 3	<p>Exhibit A is to be submitted with the Letter of Intent. Per item 8, bidders and subcontractors must certify they have and will maintain independence from the State Medicaid agency and from all MCOs, PIHPs, PAHPs, or PCCMs that will be reviewed by the EQRO, including..."</p> <p>From this, it appears we need to have already identified and selected our subcontractors so we can complete this section. Please clarify if subcontractors need to be selected by the time Exhibit A is submitted with the Letter of Intent so their information can be included in Exhibit A. Or, can this information be provided with the proposal?</p>	<p>HCA expects that any subcontractors the Bidder has already identified should be included in the certification. The intent is that the Bidder will ensure that any subcontractors they contract with after this point are also independent from the State Medicaid agency and all MCOs, PIHPs, PAHPs, or PCCMs that will be reviewed by the EQRO.</p> <p>HCA does not expect the Bidders to have all of their subcontractors chosen for submission of the Letter of Intent and Exhibit A.</p>
5	Exhibit A		3, 4	<p>Exhibit A is to be submitted with the Letter of Intent; per items 10 and 11, a copy of NCQA-certified CAHPS vendor certificate and a copy of a NCQA-licensed to conduct HEDIS® audits is required for Exhibit A.</p> <p>From this, it appears we need to have already identified and selected our subcontractors so we can include a copy of these certification forms. Please clarify if subcontractors need to have been selected in time for their information to be included in Exhibit A and submitted with the Letter of Intent. Or, can this information be provided with the proposal?</p>	<p>HCA expects the Bidder is able to submit their NCQA license to conduct HEDIS® audits. If this is something the Bidder <u>has</u> subcontracted out for already, HCA expects the subcontractor's license. If the Bidder <u>intends</u> to subcontract this work, but has not identified a subcontractor at this time, HCA will accept that statement and a commitment to deliver the NCQA license at the time of Proposal submission.</p> <p>HCA does not expect the Bidders to have all of their subcontractors chosen for submission of the Letter of Intent and Exhibit A.</p>
6	Exhibit B			<p>Do we need to include Exhibit B with our Letter of Intent that is due on Aug 15th? It is referenced in Exhibit A, but that may be an error.</p>	<p>No. This was a typographical error in the Exhibit A. HCA does not expect the Exhibit B to be submitted with the Letter of Intent.</p>

RFP 3866 – External Quality Review Organization – Amendment 2

7	RFP	2.5	30	<p>Proposals must be submitted electronically as an attachment to an email. Please advise what the file size limitation is for emails sent to the HCA.</p> <p>Due to the file sizes of some of the information required (e.g., the requirement to submit two annual technical reports), the proposal may need to be submitted via multiple emails. If this turns out to be the case, please advise if this will be acceptable to the HCA.</p>	<p>Yes, this will be acceptable. Please indicate in the subject line that it is "(# of #)" to ensure HCA receives all parts of the Proposal submission.</p>
8	RFP	3.A.c (Exhibit F)	36	<p>Can you please provide a Word version of the Contract for red-line purposes?</p>	<p>Exhibit F is available as a Word document on both HCA's website (https://www.hca.wa.gov/about-hca/bids-and-contracts) and WEBS for download (https://pr-webs-customer.des.wa.gov/)</p>
9	RFP	3.4	36, 42	<p>Section 3 identifies five major proposal sections and says they should be tabbed and submitted in the order noted (i.e., A=Letter of Transmission, B=Technical Proposal (Section 3.2), C=Management Proposal (Section 3.3), D=Cost Proposal, and E=Business References.</p> <p>While mandatory, Section 3.4 is not listed as a major section of the proposal. Please advise where the information requested in Section 3.4 should be placed in the proposal (i.e., in one of the sections (A-D) listed above. or in its own separate section).</p>	<p>Section 3.4 has been added to the major proposal sections as "D. Related Information (Section 3.4)." All subsequent requirements have been relettered. Please see amendment for clarification.</p>

RFP 3866 – External Quality Review Organization – Amendment 2

10	RFP Contract	1.2.5.2.8 - 1.2.5.2.10 2.4.5.2.9 - 2.4.5.2.11	15 51	CAHPS Survey Administration: Can you please clarify the items and expectations in Sections 1.2.5.2.8 - 1.2.5.2.10 and Sample Contract Sections 2.4.5.2.9 - 2.4.5.2.11?	Thank you for bringing this language to our attention. RFP 1.2.5.2.8 (and corresponding Contract subsection 2.4.5.2.8) is intended to ask for specificity about the populations included in the report and is revised to read “Produce reports that specify each population surveyed.” RFP 1.2.5.2.9 (and Contract 2.4.5.2.9) will be revised to read “Provide HCA a raw data table in Excel showing each completed question for all responsive surveys with identifiers removed, including a data dictionary.” We are removing 1.2.5.2.9 and 1.2.5.2.10 (and Contract 2.4.5.2.10 and 2.4.5.2.11). HCA expects data to be provided supporting the summary report provided that displays how each (unidentified) client responded to the survey. For example, respondent #1 responded 0 to the first question. The data dictionary would explain that for the first question, 0=no.
11	RFP Contract	1.2.5.2.7 2.4.5.2.8	15 51	CAHPS Survey Administration: Please clarify the report content expectation for this task: MCO reports for the CHIP survey. 1. Will the statewide population frame drawn by HCA be across MCOs or will there be a population sample for each MCO? 2. If it's a statewide survey is the expectation that there is just one statewide report rather than individual MCO reports?	There is no requirement to have specific MCO reports for the CHIP survey. This clarification is addressed in question #9. The CHIP survey is a statewide sample pool regardless of MCO enrollment status. 1. HCA will pull the statewide sample frame, which will be across all delivery systems in which CHIP children are served (any of the five MCOs and FFS as applicable). There is no separate sample pull for each MCO. 2. Yes.

RFP 3866 – External Quality Review Organization – Amendment 2

12	RFP	1.2.8	18	Communication and Education: How many forums will be held each year?	One
13	RFP	1.2.9	18	<p>The RFP says approximately 20-25 providers will be reviewed each fiscal year. The funding for the project is for the first 18 months of the contract, which crosses two fiscal years. We have the following questions:</p> <p>1. How may total WISe reviews are required to be completed during the 18 months of funding?</p> <p>2. How are these WISe reviews spread across each fiscal year (FY)? Specifically:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">a. How many WISe reviews are required to be completed during the last six-months of FY20 for the time period of January 2020 through June 2020?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">b. How many WISe reviews are required to be completed in during FY21 for the 12-month period of July 2020 through June 2021?</p>	<p>Twelve providers will receive a full QIRT review between January and June 2020. Ten (10) providers will receive a full QIRT review between July and December 2020. Ten (10) providers will receive a full QIRT review between January and June 2021. Additional providers will be reviewed, after the first 18 months of funding is exhausted, as funding is available; the review is expected to be a modular approach at that time, reviewing specific modules within the on-line QIRT tool, rather than a full QIRT review.</p>

RFP 3866 – External Quality Review Organization – Amendment 2

14	Exhibit D	Cost Proposal Worksheet	All	<p>Can you confirm that we do not need to include pricing for Validation of Network Adequacy in our cost proposal? There does not appear to be a line item for that task in the Cost Proposal Table.</p>	<p>Correct. This work is not currently included in the contract as CMS has not released the specifications thus HCA does not have scope of work specifications; however, it is expected that CMS will release them during the period of time the RFP covers.</p>
15	Exhibit D	Cost Proposal Worksheet	All	<p>Can you confirm that we do not need to include pricing for WISE for CY 2022 and CY 2023 given the work will occur in the first 18 months of the contract? Those columns in the cost proposal table are not grayed out.</p>	<p>Correct. This work is not currently funded. If this is funded by the legislature in the future, HCA will work with the awarded Contractor to negotiate at that time.</p>
16	Sample Contract (Exhibit F)	SOW, 2.4.4.2.15, 2.4.4.2.17 and HEDIS® Performance Measure Validation Deliverables 3.4.2.4 and 3.4.2.6	46, 59, 60	<p>Can you please clarify the expectation of the electronic summary report in 2.4.4.2.17? It appears to be the same information as required in Statement of Work item 2.4.4.2.15, which is the electronic report we assume is the Final Audit Report.</p> <p>This same question applies to the HEDIS® Compliance Audit™ Deliverable items 3.4.2.4 and 3.4.2.6</p>	<p>You are correct: Contract subsection 2.4.4.2.17 (and 3.4.2.6) will be removed as it is a duplicate of 2.4.4.2.15 (and 3.4.2.4).</p>

RFP 3866 – External Quality Review Organization – Amendment 2

17	Sample Contract (Exhibit F)	SOW 2.4.4.3.8 and RFP 1.2.4.2	47-49 and (RFP 14)	Is this section of the sample contract referring to RFP section 1.2.4.2–PMV for PIHP-contracted work? The process described in the contract for this work appears to follow NCQA protocol and timeframes for non-HEDIS measure validation and does not align with the assumptions in the RFP. Per RFP Section 1.2.4.2.2.2, "Validation shall be per MOC at the statewide level..." Will the EQRO conduct site visits, post on-site activities, and coordination with individual MCOs or will the site visits and coordination be with HCA and Research and Data Administration (RDA)?	HCA is still developing the Performance Measure Validation process for PIHP-contracted work for the MCOs. Please follow the assumptions in the RFP in section 1.2.4.2. Validation will be required per MCO and be statewide numbers, rather than regionally focused calculations. Coordination for the RDA-calculated measures would be with HCA and RDA.
----	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------	---	---