

2023 SNBC Procurement Questions and Answers (Q&A)

New Questions with DHS Responses

1. **Question:** In the Service Delivery Plan, Care Coordination Model section of the SNBC RFP, it states that the Responder:
 - a. may attach a CMS approved D-SNP Model of Care that describes their care coordination model
 - b. needs to include protocols for access to:
 - individual intermittent telephonic care management,
 - to ongoing intensive care management including face-to face assistance,
 - case management and declining case management services.

Will the requested documents count toward the 90-page limit?

DHS Response: The CMS approved D-SNP Model of Care, and protocols for telephonic case management, intensive case management, accessing and declining case management will not count to the 90-page limit.

2. **Question:** Per question 5 in the 2023 SNBC Procurement Questions and Answers (Q&A):

Regarding Sec. 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), during the 2022 Metro Families and Children Procurement, DHS provided instruction that question 25 could be marked as not applicable, with the expectation Responders would comply with the requirement for Contingency of Operations Planning in section 6.G the RFP. Is that same guidance still applicable for these procurements?

DHS Response: Yes, the same guidance is still applicable in this procurement cycle.

3. **Question:** In DHS' guidance on cross references between Section 2, Service Delivery Plan and Section 5, Service and Performance Deliverables, DHS has indicated that while such cross references are allowed, ***“internal cross-references may not be used to exceed the page limits. All information to be considered when awarding points for the sections that include page limits will count against the page limit.”*** Can DHS clarify how it intends to identify and quantify these references? In some cases cross references may be more contextual in nature and not provided as a direct response to the question. For example, Question 5.2 builds off of

Question 5.1 and our response in 5.2 references the process “described in the previous scenario,” even though describing that process is not explicitly asked for as part of the question. Would all of 5.1 or some subset of 5.1 then be counted towards the page limits? In cases in which there is a direct reference to another section, how is DHS quantifying the reference – to the nearest page? To the nearest half page? Can DHS provide an example?

DHS Response: The purpose of the page limit is to ensure that reviewers have an opportunity to consider all materials submitted. Cross-references in a section that is subject to page limits, that take the reader back to portions of the RFP response that are also within the sections that have page limits, will not be counted twice.

Previous Questions with DHS Responses

1. **Question:** During the responder conference, DHS was asked if it is looking for a list of specific legal agreements in place under the Data Privacy Narrative section (question 2a). The response given was yes, DHS is requesting a list of legal agreements in place with a short description of each. Can you please clarify if the intent is for responders to list all of their vendor agreements that involve access to PHI (e.g. clearinghouses, shredding services, contracted Medical Directors) or just those vendors that are considered key to meeting the responder’s administrative responsibilities in the model DHS contract? Can the list of vendors be an attachment and not counted towards the recommended 1 page limit per response?

DHS Response: DHS expects a list of all vendors who have access to PHI. The list may be an attachment. The list will not count toward the page limit.

2. **Question:** In the Data Privacy Narrative Description of Privacy Program, question 2a ask responders to describe its Legal agreements including with whom, how often reviewed or renewed, and what sensitive data are covered. Is DHS looking for a list of legal agreements in place and what types of sensitive data they have access to?

DHS Response: Yes

3. **Question:** Can DHS confirm that, in addition to links to attachments and references to other questions within the RFP, plans can include links to external web pages, such as to their own websites or other external sites with relevant information? And, can DHS confirm that this would not count against the page limits for the Performance and Service Deliverables section?

DHS Response: All information to be considered when awarding points should be included in Responder's proposal and will count against the page limit. Because reviewers will have a large volume of material to consider, Responders should clearly indicate what information they want considered as a part of the scoring. Information contained in a website may not be easily located by reviewers and it is not guaranteed that reviewers will have an opportunity to consider any material not contained in the Responder's proposal. Links to external web pages are acceptable if Responder wishes to provide evidence supporting a statement made in Responder's proposal. .

4. **Question:** Section 8: Transportation Access #7 requests an attachment of written documentation provided to members about transportation, please confirm this attached documentation does not count toward the Performance and Service Deliverables 90 page limit.

DHS Response: Written documentation provided to members about transportation does not count toward the Performance and Service Deliverables 90 page limit.

5. **Question:** During the Responder's Conference it was indicated that written responses to question would be forthcoming with the amendment estimated to be issued on December 13th. While the amendment was issued on that date, we have not seen the written responses to questions. Seeing as this is an important aspect to guide clarification questions, will you consider extending the Final Questions Due deadline beyond December 30, 2021?

DHS Response: DHS will accept questions from Responders until January 14, 2022. DHS will provide answers to questions no later than January 20, 2022.

6. **Question:** During the responders' conference, DHS said it is not a requirement to restate the RFP requirements prior to each proposal response, but if restated, the content would be excluded from page count. The addendum issued 12/13/21 did not include revised language to allow for this content exclusion. Will DHS please clarify the RFP language?

In addition, the RFP states, "Starting with the Table of Contents through the duration of the document, the proposal page numbers must flow continuously in numeric order...." With this in mind, where should the restated RFP requirements go in the proposal and how will it easily be determined what content is excluded from page count? Is it acceptable to include the Performance and Service Deliverable scenarios and questions prior to each response, and inserted on an unnumbered page?

DHS Response: It is not a requirement to restate the RFP requirements prior to each proposal response. If RFP requirements are restated within Responder's Proposal, they will be excluded from the page count. If Responder decides to include restated RFP requirements, include them prior to each response in numeric order, and inserted on an unnumbered page.

7. **Question:** When will the State publish the questions and answers that were submitted prior to the responders' conference?

DHS Response: The State posted answers to some questions on December 30, 2021. This second set of questions included response to the additional questions received. Final responses to all questions will be posted no later than January 20, 2022.

8. **Question:** The RFP states, "Starting with the Table of Contents through the duration of the document, the Proposal page numbers must flow continuously in numeric order...."

The RFP requires several attachments. Per the responders' conference, attachments can be included at the end of a section or at the end of the proposal. Will DHS please clarify if the attachments must be included in the continuously numbered pages?

DHS Response: Attachments can be included at the end of a section or at the end of the proposal. Attachments need not be included in the continuously numbered pages but should be clearly labeled.

9. **Question:** In section 3, Professional Responsibility and Data Privacy, subsection ii, Data Privacy (page 18), Responders are referred to the Data Privacy document. Within this document, Section III. Listing of Sensitive Data Breaches – Data Dictionary and Examples, the third paragraph states "Families and Children contract." Can you confirm that this should have been a reference to "Special Needs BasicCare contract"? And if so, can Responders update the question to read "SNBC contract" in our response if we are restating the questions?

DHS Response: Yes, this should have been a reference to Special Needs BasicCare contract. Please update the question to read "SNBC contract" if Responder restates the questions.

10. **Question:** In the December 3 Responder's Conference, DHS said that the question text will not count toward the page limit.

Q: Can DHS describe how they are accounting for the question text? Will a certain number of pages be subtracted from the overall section 5 to account for the text of the questions and if so, can DHS share this number with MCOs?

DHS Response: If choosing to restate the RFP scenario and questions, please do so on a separate unnumbered page prior to each proposal response. The restatement of the question/scenario will be excluded from page count. Unnumbered pages should not contain any of the Responders proposed responses.

11. **Question:** The Security Compliance Questionnaire refers to a singular "system/solution/service" in many of the questions. What specific "system/solution/service" is being referenced as it applies to providing prepaid health care services to eligible individuals?

DHS Response: The singular term “system/solution/service” is meant to encompass the functions of the hardware, software or process to which it refers. For example, in the question “The system/solution/service provides password protection and security controls to prevent unauthorized access to or use of the system, data, and images. Proposed system solutions will ensure Industry best practices for security architecture & design” the system might be the hardware, the solution may refer to software, and a service may refer to an app, a software-as-a-service program, or a process by which users gain secured access to the data. The tripartite term is intended to not limit the description of function by whichever terminology is used by the vendor, for whichever function of providing managed care services is under discussion.

12. **Question:** DHS provides a link to HRSA’s medically underserved regional listing as a reference (pg. 9)

Medically Underserved Regional Listing <https://data.hrsa.gov/>

All of Hennepin County is listed as Not Rural based on the HRSA definition. Is HRSA’s designation of rural an allowable definition? How should Responders approach these questions with respect to counties designated as “not rural”?

Will DHS please clarify how “rural” is defined? Specifically, does it mean rural within a county or is a county designated rural? If the rural designation is by county, will DHS please provide a list of rural counties?

DHS Response: If a county is identified as metro or large metro in the current Health Services Delivery (HSD) Reference File (as referred to at 42 C.F.R. § 438.52), Responders may disregard RFP questions pertaining to “rural” areas. However, Responder may also wish to describe other initiatives to counteract lack of services due to reasons other than being rural. The list of “metro” and “large metro” counties in Minnesota is as follows:

Anoka County
Carver County
Chisago County
Dakota County
Hennepin County
Olmsted County
Ramsey County
Rice County
Scott County
Sherburne County
Stearns County
Washington County

Wright County

- 13. Question:** Description of the Applicant Organization. Please clarify what the term "statement" particularly parts of the sentence that are not typically expressed as a statement (like a mission statement), i.e., quality program and service, and overall structure of the organization?

DHS Response: Please disregard the following statement, which should have been removed from the RFP addendum published December 13, 2021: *"Include an organizational statement that includes its mission, philosophy, goals and objectives, quality of care and service program and overall structure of the organization."*

- 14. Question:** For Section 4 ii of the Provider Network Listing template under the Provider file; #47: Record Type. Is it the intent of DHS that the MCO compares this submission to the previous SNBC submission and indicates change/no change/or new record based upon the previous record? If not, please clarify what requirements are needed for this Element.

DHS Response: Yes. Responder is not required to submit the Provider Network Listing template as part of the initial RFP submission

- 15. Question:** Regarding section 6. REQUIRED CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS, Item H. Accessibility Standards, can you confirm that it is the expectation that responders' full proposal response will be required to comply with the Minnesota IT Accessibility Standards, including compliance with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 (Level AA) and Section 508 Subparts A-D?

DHS Response: No. The Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 (Level AA) and Section 508 Subparts A-D are applicable to websites or other information systems and tools that are part of Responder's proposed work and not to Responder's submission of a proposal.

- 16. Question:** We appreciate that cross-references are allowed between the Care Coordination Service Delivery Plan responses and the Performance and Service Deliverables responses. Are cross-references also acceptable between the other Service Delivery Plan responses and the Performance and Service Deliverables responses, as well as between sections 1-9 in the Performance and Service Deliverables section?

DHS Response: Cross-references are allowed between Service Delivery Plan responses and the Performance and Service Deliverables response, as well as between sections 1-9 in the Performance and Service Deliverables section. However, internal cross-references may not be used to exceed the page limits.

All information to be considered when awarding points for the sections that include page limits will count against the page limit. Because reviewers will have a large volume of material to

consider, Responders should clearly include information they want considered as a part of the response.

- 17. Question:** In follow-up to DHS written response to question #32, can you please clarify if you are meaning the Excel spreadsheet can be a separate document, not part of the continuous searchable PDF or are you wanting responders to embed the Excel spreadsheet into the continuous searchable PDF? Can responders convert the Excel spreadsheet into a PDF to make part of continuous searchable PDF response?

DHS Response: The Excel spreadsheet may be submitted as a separate document, not part of the continuous searchable PDF. Or, if Responder wishes to do so, Responder may convert the Excel spreadsheet into a PDF to make it part of a continuous searchable PDF response.

- 18. Question:** How are responders to include the Disclosure of Ownership Reporting template (Excel spreadsheet) in our response? Does DHS want responders to have the Excel spreadsheet a separate document, not part of the continuous searchable PDF or are you wanting responders to embed the Excel spreadsheet into the continuous searchable PDF? Can responders convert the Excel spreadsheet into a PDF to make part of continuous searchable PDF response?

DHS Response: The Excel spreadsheet may be submitted as a separate document, not part of the continuous searchable PDF. Or, if Responder wishes to do so, Responder may convert the Excel spreadsheet into a PDF to make it part of a continuous searchable PDF response.

- 19. Question:** Section 1.1, Objective of RFP, paragraph six) states that “Responders who are currently operating SNBC or Integrated SNBC and SNBC in a county will be selected to participate if they meet the minimum requirements of this RFP.” Please confirm how a bidder meets minimum requirements. For example, will the bidder have met the minimum requirements of the RFP if they:

- Achieve a “Pass” for all evaluation items identified in Evaluation Phase I (RFP Section 5.3, Phase I: Required Statements and Forms Review)
- Achieve a “Pass” for the pass/fail evaluation items identified in Evaluation Phase II (RFP Section 5.3, Phase II: Evaluation of Proposal Requirements and Readiness Review)
- Achieve a final total score of 50 points for the scored evaluation items identified in Evaluation Phase II (RFP Section 5.3, Phase II: Evaluation of Proposal Requirements and Readiness Review)

To state it differently, please confirm that a bidder will have met the minimum requirements of this RFP if they are selected to move on to Evaluation Phase III by having passed the above elements, or please share if there are different criteria for meeting minimum requirements.

DHS Response: Yes. The bidder will have met the minimum requirements by meeting all three bulleted items. Responder must achieve a "Pass" on all Pass/Fail items and a total final score of at least 50 points on scored items.

20. Question: Please confirm that a Responder currently not in a county could not be the only MCO in that county as of January 1, 2023.

DHS Response: It is possible for a new plan to be chosen if the current single MCO in that county does not meet the minimum requirements of the RFP.

21. Question: May responders include an appendix section that is referenced in the response? If yes, will it count towards the page limit?

DHS Response: Yes. It will count toward the page limit.

22. Question: The SNBC Guiding Principles to Design, Implement, Evaluate, and Improve Services for Persons with Disabilities (PDF) is not accessible as a link, can the document referenced be made available?

DHS Response: The website link has been fixed and the document is available.

23. Question: Section 3.2, Detail of Proposal Components, is missing a letter (E). The section that is labeled under (E) is Claims and Encounters (on page 13) should be F. The sections following E are out of order because of the skipped labeling. Will DHS revise the order of the questions in this section?

DHS Response: This was fixed in the December 13th Addendum.

24. Question: Notice of Intent to Contract is "anticipated" by May 9, 2022. Will DHS adjust this date if necessary to ensure that its notice precedes (by at least a week) the CMS application deadline for withdrawing counties from 2023 service area expansion requests? For example, May 15, 2021 was the deadline for amending 2022 service area expansion requests.

DHS Response: DHS does not anticipate needing to adjust the date. CMS has published the deadline date as "late May."

25. Question: RFP Section 4.5, Proposal Submission, prohibits including scanned documents as part of the proposal response. Will DHS consider updating this requirement to allow for scanned documents as long as they are saved in a format that allows them to be searchable? We would plan to use optical character recognition functionality within Adobe Acrobat Pro to index the scanned documents, which would then make the documents searchable within Adobe Acrobat Reader. Given this is an entirely electronic submission and no scanned documents are acceptable, can the State confirm that electronic signatures are acceptable on all documents and forms requiring signatures?

DHS Response: Scanned documents are not acceptable as responses for the Service Delivery Plan or the Performance and Service Deliverables unless they are fully searchable. Scanned documents may be submitted in response to other sections. Electronic signatures are acceptable.

- 26. Question:** The proposal submission should include three (3) separate USB drives:
- One (1) complete original non-redacted copy labeled as “2023 SNBC RFP Proposal – Original”;
 - One (1) complete original redacted copy with the removal of trade secret information (refer to the Trade Secret Data Notification section) labeled as “2023 SNBC RFP Redacted Proposal”;
- and
- One (1) original non-redacted copy with the removal of the Disclosure of Ownership information labeled as “2023 SNBC RFP County Proposal” for county distribution.
- Does the State mean labeling of the actual file (filename)? If so, may the responder include the responders name in the label? (e.g., “Responder name 2023 SNBC RFP Proposal – Original”)

DHS Response: The instructions refer to labeling of the USB drives themselves. Responders may include the name of the Responder if they wish. Responders may label the files saved on each USB drive as they wish.

- 27. Question:** Section 4.5 states, “The proposal submission should include three (3) separate USB drives.” In the same section, the RFP also states, “The three (3) proposal copies must be submitted in a single sealed package or container and via USB drive only...”. Are the three USB drives intended to be the same as the three copies?

DHS Response: Yes.

- 28. Question:** Does the State have a preference for placement of attachments? May the responder include Attachments at the end of the proposal, in the order of the corresponding sections?

DHS Response: No, the State does not have a preference. Responders may put the attachments at the end.

- 29. Question:** Is a minimum font size required?

DHS Response: The RFP addendum published December 13, 2021 was updated to require a minimum font size of 12 in the main body of responses to the Service Delivery Plan section and the Performance and Service Deliverables section. Responder may use its best judgment in choosing an appropriate font for forms, tables, charts, graphs, footnotes, etc.

30. Question: For #3, it would be helpful to have clarification of the elements DHS would anticipate using in an "appropriate cost and pricing analysis" and what constitutes a reasonable proposal beyond what the RFP requires (if anything).

DHS Response: DHS does not have any further information to share.

31. Question: Regarding the instructions to responders (in paragraph two) without a current Minnesota contract, please clarify what is meant by "the varied needs of the population throughout a diverse service area."

DHS Response: This section applies to Responders who do not currently have a SNBC/Integrated SNBC contract. DHS expects Responders to share their experience in other markets to address how the needs of a population similar to SNBC are met. Any currently non-contracted SNBC Responder needs to submit evidence they understand the population enrolled in SNBC and the service area in Minnesota they are proposing to enter including how they are prepared to meet the contract requirements.

32. Question: Given the page limit, is it acceptable to cross-reference responses to Sections 1-9 within the Performance and Service Deliverables response?

DHS Response: Yes

33. Question: Does restating questions in responses to Sections 1-9 of the 5. Performance and Service Deliverables count toward 90 page-limit?

If yes, may proposers opt to not restate the questions?

DHS Response: No, restatement of the questions will not be counted toward the 90 page limit.

34. Question: A Responder may attach a CMS approved D-SNP Model of Care (MOC) that describes the care coordination model. If a Responder is updating its MOC, will the revised MOC that will be submitted to CMS meet this requirement?

DHS Response: Yes

35. Question: In the RFP questions, the term "stakeholders" is sometimes clearly used to refer to members, but at other times it seems to refer to members as well as other stakeholders. It is not always clear when DHS is seeking a response specific to the MCO's work with members, or when other stakeholders, such as counties or providers, should be part of the RFP response. Could DHS please define the term "stakeholder" for each question and sub-question, or explicitly state in a question or sub-question whether a member, county, or provider is in scope?

DHS Response: DHS intends for the term "stakeholders" to mean a wide range of stakeholders throughout the document. Questions and sub-questions in the Service Delivery Plan section that refer specifically to members should be answered with respect to members. Questions that do not refer specifically to members should be approached with an expansive definition of stakeholder.

- 36. Question:** The RFP states that "Finally, if applicable, note whether as a Medicare Advantage Plan Sponsor CMS has taken final enforcement or contract action." Please clarify DHS's understanding of the term "final enforcement action," including when DHS considers CMS (i.e., based on what timing?) to have taken final action.

DHS Response: DHS' understanding of the term "final enforcement action" means any enforcement or contract action by CMS that has been made public.

- 37. Question:** Is the Medicare Advantage information requested in #1-#3 only for the Responder's D-SNP SNBC line of business and not other Medicare lines of business?

DHS Response: This question applies to all lines of Medicare Advantage business.

- 38. Question:** If the answer to Question 2 (Must enrollees use a network provider for this service?) is no, must the Responder skip questions 3-5, or may the Responder answer questions 3-5?

DHS Response: Responder may answer questions 3-5.

- 39. Question:** In Section 3: Care Coordination Training and Support, Question 1, do "known gaps in the Responder's health care services" and "gap in the Responder's health care system" both refer to gaps in access to covered benefits? If they mean different things, please clarify the difference.

DHS Response: Health care system refers to the provider network including organizations, people and systems that provide care. Health care services are the benefits included in the SNBC contract and provided by those providers.

- 40. Question:** The opening sentence asks for a description of both "administrative services and clinical services," but the rest of the question (including the last sentence regarding oversight and coordination) refers only to administrative services. Please clarify regarding the expectations for clinical services in this question.

DHS Response: The RFP addendum published December 13, 2021 was updated to delete the reference to clinical.

41. Question: Please clarify what type of specificity DHS is looking for on the subcontractor delegation audit report summaries and CAP implementation and resolution.

DHS Response: Please refer to the Model Contract. DHS is not looking for any more specificity than is provided during the regular course of monitoring the contract.

42. Question: On page 34, Section 4.5 Proposal Submission the State requires one continual complete searchable document and sections must not be submitted in separate documents.

On page 30, 6. Required Statements and Forms, a.2 County List the responder must submit the completed "Minnesota SNBC County List" Excel spreadsheet with their proposal.

Please confirm the proposer should convert the Excel spreadsheet to PDF format to include in the single complete searchable document and that the State is not expecting a separate excel file.

DHS Response: Responders are not required to convert the Excel spreadsheet to PDF format to include in a single complete searchable document.

43. Question: For Section 4: Provider Network Adequacy Review of the RFP iii. Geographic Access Maps then the document labeled SNBC Geographic Access Maps Specifications. Please confirm that Adult Nurse Practitioner can be included in the Provider Specialty list. The Geographic access maps section indicates, "nurse practitioners practicing independently may be listed as PCP's if they practice in adult or pediatric primary care".

DHS Response: Yes, that is correct.

44. Question: For Section 4: Provider Network Adequacy Review of the RFP, there is a significant gap between the submissions of the Provider Network Listing and the Geographic Access Maps and Gap Analysis Summary. Please help us understand the reasoning of the different submission due dates and to account for any differences in the submission of a responders Provider Network.

DHS Response: DHS seeks to understand if Responder may have recently had a thorough network review. Therefore, Responder is not required to submit the Provider Network Listing template as part of the initial RFP submission. The Geographic Access Maps and Gap Analysis Summary must be submitted on February 18, 2022 with the RFP submission.

45. Question: b. Disclosure of Ownership and Management Information:

- In our responses to the Disclosure of Ownership reporting template, do we need to include the Field Definitions tab in our proposal as there is no information for us to input on that tab.

- On the Disclosure of Ownership reporting template, the header reads: "<MCO Name> Disclosure of Ownership and Management Information Report <MM-YYYY>." Are responders to use the date 02-2022?

- Are responders to leave the "Change Type" blank on the Disclosure of Ownership Reporting template?

- Can DHS make the Disclosure of Ownership Report attestation template an interactive PDF that allows for an electronic signature like the other Required Statements and Forms? The proposal submissions indicates that scanned documents included in the proposal are not acceptable due to search restrictions.

DHS Response: Responders do not need to include the Field Definitions tab. Responders may use the date 02-2022. Responders may leave the "Change Type" blank on the Disclosure of Ownership Reporting template unless Responders have a need to fill in the field. Scanned copies of the Disclosure of Ownership and Management Information are acceptable.

46. Question: e. Human Rights Compliance:

- If responders are exempt from Minnesota Statutes 363A.36 (Workforce Certificate) and 363A.44 (Equal Pay Certificate), is it acceptable to leave the forms blank, sign, and provide a narrative summary as to why we are exempt from the statute requirements?

- Can DHS make the Equal Pay Certification form (DHS-7075) an interactive PDF that allows for an electronic signature like the Workforce certificate (DHS-7016)? The proposal submissions indicates that scanned documents included in the proposal are not acceptable due to search restrictions.

DHS Response: Yes, it is acceptable to leave the forms blank, sign, and provide a narrative summary as to why Responder is exempt from statute requirements. Scanned copies of the Equal Pay Certification are acceptable.

47. Question: During the PMAP procurement, DHS provided instruction related to questions on the "Vendor Security & Compliance Questionnaire." Specifically, DHS said that questions 8, 17, 22, and 32 were not applicable. Is that same guidance still applicable for this procurement?

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.

- 48. Question:** SNBC: “Responders that provide Integrated SNBC in a county must also provide SNBC in the same county in order to assure a seamless transition of enrollee choice. Responders may provide SNBC as a standalone product in a county if not currently providing Integrated SNBC in that county.”

For the SNBC RFP Integrated SNBC/SNBC Network Adequacy Attestation, is the expectation that all respondents have a CMS-approved network for SNBC or another Medicare Advantage plan covering the same area as SNBC?

It currently states: 6. Responder attests that they have a CMS-approved network for SNBC or another Medicare Advantage plan covering the same service for which Responder is submitting a response in this Request for Proposal, and that is available to SNBC members. Note the name of the plan in the supplemental form below.

DHS Response: DHS seeks to understand if Responder has had a thorough network review. If Responder does not have a CMS-approved network, then a full network review may be required and they may need to submit excel template.

- 49. Question:** Please confirm that the section governing a Responder's Care Coordination Model (Item E?) is worth 10 points. The only place the RFP notes it is worth 10 points is in the scoring grid on page 38.

DHS Response: The Responder's Care Coordination Model (Item E) is worth 10 points. This was corrected in the December 13th SNBC Addendum

- 50. Question:** 3.2.2.O. Stakeholders states, “1. Provide a description of the organization’s stakeholder engagement activities for Integrated SNBC/SNBC and describe how the Responder conducts their contractually required Integrated SNBC/SNBC stakeholder meetings. Include in the response:...”. There are not any secondary requirements listed to detail what the response should include and the next item is “2. Who is informed of the stakeholder meetings? How are they informed and how much lead- time are they given? How are members informed that they can present or comment at stakeholder meetings?” Are items 2-7 intended to be secondary requirements?

DHS Response: The Stakeholder Meetings section was rewritten in the December 13th Addendum. It is now 3.2.2 P. The phrase "include in the response" was placed in the wrong location. "Include in the response" is now followed by seven items that have been rewritten.

51. **Question:** Given the page limit, is it acceptable to cross-reference responses to Sections 1-9 within the Performance and Service Deliverables response?

DHS Response: Yes

52. **Question:** In Section 3.2.5.3, the response numbering is missing a "3". Will DHS please clarify if an item is missing or whether the response numbering requires modification?

DHS Response: Section 3.2.5.3 required a response numbering modification. This section was renumbered in the SNBC Addendum published December 13, 2021.

53. **Question:** Questions 3 and 6 in Section 3 Care Coordination Training and Support are duplicates. May we skip a response for question 6?

DHS Response: This was fixed in the December 13th Addendum. In section 7 Improving Outcomes and Eliminating Disparities, questions 3 and 6 were duplicative. Question 6 was deleted in the SNBC addendum published December 13th and a missing question was added to this section: "Describe how the Responder monitors member experience and utilization to ensure that its provider network is sufficient, including long term services and supports. Include the Responder's approach to ensuring access to culturally appropriate care and access for groups that experience disadvantages within the MSHO/MS C+ population."

The new question should not have included MSHO or MS C+ nor should it include the statement "including long term services and supports". The correct wording of the new question is: "Describe how the Responder monitors member experience and utilization to ensure that its provider network is sufficient. Include the Responder's approach to ensuring access to culturally appropriate care and access for groups that experience disadvantages within the SNBC population."

54. **Question:** Scenario 9 states that group home staff "use the Provider and Pharmacy Directory provider by the Responder." Please confirm what is meant is "Provider and Pharmacy Directory provided by the Responder."

DHS Response: There was a typo in the sentence and it should read "Provider and Pharmacy Directory **provided** by the Responder." The RFP addendum published December 13, 2021 was updated to correct the typo.

55. Question: In Section 2. SNBC Service Delivery plan, sub section I Information Technologies - The RFP says "Include whether the organization's main administrative system interacts with your clinic care systems and in what ways does "administrative system" mean "claims?"

DHS Response: The term "administrative system" includes but is not limited to the claims system. The term "clinical care systems" is intended to refer to contracted providers with whom the Responder would share data.

56. Question: In Section 3.2 Proposal Requirements question #K Population Health Management, please clarify DHS's definition of "health experience", or is DHS referring to the IHI's Triple Aim definition that includes quality and satisfaction?

DHS Response: DHS is referring to the IHI's Triple Aim definition

57. Question: The instructions note that responders may submit information which demonstrates recognition of their professional responsibility, including, references and/or letters of recommendations. Can DHS please clarify what they mean by "references." What would DHS be expecting to see for references?

DHS Response: "References" can include letters from community organizations or other entities with whom Responder partners. DHS is expecting to see evidence that Responder is committed to serving Minnesota communities and the populations covered under the contract.

58. Question: For Section 4: Provider Network Adequacy Review of the RFP iii. Geographic Access Maps then the document labeled SNBC Geographic Access Maps Specifications. Please confirm that Geriatric Nurse Practitioner can be included in the Provider Specialty list, as Gerontology is listed under the physician specialties. The Geographic access maps section indicates "nurse practitioners practicing independently may be listed as PCP's if they practice in adult or pediatric primary care".

DHS Response: The Geriatric Nurse Practitioner can be included in the Provider Specialty list.

59. Question: In question 2 of the Provider Network Administration section, the last sentence refers to "the senior population." Should we assume that this was intended to refer to the population of people with disabilities for this RFP?

DHS Response: The SNBC addendum published December 13, 2021 corrected the statement to read: Responder's approach to ensuring access to culturally appropriate care and access for underserved populations within the population of people with disabilities

60. Question: In the second bullet under Quality Management, if the organization does not have an alternative mechanism to address special health care needs, but rather follows the model

contract as described in 7.1.5.1, does the process by which we address special health care needs need to be described?

DHS Response: If the organization does not have an alternative mechanism to address special health care needs, it doesn't need to be described.

61. Question: In the third bullet under Quality Management on PIPs, do responders provide information on just the current PIP or past PIPs? Is one paragraph the expected limit for this response?

DHS Response: Please provide current PIPs. There is no limit imposed on the length of this response.

62. Question: If the Responder's care coordination model incorporates a care coordination team approach with various levels of intensity of care coordination such as complex care coordination, care coordination, care management, care navigation or care guide, the Responder must complete and submit detailed responses for each level of intensity of care coordination provided to MSHO members.

Should this be referring to SNBC?

DHS Response: That is correct. This question refers to people with disabilities. The SNBC addendum published on December 13, 2021 updated this question to read:

"If the Responder's care coordination model incorporates a care coordination team approach with various levels of intensity of care coordination such as complex care coordination, care coordination, care management, care navigation or care guide, the Responder must complete and submit detailed responses for each level of intensity of care coordination provided to SNBC members."

63. Question: Is page 27 intentionally blank?

DHS Response: This was fixed in the December 13th Addendum.

64. Question: Before DHS will sign a contract, must a Responder have MDH approval of its service area and network? That is the wording found in the seniors RFP, as contrasted with the language found here ("Before the State can sign a contract with any Responder, the Responder must demonstrate that its network will provide appropriate levels of access"). If the language on p. 18 is correct, how does DHS distinguish it from the language in the seniors RFP?

DHS Response: Thank you for pointing out the discrepancy. The language in SNBC is the correct language. This was corrected in the December 13, 2021 Amendment to the MSHO/MSO+ RFP.