**STATE OF MAINE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**RFP SUBMITTED QUESTIONS & ANSWERS SUMMARY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFP NUMBER AND TITLE:** | RFP#202504053 Assorted Actuarial Services and Fiscal Management |
| **RFP ISSUED BY:** | Department of Health and Human Services, Office of MaineCare Services |
| **SUBMITTED QUESTIONS DUE DATE:** | May 16, 2025, no later than 11:59 p.m., local time |
| **QUESTION & ANSWER SUMMARY ISSUED:** | May 29, 2025 |
| **PROPOSALS DUE DATE:** | June 17, 2025 no later than 11:59 p.m., local time |
| **PROPOSALS DUE TO:** | [Proposals@maine.gov](mailto:Proposals@maine.gov) |

**Provided below are submitted written questions received and the Department’s answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix D pages 36-37 | The project example instructions in Appendix D state “**At least one project must demonstrate meeting all eligibility requirements outlined in Part I, C and Appendix C of the RFP.”** Many states do not require both stand-alone NET rate certifications and UPL demonstrations, and therefore it is anticipated most qualified vendors will not have a single project demonstrating both components of the eligibility requirements.  Can the State confirm it they would consider it sufficient if a vendor provides separate project examples to demonstrate their experience and expertise in performing the services to meet the two eligibility requirements? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, Bidders may demonstrate eligibility through one or more projects. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix G page 24 | Question 2a mentions that minimum qualifications should be included in the staffing description.  Are there any minimum qualifications other than the eligibility requirements listed in Part I, Section C? |
| **Answer** | |
| No. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I  page 7 | Does the state currently use a vendor to complete the Fiscal Management Analytics scope of work? If so, will the state provide the current annual contract value? |
| **Answer** | |
| No. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I  page 7 | Does the state currently use a vendor to complete the Upper Payment Limit scope of work? If so, will the state provide the current annual contract value? |
| **Answer** | |
| No. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, E.1.b page 18 | Will the results of these UPL calculations to maximize room under the UPL be used to determine supplemental payment amounts to providers or provider cost settlements? |
| **Answer** | |
| Generally, no. Conversely UPL calculations are used to ensure that supplemental payments determined through other methodologies have not bypassed the UPL. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **6** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section E.1.c page 18 | Does the State currently have or plan to pursue the use of a qualified practitioner UPL during this contract period to support non-institutional supplemental payments? |
| **Answer** | |
| No; however, there is legislation under consideration at the State level which may result in the need of this new UPL type. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **7** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix K page 44 | Attachments 6 and 8 appear to be corrupted. Can the state provide a new copy of Attachment 6 and 8? |
| **Answer** | |
| The Accountable Communities and PCPlus attachments 6 and 8 may be obtained in a PDF (.pdf) format by double clicking on the document icon below. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **8** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section C.2, AC and PCPlus Data Analysis and Reporting, Table 2, Page 13 | It is noted in Section C.2 that there are “Risk scores for all MaineCare Members related to the period of analyses”. Can the Department clarify if developing these risk scores are included in the scope of work, and if so, can the Department provide the current methodology for developing risk scores? |
| **Answer** | |
| Developing risk scores is not included in the scope of work. Member risk scores, along with claims, eligibility, and other files will be provided to the awarded Bidder on a regular basis. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **9** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section E, 2 2. UPL Demonstration Related Services, Page 18-19 | Can the Department provide historical UPL documentation for each related service that was provided to CMS? |
| **Answer** | |
| Refer to the [Medicaid.gov Payment Limit Demonstrations webpage](https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/financial-management/payment-limit-demonstrations) for CMS’s UPL documentation. The Department will provide the latest UPL demonstrations that have been submitted to CMS to the awarded Bidder. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **10** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section F, Confidential Data, Page 19 | To mitigate risks associated with sensitive data transfers, is the Department open to solutions that allow contractors to access and handle PHI remotely on Department servers/clouds/devices rather than handling on contractor-owned servers/clouds? |
| **Answer** | |
| Irrespective of the hosting location and ownership, the Department and MaineIT expects the same level of policy compliance and due diligence in terms of protecting PHI and other sensitive data transacted as part of the contract. Refer to the [MaineIT Policies and Standards](https://www.maine.gov/oit/policies-standards). | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **11** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section H, Ad Hoc Work, Page 20 | Can the Department provide additional examples of past and potential future ad hoc work? |
| **Answer**\_ | |
| * An example of ad hoc work under the AC/PCPlus service would be assessing the impact of changing billing codes used for attribution. * An example of ad hoc work under the FMA service would be off-cycle analyses of potential impacts to utilization or enrollment (e.g. those due to changing economic conditions, federal policy proposals) or retrospective analyses related to realized vs anticipated impact of policy changes in a specific service area. * An example of ad hoc work under the UPL service would be additional UPL modeling that may be needed while the Department explores options related to reimbursement reforms. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **12** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part V, Proposal Evaluation and Selection, Sect. B, page 29-30 | Can the Department provide additional details on if and how the contractor-submitted ad hoc hourly rates will be factored into the total cost proposal component scoring? |
| **Answer** | |
| The proposed hourly rate for providing ad hoc reports will not be considered during the scoring process. The Total Cost on Schedule 1 will be used to score the cost proposal as defined in Part V, B.3. of the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **13** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix H, Page 41 | Can the Department provide historical annual hours, hourly rates, and total fees for the services included within the scope of work over the past three years by major fixed fee scope of work area? Can the Department also provide estimated or maximum annual hours for the fixed fee scope of work broken down by deliverable listed in Schedule 1 of Appendix H? |
| **Answer** | |
| The Department does not have these figures. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **14** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix J Attachment 1, Page 43 | Can the Department re-provide the embedded Attachment 1 in Appendix J? “1. Claims - 3038\_ACO\_Interface”. In the version posted online (05/07/2025), this attachment is not able to be opened or downloaded. |
| **Answer** | |
| The Claims 3038 ACO Interface attachment 1 may be obtained in a PDF (.pdf) format by double clicking on the document icon below. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **15** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Can the Department disclose the current contractors for each of the services under this RFP and when the last time each scope of work was competitively procured? |
| **Answer** | |
| The current vendor for NET work is Deloitte, last RFP issued 2021.  The current vendor for AC/PCPlus work is Mercer, last RFP issued 2018.  The Department does not currently have contracts for the other services included in this RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **16** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section C.1, pages 8–9  and Appendix C, page 35 | Since there are only a few standalone NET programs that operate under waiver authority, requiring CMS approval of rates, will the Department consider vendors qualified to bid if they have developed rates and provided rate methodology documents or rate certifications to state clients for standalone NET programs under the commonly used State Plan authority within the past five years? Rates developed for State Plan NET programs often follow the same guidelines in the CMS Medicaid Managed Care Rate Development Guide and the same principles for actuarial soundness outlined in 42 CFR Part 438.4, but do not require CMS approval. |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, the Department will consider experience with programs using State Plan authority instead of waiver authority. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **17** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section C.1, pages 8–9  and Appendix C, page 35 | Since there are only a few standalone NET programs that operate under waiver authority, requiring CMS approval of rates, will the Department consider vendors qualified to bid if they have developed and certified NET capitation rates that have been approved by CMS as part of a comprehensive managed care program within the past five years? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **18** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A, 1.a., page 6 | Please confirm whether the Department intended to reference 42 C.F.R. Part 438.4. |
| **Answer** | |
| 42 C.F.R. Part 438.4 is correct. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **19** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section I, Table 5, page 21 | Will the Department share sample materials, such as rate certification reports, financial reports, data files, and other deliverables for the NET rate development and certifications similar to what is provided in Appendices J and K for the AC and PCPlus Data Analysis and Reporting and Fiscal Management Analytics? |
| **Answer** | |
| The Department will provide all necessary materials to the awarded Bidder in order to conduct the scope of services outline in the RFP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **20** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section I, Table 5, page 22 | Will the Department share sample materials, such as guidance documents, demonstrations, data files, and other deliverables for the UPL demonstrations similar to what is provided in Appendices J and K for the AC and PCPlus Data Analysis and Reporting and Fiscal Management Analytics? |
| **Answer** | |
| Refer to the answer to question 9 of this document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **21** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix D, page 36 | Can the Department please confirm that the statement “[a]t least one project must demonstrate meeting all eligibility requirements outlined in Part I, C and Appendix C of the RFP” means that at least one project must include a NET rate certification within the past five years and at least one project must include a UPL demonstration within the past five years? |
| **Answer** | |
| Refer to the answer to question 1 of this document. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **22** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section C, 2a, Table 2, page 13 | Will the Department please confirm the cycle for the files identified in rows ii. and iii. of Table 2 – AC Files? Will these files be provided only twice per year even though there are two annual reports, as well as biannual reports identified in Table 6? |
| **Answer** | |
| AC Files will be provided twice per year. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **23** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section C, 5a and 6a, pages 14–15 | Will the Department please confirm the total number of TCOC reports that will be produced each year? Section C, 5a identifies an annual projection report and an annual reconciliation report, while Section C, 6a and Table 6 also identify biannual TCOC reports. |
| **Answer** | |
| There are four (4) TCOC reports per year for each AC: the annual projection report biannual TCOC reports, and the annual reconciliation report. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **24** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section G, 3, page 20 | Is participation in any of the collaborative meetings (or any other meetings) expected to be on-site (in person), or will the meetings be held virtually? |
| **Answer** | |
| All meetings will be held virtually. | |