

**PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
1.	Scope of Work	1. AHCCCS Overview , par 1	4	<p>As of 01/20/2010 there was no specific Bidder's Library on the referenced URL in the RFP. Will there be a specific Bidder's Library for RFP YH10-0002?</p> <p>If the State will provide a specific Bidder's library, will vendors be allowed to submit questions once it is released?</p> <p>If a specific Bidders Library will not be provided, can the State direct vendor's to relevant documents in Bidders Libraries for other RFP's?</p>	There is no Bidder's Library for this RFP The website addresses for relevant documents are located within the RFP.
2.	Scope of Work	2. Project Introduction and Objectives , par 2, line 1	4	<p>The RFP references 'Contractor shall provide ...support ...'. What types of support does this entail?</p> <p>Do you want the Contractor doing any of the actual analysis/discovery activities and or working with State personnel doing this?</p>	<p>Support refers to any activity required to keep the system operational including, but not limited to, software and hardware maintenance and upgrades.</p> <p>The State does not anticipate the vendor performing any analysis/discovery activities.</p>
3.	Scope of Work	1. Project Introduction and Objectives	4	<p>This portion of the RFP states that the software must be capable of being used by both State and MCO personnel, but the rest of the RFP appears to have the Contractor performing all program integrity service related work, including that done with the software proposed.</p> <p>Does the State need to have State staff and MCO personnel actually use the software, with the likelihood that additional costs would be passed on to the State to handle such usage and training OR is the State interested in having the Contractor use the software but then provide the State with the results of that usage; i.e., reports that enhance the staff's capabilities to administer, plan and evaluate the performance and use of the State's programs, MCOs, providers and members?</p>	<p>The State would like to have the ability to make the system available to approximately 50 personnel from multiple Managed Care Organizations if possible.</p> <p>At this time, the State envisions State personnel producing the analysis results and restricting the MCOs use of the system to reviewing those results.</p>
4.	Scope of Work	2. Project	4	What will MCO personnel use the system for (run reports,	At this time, the State envisions State personnel

PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
	Work	Introduction and Objectives		view claims history, etc.)?	producing the analysis results and restricting the MCOs use of the system to reviewing those results.
5.	Scope of Work	2. Project Introduction and Objectives	4	<p>The RFP says that “<i>the software must be capable of being used by both State and Managed Care Organization personnel.</i>”</p> <p>Is it a requirement that the Contractor provide direct access to the system for Managed Care Organization personnel? If there is such a requirement, how many managed care organizations must be provided access and how many MCO personnel on average from each MCO must be given access, trained, and supported? How will the MCO personnel need to use the system?</p>	<p>The State would like to have the ability to make the system available to approximately 50 personnel from multiple Managed Care Organizations if possible. The ability of the system to provide security based on the MCO would be desirable.</p> <p>At this time, the State envisions State personnel producing the analysis results and restricting the MCOs use of the system to reviewing those results.</p>
6.	Scope of Work	2. Project Introduction and Objectives	4	If MCO personnel will have direct access to the system, will AHCCCS be willing to require the MCOs to execute a 3 rd Party Access Agreement to protect the Contractor from liability for actions of the MCOs as well as protection of intellectual property of the contractor? Currently, the RFP only seems to contemplate a contractual relationship between AHCCCS and the Contractor.	Yes.
7.	Scope of Work	2. Project Introduction and Objectives	4	Is it the intention of the state that offerors also provide analytical services in conjunction with the software proposed?	The State does not anticipate the vendor performing any analysis/discovery activities.
8.	Scope Of Work	1. Ahcccs Overview	4	In addition to the State of Arizona Medicaid program, does the proposed Program Integrity solution also include: Arizona SCHIP? ALTCS? Arizona Department of Corrections? Med-QUEST?	Yes, the proposal should encompass all lines of business supported by the Agency.
9.	Scope Of Work	1. AHCCCS Overview	4	Given that AZ also services HI MedQuest and AZ DOC, is the system that is being created supposed to meet the requirements for each of these organizations independently or are they considered all part of the same system?	<p>For data storage purposes, Hawaii’s Medicaid program, Med-QUEST, would be treated as separate entity.</p> <p>The other lines of business supported by AHCCCS can</p>

**PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
				Example: 4.2.1- are we comparing the Hawaii members and the AZ DoC as independent members or are they consolidated into the AZ members? Are we to consolidate FFS and MC data or provide separate profiles?	be treated as one entity and the data can be stored in a single data base.
10.	Scope Of Work	2. Project Introduction And Objectives	4	The software must be capable of being used by both State and Managed Care Organization personnel. Roughly how many State users will be accessing the proposed system? Roughly how many Managed Care Organization Users will access the proposed solution?	<p>Depending on the functionality provided by the system, several divisions within AHCCCS may also access the system. This could include the Office of the Inspector General, Division of Health Care Management, the Division of Fee-for-Service Management, the Office of the Director, Information Services Division and others. In total, AHCCCS envisions approximately 30 users within the Agency.</p> <p>The State would also like to have the ability to make the system available to approximately 50 personnel from multiple Managed Care Organizations if possible. The ability of the system to security based on the MCO would be desirable.</p> <p>The proposal should allow for a maximum of 10 additional users for the State of Hawaii.</p>
11.	Scope of Work	2. Project Introduction and Objectives -AND- 4..1 Introduction	4; 7	Based on the discussion at the Pre-Proposal Conference, there seems to be a wide range of anticipated users (50 – 100). This variation impacts the ability for the Vendor to plan for server performance, training, support, etc. Is there more specific information that AHCCCS can provide on the expected type and number of OIG users in order to help guide the Vendor’s solution?	<p>Depending on the functionality provided by the system, several divisions within AHCCCS may also access the system. This could include the Office of the Inspector General, Division of Health Care Management, the Division of Fee-for-Service Management, the Office of the Director, Information Services Division and others. In total, AHCCCS envisions approximately 30 users within the Agency.</p> <p>The State would also like to have the ability to make the system available to approximately 50 personnel from multiple Managed Care Organizations if possible. The ability of the system to provide security based on the MCO would be desirable.</p>

**PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
					The proposal should allow for a maximum of 10 additional users for the State of Hawaii.
12.	Scope of Work	2. Project Introduction and Objectives -AND- 4.1 Introduction	4; 7	Can AHCCCS provide an estimate of the number of power users versus other users, and the number of users who are anticipated to use the case tracking system?	The case tracking capability would be used only by the Office of the Inspector General. For planning purposes, allow for approximately 15 users.
13.	Scope of Work	Current Information Technology Environment	5	Does the end user environment support Adobe Acrobat? If so what version?	Yes, Adobe Acrobat reader V 9 is available to all users registered to the State of Arizona domain.
14.	Scope of Work	Current Information Technology Environment	5	Will AHCCCS be able to provide a historical data extract (up to 3 years or more) during implementation for establishing a historical baseline?	Historical data for Claims, Encounters, member Demographics, Eligibility, Enrollment, Provider and managed Care Contracts are available dating back to December 31, 2000.
15.	Scope of Work	2. Project Introduction and Objectives	5	The specific AHCCCS goals refer to "Program Integrity staff". Are these staff the same as the OIG staff described on pg. 7?	Yes, the Office of Program Integrity (OPI) has been renamed to the Office of the Inspector General (OIG). References to Program Integrity staff are the same staff as the OIG staff.
16.	Scope of Work	3. Current Information Technology Environment	5	What is the size of the current data warehouse in terms of the space required to store the data (e.g., 100 gigabytes)?	The data warehouse currently uses 1.3 terabytes of data space.
17.	Scope of Work	3. Current Information Technology Environment	5	What is the average length of an encounter record in bytes? Fee for service records?	Both Encounter and FFS records are made up of multiple records in a relational database form. The data warehouse utilizes 1.3 terabytes of data for 6 years and 8 months worth of claims and encounters.
18.	Scope of Work	3.5 Electronic Data Interface	5-6	What will be the source of the data to be loaded into the system? Will the source data be from the PMMIS or from the Data Warehouse?	The data will be taken from the best available source. That could include PMMIS, the data warehouse, the original HIPAA submissions from Providers or MCOs,

**PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
					or other sources as needed.
19.	Scope of Work	3.4, Data Warehouse/Decision Support Environment	6	What COGNOS reporting tools are currently being utilized?	The Sate is licensed for the following Cognos products: BI Administrator BI Advanced Bus Author BI Consumer BI Professional Data Manager Developer Data Manager Engine Metrics Studio User Add-On PM Contributor PM Modeler
20.	Scope of Work	4. Program Integrity Business Requirements	6	How many years of data does AHCCCS desire in the system?	We anticipate that the function being performed will dictate the amount of data that is needed. Historical data for Claims, Encounters, member Demographics, Eligibility, Enrollment, Provider and managed Care Contracts are available dating back to December 31, 2000.
21.	Scope Of Work	4. Program Integrity Business Requirements 4.1 Introduction	6	While it is envisioned that most of this software will evaluate post adjudication claims and encounter data, pre-adjudication activities as well as activities that use other data sources will be considered. Will pre-adjudication and activities that use other data sources be scored? Would the State consider that the Proposal include this as an optional functionality and provide it as such in the appropriate requirements section as it is only seen in the Introduction and is not introduced in the requirements?	Functionality such as edits that are used pre-adjudication are included in the Optional Functionality. The vendor may introduce other functionality in the Written Narrative section.
22.	4. Scope of Work, Program Integrity Business	“The Office of Inspector General is staffed by 54 individuals ...”	7	Will all 54 of the individuals be end-users of the Program Integrity system (i.e., they will access the system through its user interface, running queries, reports, tracking investigation cases, etc.)?	Depending on the functionality provided by the system, several divisions within AHCCCS may also access the system. This could include the Office of the Inspector General, Division of Health Care Management, the Division of Fee-for-Service Management, the Office of

**PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
	Requirements			Will there be any other end-users of the system beyond those noted above (i.e., the 54 individuals) and, if so, please provide the unit name, the nature of system use and number of individuals in those units?	<p>the Director, Information Services Division and others. In total, AHCCCS envisions approximately 30 users within the Agency.</p> <p>The State would also like to have the ability to make the system available to approximately 50 personnel from multiple Managed Care Organizations if possible. The ability of the system to provide security based on the MCO would be desirable.</p> <p>The proposal should allow for a maximum of 10 additional users for the State of Hawaii.</p>
23.	Scope of Work, 4. Program Integrity Business Requirements	“The Office of Inspector General is staffed by 54 individuals ...”	7	If State personnel will be end-users of the Program Integrity system, it may be necessary to include license terms for 3 rd party products in the vendor’s proposals. Where should vendors include those license terms in the Proposal itself?	Licensing terms or restrictions on the product use should be stated in the Written Narrative section of the proposal.
24.	Scope of Work, 4. Program Integrity Business Requirements	“The Office of Inspector General is staffed by 54 individuals ...”	7	It is not clear from the RFP which unit is responsible for the initial analysis of the data (i.e., the ‘discovery’ function) and evaluates the result of that initial analysis to determine if investigations and investigative audits should be initiated. Will State personnel be doing this initial analysis, or is this one of the services the State is looking to vendors to provide (either in whole or in part)?	The State anticipates using the system to perform the analysis. The State does not anticipate using Vendor services for that purpose.
25.	Scope of Work	4.1/Introduction	7	Please provide detail regarding how the 54 individuals in the Office of the Inspector General are split between the 5 units (as an example- 5 investigators, 5 admin, etc.)	<p>Inspector General (1) Member Compliance Admin (2) Member Compliance Investigators (11) Fraud Prevention Unit Admin (1) Fraud Prevention Unit Investigators (12) Provider Compliance Admin (1) Provider Compliance Investigators (7) Analysis Investigators (4) Provider Registration Admn (2) Provider Registration Staff (13)</p>

**PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
26.	Scope of Work	4.1/Introduction	7	If Hawaii is to use the system, how many additional users are to be included?	The proposal should allow for a maximum of 10 additional users for the State of Hawaii.
27.	Scope of Work	4.1/Introduction	7	Please provide the estimated number of each type of user: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic User • Cognos Admin • Cognos BI Professional • Cognos Business Author • Cognos Professional Author 	Without knowing what functions are available for the different levels of user, the State cannot answer the question.
28.	Scope of Work - Program Integrity Business Requirements	4. 1 Introduction	7	This section states that, “ <i>The principal user of this proposal will be the Arizona Office of the Inspector General.</i> ” What other organizations will have access to the system? How many users will there be for each organization? Will Med-QUEST staff have direct access to the system? What are the security considerations regarding other users?	<p>Depending on the functionality provided by the system, several divisions within AHCCCS may also access the system. This could include the Office of the Inspector General, Division of Health Care Management, the Division of Fee-for-Service Management, the Office of the Director, Information Services Division and others. In total, AHCCCS envisions approximately 30 users within the Agency.</p> <p>The State would also like to have the ability to make the system available to approximately 50 personnel from multiple Managed Care Organizations if possible. The ability of the system to security based on the MCO would be desirable.</p> <p>The proposal should allow for a maximum of 10 additional users for the State of Hawaii.</p>
29.	Scope of Work	4, Program Integrity Business Requirements , Mandatory Requirements , 4.2.4	8	Will the State please provide an explicit description of what they mean by the term ‘interactive format’ in this requirement, along with some examples of ‘an interactive format’ used to alert state staff to potential fraud and abuse?	The State is asking about the ability to identify potential cases of fraud, waste or abuse automatically and provide an alert to the users. This alert could be accomplished in a number of ways including but not limited to an online report, an email or a dashboard function.
30.	Scope of Work	4, Program Integrity Business	8	While the State requires vendors to submit a project management plan with a start date of February 1, 2010,	The project management plan should be submitted using a start date of May 1, 2010 as stated on page 52.

**PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
		Requirements Training and Documentation, 4.2.11.1		does the State have an expectation for how long the implementation should be?	The State is interested in gaining benefits from the system as quickly as possible, so the implementation time frame should be as effective as possible.
31.	Scope of Work	4.2.4/Mandatory Requirements	8	Please define “alert” and “interactive format” per AHCCCS’s requirement.	The State is asking about the ability to identify potential cases of fraud, waste or abuse automatically and provide an alert to the users. This alert could be accomplished in a number of ways including but not limited to an online report, an email or a dashboard function.
32.	Scope of Work - Program Integrity Business Requirements	4.2.11.1 Project Management Plan	8	What is the desired implementation time frame?	The State is interested in gaining benefits from the system as quickly as possible, so the implementation time frame should be as effective as possible.
33.	Scope Of Work	4. Program Integrity Business Requirements 4.2 Mandatory Requirements	8	4.2.4 The proposed product must alert State staff to potential cases of fraud, waste and abuse in an interactive format. Is the State looking for <u>automated</u> alerts that notify specific users of possible fraud, abuse, or waste, or is the State seeking a standardized reporting system that, after running a standardized report will flag potential issues?	The State is asking about the ability to identify potential cases of fraud, waste or abuse automatically and provide an alert to the users. This alert could be accomplished in a number of ways including but not limited to an online report, an email or a dashboard function.
34.	Scope Of Work	4. Program Integrity Business Requirements 4.2 Mandatory Requirements	8	4.2.6 Drill-down capabilities must available both by Provider and by member. Should the proposed solution also provide drill-down capabilities by the Managed Care Plan?	Additional drill-down capabilities are encouraged, but they are not required by the RFP.
35.	Scope Of Work	4. Program Integrity Business Requirements	8	4.2.10 The proposed system must satisfy the Program Integrity Checklist as defined by the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) Medicaid	If the system requires certification as part of the State PMMIS, the State will coordinate that certification with CMS.

PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
		4.2 Mandatory Requirements		Enterprise Certification Toolkit (MECT). The program integrity checklist and more information about the MECT can be found at : http://www.cms.hhs.gov/MMIS/09_MECT.asp#TopOfPage Who will be responsible, from a resource perspective to obtain CMS certification?	The vendor would be responsible for ensuring that the system meets the certification requirements if applicable.
36.	Scope Of Work	4. Program Integrity Business Requirements 4.2 Mandatory Requirements	8	4.2.11.1 Project Management Plan: The Contractor shall provide a project management plan using a proposed project start date of February 1, 2010 Please confirm the start date is correct.	The project management plan should be submitted using a start date of May 1, 2010 as stated on page 52.
37.	Scope Of Work	4. Program Integrity Business Requirements 4.2 Mandatory Requirements	8	4.2.11.1 Does the State have an estimated “go live” for this project? Please provide some expectation in terms of your role in approving the milestones? Should Offerors expect approval or denial of milestones with 5 days, 10 days, etc. so that we can provide the appropriate project planning to meet the schedule?	The State is interested in gaining benefits from the system as quickly as possible, so the implementation time frame should be as effective as possible. The project work plan dates will be finalized after the contract has been awarded.
38.	Scope of Work - Program Integrity Business Requirements -AND- Exhibit A	4.2.11.1 Project Management Plan -AND- Ex. A, Sec. 4.2.11	8; 52	Page 8 states the Project Management Plan should use a proposed start date of February 1, 2010 ; but page 52 states the Project Management Plan should use a proposed project start date of May 1, 2010 . Please clarify which start date should be used in the Project Management Plan.	The project management plan should be submitted using a start date of May 1, 2010 as stated on page 52.
39.	Scope of Work	4.3.1/Optional Functionality	9	Is “Multiple Procedures” referring to unbundling of payment edits?	Please refer to the National Correct Coding Initiative Coding Policy Manual for Medicare Services (Coding Policy Manual) for complete definitions, descriptions and examples. This information is available on the

**PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
					CMS website at: http://www.cms.hhs.gov/NationalCorrectCodInitEd/
40.	Scope of Work - Program Integrity Business Requirements	Section 4.2.11.4 – System Documentation	9	AHCCCS is requesting a hosted system. Why does AHCCCS need system documentation if this a hosted system? How will AHCCCS use the system documentation?	The State needs assurance that system documentation exists and is appropriate for the application.
41.	Scope Of Work	4. Program Integrity Business Requirements	9	4.2.11.2 How many users will require training? And, at what level of system use—casual, intermediate, or power user?	<p>Depending on the functionality provided by the system, several divisions within AHCCCS may also access the system. This could include the Office of the Inspector General, Division of Health Care Management, the Division of Fee-for-Service Management, the Office of the Director, Information Services Division and others. In total, AHCCCS envisions approximately 30 users within the Agency.</p> <p>The State would also like to have the ability to make the system available to approximately 50 personnel from multiple Managed Care Organizations if possible. The ability of the system to security based on the MCO would be desirable.</p> <p>The proposal should allow for a maximum of 10 additional users for the State of Hawaii.</p>
42.	Scope Of Work	4. Program Integrity Business Requirements 4.3 Optional Functionality	9	4.3.3 references the 'appropriate use and validation of Modifiers on both professional and facility claims'. Is the State prepared to work with the vendor in defining the appropriateness of use and validation of Modifiers or is the State requesting a predictive system or analytical staff to provide this information on part of the vendor?	The State will work with the vendor to define the appropriateness of use and validation of Modifiers.

**PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
43.	Scope Of Work	4. Program Integrity Business Requirements 4.3 Optional Functionality	9	4.3.1 Does the proposed system provide enhanced analysis of the use of payment editing capabilities? Examples of desired edits include but are not limited to: ... Does this pertain to an upgrade to the PMMIS or post payment review? Does this question pertain to adding an upgrade to the actual PMMIS claim processing or in the activity of post payment review?	No decision has been made about how any editing capabilities will be used by the State.
44.	Scope of Work	4, Program Integrity Business Requirements , Optional Functionality , 4.3.9	10	Does the State currently use a case tracking system? If yes, is it the State’s intention to have the cases in that system converted into the new case tracking system?	Yes, the State has an in-house developed Case Tracking System. The State may chose to convert the existing data if an automated method can be provided by the vendor.
45.	Scope of Work	4, Program Integrity Business Requirements , Optional Functionality , 4.3.13	10	How does the state define “risk group”?	“Risk Group” is a term used to categorize our populations based on age, sex and other health care cost factors.
46.	Scope of Work	4.3.7, Optional Functionality	10	What is meant by form types? (i.e. institutional vs. professional)	“Forms” is a term used to refer to the type of form used to submit a claim. Examples are CMS-1500, UB04, etc.
47.	Scope Of Work	4. Program Integrity Business Requirements 4.3 Optional Functionality	10	4.3.8 As we understand it, AZ currently performs CCI editing. According to the Provider Manuals, AZ currently uses CCI editing for professional and ASC claims. Please clarify the RFP requirement: 4.3.8 Does the proposed system support CCI edits or both professional and facility claims as defined by the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services.	The State’s PMMIS does perform some CCI edits. The complete list of CCI edits is posted on the CMS website. If additional functionality or performance benefits are available, the State may be interested in implementing CCI edits in lieu of those developed in house.

PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
				Please clarify what additional type of functionality the state desires for this requirement. (see the following notes). We are looking for clarification.	
48.	Scope Of Work	4. Program Integrity Business Requirements 4.3 Optional Functionality	10	4.3.12 Does the proposed system provide simplified and complex analysis of encounter data including summary counts and advanced drill-down/up capabilities for detail counts by category, e.g., contractor, form type, service provider type, category of service, procedure code and/or procedure classification, and diagnosis? Please provide an example of 'Complex' vs. 'Simple' analysis of encounter data.	Please refer to the National Correct Coding Initiative Coding Policy Manual for Medicare Services (Coding Policy Manual) for complete definitions, descriptions and examples. This information is available on the CMS website at: http://www.cms.hhs.gov/NationalCorrectCodInitEd/
49.	Scope of Work - Program Integrity Business Requirements	4.4.3 Other General Functionality	11	What is the desired database update frequency?	There is no required frequency. The State processes eligibility and enrollment on a daily basis, claims on a weekly basis and encounters twice monthly. The data load frequency will be dependent on the data needs of the proposed system.
50.	Scope Of Work	4. Program Integrity Business Requirements 4.4 Other General Functionality	11	4.4.1 Assumes a level of Claims History will be loaded to support data analytics? How many years of Claims History is the state expecting to be loaded to support Fraud and Abuse Detection and reporting to the Attorney General?	Historical data for Claims, Encounters, member Demographics, Eligibility, Enrollment, Provider and managed Care Contracts are available dating back to December 31, 2000. The State will work with the vendor to determine the appropriate amount of historical data needed to support the system.
51.	Pricing Schedule	n/a	n/a	At the pre-proposal conference, the concept of a benefits funded contract was posed as an alternative price model. Under a benefits-funded contract, the vendor is compensated based on a percentage of the benefits generated and the State retains the remainder of the benefit. Can the Offeror propose an alternative benefits funded solution for the price model and solution?	The pricing for the proposal must fall within one of the two categories required by the RFP. Alternative pricing strategies will not be evaluated at this time.

PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
52.	Pricing Schedule	1. Pricing Schedules	12	<p>The RFP language states: “The Offeror shall complete one of the following pricing schedules ...”. Can the State clarify which of the following is desired:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Bidders should complete only one (1) of the four (4) schedules shown; (2) Bidders should complete all four (4) of the pricing schedules (i.e., A1, A2, B1 and B2); or (3) Bidders should complete either both schedules for Fixed Price (i.e., Schedules A1 and A2) or both schedules for Per Member Price (i.e., Schedules B1 and B2)? 	<p>If the offeror chooses to provide a fixed price bid, then schedules A1 needs to be completed. If the offeror chooses to offer their services to both the State of Arizona and the State of Hawaii, then Schedule A2 should be also be completed.</p> <p>If the offeror chooses to provide a per member bid, then Schedule B1 needs to be completed. If the offeror chooses to offer their services to both the State of Arizona and the State of Hawaii, then Schedule B2 should be also be completed.</p>
53.	Pricing Schedule	1. Pricing Schedules	12	<p>Will the State separate the pricing schedules for the Mandatory and the Optional requirements so that the value/price for the Optional Services can be clearly distinguished from the price for the Mandatory requirements?</p>	<p>The State does not intend to differentiate scores for pricing for Mandatory and Optional Services in the Pricing Schedule.</p> <p>The proposals will be evaluated on the functionality outlined in sections 4.2 (Mandatory Requirements), 4.3 (Optional Functionality) and 4.4 (Other General Functionality). Additional functionality may be submitted as part of the proposal but will not be considered in the evaluation.</p> <p>If the vendor chooses, they may submit information about additional products or functionality that are NOT included as part of the proposal but as an addendum to the proposal. The addendum should clearly state that the products or functionality are not included in the proposal. No information in the addendum will be used in the evaluation of the proposal.</p>
54.	Pricing Schedule	1. Pricing Schedules	12	<p>If the State separates the pricing schedules for the Mandatory vs. the Optional requirements, would the State further agree to have the Vendors price the Optional requirements on an ‘a la carte’ basis so the State could ‘pick and choose’ those Optional requirements that offer the best added value to the State?</p>	<p>The State does not intend to differentiate scores for pricing for Mandatory and Optional Services in the Pricing Schedule.</p> <p>The proposals will be evaluated on the functionality outlined in sections 4.2 (Mandatory Requirements), 4.3</p>

PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
					<p>(Optional Functionality) and 4.4 (Other General Functionality). Additional functionality may be submitted as part of the proposal but will not be considered in the evaluation.</p> <p>If the vendor chooses, they may submit information about additional products or functionality that are NOT included as part of the proposal but as an addendum to the proposal. The addendum should clearly state that the products or functionality are not included in the proposal. No information in the addendum will be used in the evaluation of the proposal.</p>
55.	Pricing Schedule	Pricing Schedule	12	The Offeror is required to complete one of the following pricing schedules; either a Fixed Annual Fee (Schedule A) or an annual fee based on the average monthly member enrollment count (Schedule B). Can an Offeror submit both Price Schedules for consideration?	Yes, the proposal can include both pricing schedules.
56.	Pricing Schedule	Pricing Schedule	12	Should the Offeror provide any cost justifications or backup for the Fixed Fee prices?	The Offeror may include cost justifications as part of the Written Narrative section if they so choose.
57.	Pricing Schedule	Pricing Schedule	12	Should the Offeror include the Price Schedules in the overall proposal response or should this be a separate proposal volume?	It should be included in the overall proposal.
58.	Pricing Schedule	Pricing Schedule	12	Can multiple bids be submitted if a company has 1 product that supports the mandatory requirements and another that supports optional requirements?	Yes, a vendor can submit multiple bids, but to be considered, they must be responsive to the RFP.
59.	Pricing Schedule	3.Sanctions	13	What constitutes 'non-compliance'?	Failure to fulfill the terms of the contract.
60.	Pricing Schedule	Section 2 – Assumptions	13	In order for the State to make better comparison between Vendors' costs, would the State consider a minimum number of assumptions to be included in the pricing (e.g., number of users, number of years in the database, frequency of database updates)? Would the State consider requiring vendors to segment implementation cost from the Year 1 cost in the cost sheet?	<p>Licensing terms or restrictions on the product use should be stated in the Written Narrative section of the proposal.</p> <p>For the purpose of this proposal, the RFP does not ask for up front or implementation costs separate from the Year 1 costs.</p>

PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
61.	Pricing Schedule	Section 3 – Sanctions	13	This section states, “ <i>AHCCCS may impose liquidated damages to Contractor for non-compliance</i> ” occurrences. What is a non-compliance occurrence? Normally, this type of liquidated damage provision would specify the particular events that would trigger liquidated damages. Can AHCCCS be more specific regarding non-compliance occurrences?	Failure to fulfill the terms of the contract.
62.	Pricing Schedule	Section 4 – Payment	13	This section states, “ <i>AHCCCS will begin making monthly payments after the program has been up and running for one full month</i> ”. How and when will payment be made for the necessary system implementation activities?	Pricing for the proposal must fall into the categories as described in the RFP. There is no provision for implementation costs.
63.	Pricing Schedule	2	13	Please provide the annual volume for pharmacy claims.	In calendar year 2009, we received 169,223 pharmacy claims.
64.	Pricing Schedule	Payment	13	We typically see a DDI price so that the State can claim Fed Funds to pay for the installation. Would the State like to provide a separate DDI price for the system?	For the purpose of this proposal, the RFP does not ask for up front or implementation costs separate from the Year 1 costs.
65.	Pricing Schedule	Payment	13	The Pricing Section calls for <i>either</i> Price Per Member or Fixed Price. We respectfully ask that the State require Vendors to provide the same information, either have us provide the pricing as fixed, or have us provide it as Per Member or both, something that allows the State to fairly compare the vendors offers.	The State believes that either pricing method will allow the State to fairly compare proposals.
66.	Pricing Schedule	Payment	13	AHCCCS will begin making monthly payments after the program has been up and running for one full month. How about something tied to a project plan milestone?	This can be negotiated with the awardee(s).

PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
67.	Pricing Schedule	Payment	13	4. Payment Do we need a definition for up and running since our payment is tied to this?	Providing the services as stated in the offer for one full month and accepted by the system.
68.	Pricing Schedule	Sanctions	13	Non-Compliance Could the State please define the term and situations of the concept of non-compliance?	Failure to fulfill the terms of the contract.
69.	Pricing Schedule	Payment	13	In the RFP, it calls for Mandatory Requirements and then has Optional and Other General functionality. We respectfully ask that the State have a price section for mandatory requirements and then a section for each of the other two sets of requirements. We believe this will result in a much better set of options for the State to choose from and compare bids. We believe this will allow the State to get firm proposals for the “Base System” that they require and then they can look at what each vendor brings for the Optional and Other General.	The State does not intend to differentiate the prices for Mandatory and Optional Services in the Pricing Schedule. The proposal will be evaluated for cost effectiveness in its entirety. A vendor can submit multiple bids, if so desired.
70.	Uniform Instructions to Offerors, Definition of Terms	1.22	15	Should the term ‘State’ also mean the State of Hawaii?	No, for contract purposes, the State refers only to the State of Arizona.
71.	Uniform Instructions to Offerors, Award	6. Award	20	Would there be a separate Award (and, therefore, a separate Contract) between the vendor and the State of Arizona and between the vendor and the State of Hawaii? Do the Contract terms included in the RFP apply to both Arizona and Hawaii?	The contract award would be with the State of Arizona. Therefore, the contract terms apply only to the State of Arizona. The State of Hawaii is under contract with AHCCCS.
72.	Special Instructions to Offerors	3.2 Cost	22	Does the State want the Cost Proposal as a separate document, or embedded as a Section within the body of a single Proposal?	It should be embedded as a section within the body of the proposal.
73.	Special Instructions to Offerors	3.3 Experience and Expertise of the Firm	23	Section 3.3 on page 23 states that the Offeror must provide Experience and Expertise of the Firm including a minimum of 3 references in the proposal response limited to 10 pages	The Experience and Expertise of the Firm is limited to 10 pages and includes 3 references.

PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
				max. Is that correct?	
74.	Special Instructions to Offerors	3.3 Experience and Expertise of the Firm	23	Please clarify whether the 10-page limit for this section includes pages used for providing references, organizational chart, and other pertinent information (items 3.3.2, 3.3.3, and 3.3.4)?	The ten page limit applies to all information for section 3.3
75.	Special Instructions to Offerors -AND- Exhibit A	3.3 Experience and Expertise of the Firm; Exhibit A, item 1 and 4.2.11	23, 48, 52	May the proposal include appendices or supplemental materials? Do the page limits listed in these three sections include appendices or supplemental materials that may be provided?	The proposals must abide by the page limits. However, as denoted in section 3.1.2 on Page 22, "Additional documentation may be included by the Vendor to more clearly describe its ability to meet a requirement. References to this documentation may be included in the Vendor comments section of Exhibit A."
76.	Uniform Terms and Conditions	Exclusions, Fitness and Implied Contract Terms, Sections 15, 17 and 20, respectively	27, 29 and 30	<p>Section 15 is inconsistent with Sections 17 and 20. For instance, Section 20 states that each provision of law is part of the contract as if fully stated in the contract. Arizona law contains implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. See Title 47, Sections 2314, 2315, and 2316. Section 17 contains an express warranty of fitness for a particular purpose. On the other hand, the intent of Section 15 is to exclude these implied warranties, which is permitted under Title 47, Section 2316.</p> <p>In addition to the need to reconcile conflicting provisions, if both the express warranty of fitness for a particular purpose and the implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose were to be expressly disclaimed, the State would benefit from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State would likely enjoy lower pricing from bidders since they would not have to price the cost of a very open ended warranty that any contractor will have difficulty meeting • The State can still benefit from other express warranties that the Contractor will meet the requirements of the 	We are not allowed to deviate from the State's approved "Uniform Terms and Conditions."

PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
				<p>contract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An express disclaimer of implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose is permitted and enforceable under Arizona law. <p>Will the State amend the RFP to contain an express exclusion of the implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose as well as remove any express warranty of fitness for a particular purpose?</p>	
77.	Uniform Terms and Conditions	Indemnification – Patent and Copyright, Section 21	30	<p>Intellectual property infringement indemnities are both typical and appropriate for a contractor to provide. There are, however, several provisions that are missing in the language found in Section 21 whose inclusion would be (a) likely to lead to lower costs from a bidder and (b) standard and customary for contracts such as the one envisioned by this RFP.</p> <p>Will the State amend the RFP to add the following language or something substantially similar?</p> <p>“The State of Arizona shall provide reasonable assistance to the Contractor as well as sole control and authority over the Contractor’s defense or settlement of any claim covered by the foregoing indemnity. If Contractor’s indemnity is triggered, Contractor shall (a) replace or modify the service or material that gives rise to the infringement, (b) obtain the rights for Contractor and the State to provide and receive the service or material that previously gave rise to the infringement claim or (c), if neither (a) or (b) are available, Contractor’s sole and exclusive liability and the State’s entire remedy shall be limited to a prorate refund of the fees paid during the period covered by the infringement. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Contractor’s indemnity shall not apply to the use of any services or materials in a manner by the State that is not authorized by the Contractor</p>	We are not allowed to deviate from the State’s approved “Uniform Terms and Conditions.”

**PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
78.	Uniform Terms and Conditions	Non-exclusive Remedies, Section 30	31	<p>hereunder.</p> <p>One of the remedies available at law to a purchaser of services and products, such as the State, is holding a Contractor liable for consequential damages as well as liability for any actual damages incurred by the State, regardless of the amount or its relationship to the amount payable to the Contractor under the Contract. Section 30, as written, has the very open-ended exposure for any Contractor.</p> <p>While such a provision may at first blush appear to be highly desirable for the State to have, the following advantages would inure to the State if the RFP were to be amended so as to exclude either party's right to recover consequential damages and to limit the contractor's liability for direct damages to the amount payable under the contract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enables the State to benefit from lower pricing since contractors don't have to price this risk into their bids. 2. Enables the State to receive bids from truly responsive and responsible bidders. Many financially capable and responsive bidders will not accept this type of liability. Those who do often don't have the assets to make the contractual remedy meaningful for the State. 3. Is permitted under Arizona Law. See Chapter 47-2719. <p>Based on the above, would the State consider deleting this Section (30) and substituting the following Limitation of Liability provision or something substantially similar:</p> <p>"30. Limitation of Remedy: Notwithstanding anything</p>	We are not allowed to deviate from the State's approved "Uniform Terms and Conditions."

PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
				<p>to the contrary in this Contract, in no event shall either party be liable for consequential, incidental, indirect or special damages, including, without limitation, lost profits, arising out of the services provided under this Contract or any other aspect of this Contract.</p> <p>Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Contract, Contractor's liability and the State's entire remedy, in the case of actual damages incurred by the State as a result of the Contractor's performance hereunder, whether based in contract, tort or otherwise, shall not exceed the State's actual damages and in no event greater, in the aggregate, than the total amount payable hereunder.</p> <p>The foregoing limitation of liability provisions shall not apply to claims involving bodily injury, property damage, or death to the extent caused by either party nor to breaches of confidentiality obligations.'"</p>	
79.	Special Terms and Conditions	Contract Cancellation (Immediate), Section 6 and Contract Cancellation (Minimum 10 Day), Section 7	36 and 37	<p>There are two Contract Cancellation provisions in the Special Terms and Conditions portion of the RFP. Section 6 provides no cure period whatsoever while Section 7 permits a 10 day cure period or such longer cure period as the Contracting Officer may determine. As such, these two Special Terms and Conditions are in direct conflict.</p> <p>In addition to the need to reconcile this conflict, Section 7 is preferable for both parties over Section 6. The reason for this preference is that the remedies of cancellation, while important, are drastic. It would be more cost efficient in the long term to at least give the Contractor a chance to cure the breach prior to having to resort to a remedy that will involve time delays in permitting the State to achieve its objectives.</p>	AHCCCS reserves the right to cancel the contract in either manner.

**PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
				Will the State delete Section 6 of the Special Terms and Conditions?	
80.	Special Terms and Conditions	Indemnification Clause, Section 21	40; 41	<p>General indemnities are both typical and appropriate for a contractor to provide. There are, however, several provisions that are missing in the language found in Section 21 whose inclusion would be (a) likely to lead to lower costs from a bidder and (b) standard and customary for contracts such as the one envisioned by this RFP.</p> <p>Will the State amend the RFP to add the following language or something substantially similar?</p> <p>“The State of Arizona shall provide prompt written notice, reasonable assistance to the Contractor as well as sole control and authority over the Contractor’s defense or settlement of any claim covered by the foregoing indemnity. Contractor’s indemnity is subject to the Limitation of Remedy set forth in Section 30 of the Uniform Terms and Conditions.”</p>	The Arizona Department of Administration, Risk Management Department, developed the indemnification language for use by all State agencies, and therefore, the language will not be revised.
81.	Special Terms and Conditions	Section 9 – Cooperation with other Contractors	38	<p>What type of cooperation under Section 9 is contemplated?</p> <p>What would be examples of such cooperation?</p>	If multiple awards are made, AHCCCS would expect the various contractors to cooperate, if requested by AHCCCS. An example might be to attend a phone or in -person meeting at the same time, if requested by AHCCCS. AHCCCS would want to ensure interfaces or discuss program capability.
82.	Special Terms and Conditions	7. Contract Cancellation (Minimum 10 Day)	38	Would AHCCCS consider a longer minimum cure period (such as 20 days), as some problems are quite complex and this may be insufficient time in which to resolve them?	AHCCCS is open to discussing this provision during the “Discussions” phase prior to award, or if there are no Discussions, after contract award and then providing a contract amendment. This will be determined on a case-by-case basis.
83.	Special Terms and Conditions	13. Disclosure of Confidential Information	39	Will the State consider making this provision mutual, so Contractor’s proprietary information is protected, unless appropriate access or confidentiality agreements are	AHCCCS is open to discussing this issue with the awardee, and may consider a contract amendment.

**PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
				executed with a 3rd party?	
84.	Special Terms and Conditions	23. Key Personnel	44	What is the definition of key personnel? Who does AHCCCS consider to be key personnel?	Project Manager or Contractor's authorized representative.
85.	Special Terms And Conditions	General Comment	n/a	Is the State willing to limit the liability to a commercially reasonable amount or to an amount often seen in other Government contracts for the scope in this procurement?	No.
86.	Exhibit A - System Technology and Functional Capability	D / E	48	Is it correct that item D is to fill in an E in the table, and item E is to fill in F in the table?	Valid values for the Vendor Response column are A,B,C,E or F., as described in the instructions.
87.	Exhibit A	2.1 How to Respond to Questions with Vendor Response Column	48	Please define more specifically what is meant by "B", with examples if possible.	A "B" indicates that the proposed system has the capability to meet a specific functional requirement but that some end user activity is required to configure the system. For example, covered versus uncovered procedures would need to be defined by the State. The proposed system should provide a means of performing that configuration.
88.	Exhibit A	2.1 How to Respond to Questions with Vendor Response Column	48	Item D reads: " <i>Place an E in this column...</i> " and Item E reads, " <i>Place an F in this column...</i> " However, these seem to be typographical errors. To be consistent with the A, B, and C lettering, shouldn't these be a "D" and an "E", respectively?	Valid values for the Vendor Response column are A,B,C,E or F., as described in the instructions. For clarity, the items labels 2.1.A through 2.1.F should be treated as Bullet items under 2.1.
89.	Exhibit A - System Technology and Functional Capability	1. Written Narrative	48	On page 48, it states that the Offeror should present a 15-page maximum Written Narrative demonstrating the method or manner in which the Offeror proposes to satisfy the requirements of the services described in the Scope of Work. This 15-page write-up will precede the Exhibit A that details the Offeror's response for the mandatory requirements and optional functionality. Is there a page limit for Exhibit A that is required to be completed?	The written narrative is limited to 15 pages. The 15 page limit does not apply to Appendix A. Within Appendix A, the Project Management plan is restricted to 10 pages.

PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
90.	Exhibit A	4.2.1, 4.2.7, 4.2.10	50; 51	Although not explicitly required in the RFP, these two requirements suggest that Arizona is intending for the new Program Integrity software and services to include both 'SUR' (Surveillance Utilization Review) and 'FAD' (Fraud Analysis and Detection) capabilities. Is this a correct interpretation of the RFP requirements and will Arizona be replacing their current SUR systems with the new Program Integrity software and services?	The State does not currently employ a SUR system.
91.	Exhibit A - System Technology and Functional Capability	4.2.11 Project Management Plan	52	Section 4.2.11 on page 52 states that the Offeror shall provide a Project Management Plan in the proposal response limited to 10 pages. Is that correct?	Within Appendix A, the Project Management plan is restricted to 10 pages.
92.	Exhibit A - System Technology and Functional Capability	4.2.11 Project Management Plan	52	In Section 4.2.11 on page 52, it references a proposed start date of May 1, 2010 and on page 8 it references a start date of February 1, 2010. Please clarify.	The project management plan should be submitted using a start date of May 1, 2010 as stated on page 52.
93.	Exhibit A - System Technology and Functional Capability	Documentation	53	Is it expected that the Documentation section of Exhibit A also has a Vendor Response from A to F?	Yes, valid values for the Vendor Response column are A,B,C,E or F., as described in the instructions.
94.	Exhibit A - System Technology and Functional Capability	4.2.12 - 4.2.14, User Training, User Documentation, System Documentation	53	Is the contractor required to provide the completed materials and documentation in our proposal response? Or, should the contractor provide a response of how we will provide this documentation after contract award? If the contractor provides a sample of our documentation, is there a page limit requirement and is this page limit part of the 10 page Project Management Plan section?	The documentation does not need to be provided as part of the proposal.
95.	Exhibit A	4.3.1	54	Is the State asking for this 'enhanced analysis' post-payment or pre-payment (or both)?	The State will consider both pre-payment and post-payment analysis.

**PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
96.	Exhibit A	4.3.4, 4.3.7	55	Will the State please provide an explicit description of what they mean by the term 'forms' in this requirement? One possible interpretation is different 'claim types' (e.g., encounter vs. fee for service).	"Forms" is term used to refer to the type of form used to submit a claim. Examples are CMS-1500, UB04, etc.
97.	Exhibit D	Requirement #4	64	The instructions for this section state that the Vendor must "provide the page number where this item is located within your proposal". Requirement #4 is "Copies of proposal submitted as one (1) marked "Original" and four (4) copies plus (1) CD." As this requirement seems to refer to the overall proposal (rather than a specific section thereof), can AHCCCS elaborate on what is expected in terms of providing page numbers for Requirement #4?	The page number can be left blank for this checklist item.
98.	Exhibit E, HIPAA Business Associate Addendum		65-68	Will the State negotiate supplemental provisions to the Business Associate Addendum so that it complies not only with HIPAA but also with the HITECH Act of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009?	If the vendor can identify any provisions of HITECH that require amendment to the BAA, AHCCCS will amend the BAA to conform to the HITECH.
99.	Exhibit E	Item 3(c)	65	This item requires Business Associate to comply with the AHCCCS health information privacy and security policies and procedures. Please make those policies and procedures available for vendor review.	We can make this available to the awardee. Unfortunately, this information is available on the Infonet (AHCCCS internal website), but not on our public website.
100.	Exhibit E	14. Reporting	67	Would AHCCCS consider a different reporting time period, such as "no more than 48 hours" after Business Associate learns of unauthorized use or disclosure?	No.
101.	General			Will there be a public opening of bids? If so, what will the process be?	Yes, please refer to paragraph #10, of the Uniform Instructions to Offerors. Vendors may also email the RFP contact person after the opening for a list of offerors. Pricing will not be disclosed.
102.	General			What is the main priority - clinical edits or fraud detection?	Fraud Detection is the main priority of this RFP. However, any activity that may provide a reduction in

**PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES**

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
					costs will be considered.
103.	General			What do you use now for clinical edits?	Clinical edits are performed by custom software in our Pre-Paid Medical Management Information Systems (PMMIS).
104.	General			Do you have a defined priority on rules vs. anomaly detection vs. advanced analytics?	No, priorities have not been established. The State is open to any solutions that identify and help alleviate fraud, waste and abuse.
105.	General			How will advanced analytics (e.g., predictive modeling) be evaluated in the RFP?	The State is looking for existing, proven solutions. The State anticipates that references can be provided to validate any claims made in the RFP.
106.	General			Are there any restrictions on teaming with other vendors?	Teaming with other vendors is acceptable as long as the terms and conditions of the RFP are met.
107.	General			Is the project currently funded? What are the budget constraints?	The State has received conditional approvals for this project from both the Arizona Government Information Technology Agency (GITA) and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). Funding will be finalized after a vendor has been selected.
108.	General			Is there an incumbent or incumbents? If so, who are the incumbent vendors? Will these vendors' current contracts overlap with the proposed scope of work?	No. There is no incumbent providing Program Integrity services to the State.
109.	General			In order to create an effective RFP response, it is important to understand how the provider profiling data will be utilized. Could you describe how the data will be used to promote program integrity? Will it be used to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Educate physicians? 2. Support provider contracts? 3. Inform the modification of reimbursement design? 4. Impose financial penalties or sanctions? 5. Other options? 	Actions to be taken will be determined on a case by case basis and could include any of the options listed. The most important process is reducing costs.
110.	General			The RFP appears to focus on retrospective review of expenditures and activities but appears to allow vendors to	The State has developed the RFP with a focus on Program Integrity functions. The proposals will be

PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
				include new technologies or approaches to program integrity. Is AHCCCS open to the inclusion of investigative and preventative technologies including provider/applicant screening, predictive modeling and other approaches that detect or prevent fraudulent activity before it occurs?	<p>evaluated on the functionality outlined in sections 4.2 (Mandatory Requirements), 4.3 (Optional Functionality) and 4.4 (Other General Functionality). Additional functionality may be submitted as part of the proposal but will not be considered in the evaluation.</p> <p>If the vendor chooses, they may submit information about additional products or functionality that are NOT included as part of the proposal but as an addendum to the proposal. The addendum should clearly state that the products or functionality are not included in the proposal. No information in the addendum will be used in the evaluation of the proposal.</p>
111.	General			Is the bid looking for provider profiling in the classic manner, or is the bid looking for judgments on the appropriateness of service by providers conducted on an individual basis?	We are not sure exactly what is meant by “classic manner.” The State is interested in products that will help identify fraud, waste and abuse and sees Provider profiling as one of those methods.
112.	General			As part of the contract will the vendor have direct involvement in any provider or plan communication?	The State is not asking the vendor for any direct involvement with provider or plan communications.
113.	General			Does AHCCCS anticipate growth in the user base over life of contract?	The number of users should not change significantly over the life of the project.
114.	General			What is the required frequency of data loads?	There is no required frequency. The State processes eligibility and enrollment on a daily basis, claims on a weekly basis and encounters twice monthly. The data load frequency will be dependent on the data needs of the proposed system.
115.	General			What is the volume of adjustments to be processed?	For all form types, we receive 11.2 million encounters, 1.4 million encounter adjustments, 3.9 million FFS claims and 1.4 million FFS adjustments annually.

PROGRAM INTEGRITY
Request For Proposal (RFP) #YH10-0002
QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question #	Section Name	Paragraph #/Title	Page #	Question	Response
116.	General			Is the current DW/DS Cognos environment licensed on a named user basis?	Yes. The State is licensed for 50 named users of BI Professional for Windows.
117.	General			What is the State's preferred timeframe for the implementation time period? Will a phased implementation be considered?	The State is interested in gaining benefits from the system as quickly as possible, so the implementation time frame should be as effective as possible.
118.	General			Since the RFP contemplates awarding this contract to more than one vendor, will AHCCCS consider proposals that are for cost containment/recovery services only and that do not include a system component?	Any proposal must meet the requirements as stated in the RFP.
119.	General			Will AHCCCS publish a list of attendees at the Pre-Proposal Conference?	The list of attendees at the pre-proposal conference is available upon request. Send an email requesting the list to Jamey.Schultz@azahcccs.gov.
120.	General			The certification requires the vendor to identify if they qualify as a small business. How is this requirement incorporated into the evaluation process? Do vendors receive additional evaluation points if they qualify as a small vendor?	The Arizona Procurement Code does not provide preference to small businesses for procurements over \$50,000. This statement is used for an annual report which includes tracking awards to small businesses.
121.	General			What is the projected annual growth in AHCCCS membership and MedQUEST membership and processed claims?	Historically, AHCCCS has seen annual growth rate of 15 to 20%. However, membership and claims volumes may be significantly impacted by legislation currently under consideration at both the State and Federal levels.