

RFP Questions and Clarifications Memorandum

To: Vendors Responding to RFP Number 4111 for the Mississippi Division of Medicaid and the Mississippi Department of Human Services (DOM/DHS)

From: Craig P. Orgeron, Ph.D.

Date: June 28, 2019

Subject: Responses to Questions Submitted and Clarifications to Specifications

Contact Name: Jeannie Williford

Contact Phone Number: 601-432-8052

Contact E-mail Address: jeannie.williford@its.ms.gov

RFP Number 4111 is hereby amended as follows:

1.	Section VII, Item No. 4 Project Procurement Schedule is hereby modified.	
	Task	Date
	First Advertisement Date	May 21, 2019
	Second Advertisement Date	May 28, 2019
	Mandatory Vendor Web Conference	June 6, 2019 At 2:00 p.m. Central Time
	Deadline for Vendor's Written Questions	June 12, 2019
	Delay Memo Posted for Questions Answered and Posted to ITS Web Site	June 27, 2019
	Deadline for Questions Answered and Posted to ITS Web Site	June 28, 2019 June 27, 2019
	Open Proposals	July 17, 2019
	Begin Evaluation of Proposals	July 18, 2019
	Begin Contract Negotiation	August 08, 2019
	ITS Board Approval	August 15, 2019
	Federal Approvals (CMS/FNS) Estimate	August 15, 2019
	Estimated Project Implementation Start-up	October 14, 2019

2.	RFP Page 33 - Section VII.1.2 is amended as follows:	<p>VII, 1.2 Page 33</p> <p>1.2 The Vendor must respond with "ACKNOWLEDGED", "WILL COMPLY", or "AGREED" to each point in this section. In addition, Vendors must respond to each specification in Section VII, Items 3 through 16 5 through 22, with a narrative description <u>for all requirements that require a response beyond Acknowledged, Will Comply, or Agreed. Examples include requirements that use terms such as describe, explain, identify, or specify.</u> Failure to provide the information requested will result in the Vendor receiving a lower score for that item, or, at the State's sole discretion, being subject to disqualification. The description must include the following:</p> <p>1.2.1 A description of the methodology Vendor will use to accomplish each requirement, in order to demonstrate the Vendor's understanding of this RFP.</p> <p>1.2.2 Information about past performance results for similar work in a fraud and abuse environment; lessons learned from those projects and how they will be applied to this project.</p>
3.	RFP Page 37, Section VII, 5.6 is hereby amended. The second sentence is amended to read as follows:	<p>Section VII, 5.6 Page 37</p> <p>All Payments shall have a 45% 20% retainage payable after the warranty period (See Section VII, Item 17).</p>
4.	RFP Page 41 Section VII 6.3.6 is amended as follows:	<p>RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.6. Page 41</p> <p>6.3.6 The State of Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services (ITS) currently has an Agreement with LexisNexis to provide data services. The agreement can be viewed from the State of Mississippi Transparency site: Contracts>Contracts">http://www.transparency.mississippi.gov/>Contracts>Contracts by Agency>Department of Human Services>Purchasing (General)>Vendor>LEXIS NEXIS RISK.</p> <p>https://www.msegov.com/dfa/transparency/default.aspx</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Select Contracts</u> 2. <u>Under MAGIC Implementation – Budget Year 2015 Forward, select the hyperlink for State of Mississippi Contracts.</u> <p><u>The Navigation Column on the left side of the opening page offers Input Controls and Contract Filters.</u></p> <p><u>In the Navigation Column, select the following controls and filters:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>View Contracts by - Select Contract Details</u> 2. <u>Agency - Select Department of Human Services</u> 3. <u>Vendor -Select LEXIS NEXIS RISK SOLUTIONS FL</u> <p><u>On the filtered page, click on the Hyperlink to Contract ID 8200003101</u></p> <p><u>The page opens to Contract Expenditures and Attachments. The hyperlinks underneath the column labeled Contract Attachments will provide access to the contract and its amendments.</u></p>

5.	RFP Page 54, Section VII.10.12.16 is modified to include an asterisk to mark it as a deliverable requiring a sample as specified in Item 10.12, Page 51.	
	VII, 10.12.16 Page 54	<u>10.12.16</u> <u>Fraud Detection Plan*</u>

Vendor must include in their proposal a response to each amended requirement as listed above. Vendor must respond using the same terminology as provided in the *How to Respond* instructions included in RFP No. 4111 and Attachment A to RFP No. 4111.

The following questions were submitted to ITS and are being presented as they were submitted, except to remove any reference to a specific vendor and to correct any incorrect RFP cites. This information should assist you in formulating your response.

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Question 1	RFP Section II, No. 8.	Is it the State's desire that respondents restate each RFP section in its entirety prior to responding? If so, can the State please specify which sections this applies to?
Response		Yes, the State prefers to see the requirement restated above the Vendor response because it is helpful to evaluators. This would apply to all requirements demanding a response from the Vendor. Vendor must not alter or rekey any of the original text of this RFP. If the State determines that the Vendor has altered any language in the original RFP, the State may, in its sole discretion, disqualify the Vendor from further consideration. The RFP issued by ITS is the official version and will supersede any conflicting RFP language submitted by the Vendor.
Question 2	RFP Section III, No. 11.	Which governmental entities outside Mississippi does the state currently partner with and which governmental entities outside Mississippi does it anticipate partnering with in the future?
Response		In reference to reuse of this procurement with entities outside of Mississippi, the State knows of none wishing to reuse at this time.
Question 3	RFP Section VII, 1.1. Page 33.	The State has indicated that "beginning with Item 2.1 of this section, label and respond to each outline point in this section as it is labeled in the RFP." Can the State please clarify which specific outline points should be responded to? Would this include, for example, section 3.1 Common Acronyms and/or outline points in section 3, 4, 5, etc.?
Response		The state requires a response to all outline points, including those that are provided for Vendor reference and understanding, such as background information and common acronyms. Refer to Section VII, Item 1.3, which states: “ACKNOWLEDGED should be used when no Vendor response or Vendor compliance is required. “ACKNOWLEDGED” simply means the Vendor is confirming to the State that he read the

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer								
		statement. This is commonly used in the RFP sections where the agency's current operating environment is described or where general information is being given about the project."								
Question 4	RFP Section VII., 1.2 Page 33	The State has indicated that "vendors must respond to each specification in Section VII, Items 3 through 16, with a narrative description." Can the State please clarify which pages "items 3 through 16" are found on and what specific "items" this requirement is referring to? For example, it appears item 3 refers to "General Information" such as "Common Acronyms", item 4 refers to "Procurement Project Schedule", and item 6 refers to "Introduction and Background", etc.; none of which seem to be requesting a narrative response. Please provide further specificity on which sections (please include page numbers) require a narrative response.								
Response		See Amendment #2.								
Question 5	RFP Section VII., 1.2 Page 33	RFP Language: "In addition, the Vendors must respond to each of specification in Section VII, Items 3 through 16, with a narrative description." Question: Should we also include Items 17 (Warranty) and 18 (Cloud or Offsite Hosting Requirements)?								
Response		See Amendment #2.								
Question 6	Section VII, No. 6. Page 38	Can the State please provide the current enrollment by program type and the number of new applications received by program type each month or year?								
Response		<p>The State believes the Vendor wants an estimate of the number of verifications queried. That number is closely aligned with the application count. Below are the average monthly application counts for each program:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="597 1346 1219 1486"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="597 1346 1219 1381">Average Monthly Applications</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="597 1381 971 1417">Medicaid</td> <td data-bbox="971 1381 1219 1417">18,479</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="597 1417 971 1453">SNAP/TANF</td> <td data-bbox="971 1417 1219 1453">23,749</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="597 1453 971 1486">Community Services</td> <td data-bbox="971 1453 1219 1486">3,986</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Average Monthly Applications		Medicaid	18,479	SNAP/TANF	23,749	Community Services	3,986
Average Monthly Applications										
Medicaid	18,479									
SNAP/TANF	23,749									
Community Services	3,986									
Question 7	RFP, Section VII, No. 6 Page 38	Can the state please provide an estimation of verifications to be submitted annually? What is expected to be included in the verifications?								

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer																
Response		<p>As verifications are planned to occur at the time of application and renewal/recertification, total annual applications and program counts as of December 2018 are presented below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="597 443 1219 724"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="597 443 1219 478">Annual Application Counts</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="597 478 971 514">Medicaid</td> <td data-bbox="971 478 1219 514">221,774</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="597 514 971 550">SNAP/TANF</td> <td data-bbox="971 514 1219 550">284,984</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="597 550 971 585">Community Services</td> <td data-bbox="971 550 1219 585">47,839</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="597 585 1219 621">Program Counts as of 12.31.18</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="597 621 971 657">SNAP</td> <td data-bbox="971 621 1219 657">481,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="597 657 971 693">TANF</td> <td data-bbox="971 657 1219 693">9,085</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="597 693 971 724">Medicaid/CHIP</td> <td data-bbox="971 693 1219 724">721,104</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Annual Application Counts		Medicaid	221,774	SNAP/TANF	284,984	Community Services	47,839	Program Counts as of 12.31.18		SNAP	481,000	TANF	9,085	Medicaid/CHIP	721,104
Annual Application Counts																		
Medicaid	221,774																	
SNAP/TANF	284,984																	
Community Services	47,839																	
Program Counts as of 12.31.18																		
SNAP	481,000																	
TANF	9,085																	
Medicaid/CHIP	721,104																	
Question 8	RFP Section VII, No. 6 Page 39 - ESB	What is the architecture of the ESB? The RFP mentions that this is currently being produced by DXC but does not go into detail about how it will be set up. This is important, since all data requests must be routed through this solution.																
Response		<p>The ESB makes use of SOAP (Simple Object Access Protocol) messages to enable all systems to send and receive data on the HHSTP (Health and Human Services Transformation Project). The data and structures are overseen by an interface control document. In addition, the ESB uses the following standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Web Services Security (WSS) 1.0 2. SOAP Version 1.2 3. SOAP Body payload is encrypted with the AES 256 CBC Algorithm 4. X.509: A trusted Certificate Authority (CA) must sign the certificates 5. Certificates must use 2048-bit keys. 6. Certificates must use Secure Hash Algorithm (SHA)-2 for message digest. It can be any of the following strengths: 256, 384, or 512. (At minimum 256) 7. Each request contains a WSS header 																
Question 9	RFP Section VII, No. 6 Page 39	The requirements seem to be shaped around existing commercially available system; is the State looking for the spirit of a new solution to be created & closely aligned with the HHSTP vision or is this something that is already built today?																
Response		The State is looking for the best solution that is closely aligned with the HHSTP vision as described in RFP Section VII, item 6 - Introduction and Background.																

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Question 10	RFP Section VII, No. 6.1 Page 39	<p>What is the State's definition of "necessary" in regards to the clause below?</p> <p>Cost Conscious: The FAM shall have a sophisticated set of business rules, data caching, and storage to check verifications only when <u>necessary</u>. DOM and MDHS already have an extensive set of eligibility verifications native to their respective eligibility systems and do not intend to pay twice for the same data.</p>
Response		<p>The intent of the word <i>necessary</i> in the referenced section is intended to mean checking verification data from the source or renewing verification data from paid data sources. As the FAM is caching all data, returning data already owned or paid for by the State is expected. The word <i>necessary</i> in this case refers to rules determined by each agency for reviewing the data, and if that data is not existent, old or stale, it would be necessary to query a data source for fresh data.</p>
Question 11	RFP Section VII, No. 6.1 Page 39	<p>FAM is looking for real-time verification of eligibility, but fraud schemes often take time to be identified. Is there a process for holding cases that are suspected of being part of a developing fraud scheme?</p>
Response		<p>In this case, the term "real-time verification of eligibility" means real time data returned from data sources wherever possible for use by participating agencies. CMS and FNS have policies regarding the timeliness of eligibility determination, so the FAM will not delay granting eligibility. It is expected that there is the ability to detect fraudulent schemes proactively in the FAM. That subject is intended to be responded to by Vendors as part of Section VII, 10.12.16 and as part of Attachment A: Technical Requirements (RE-994).</p>
Question 12	RFP Section VII, No. 6.1.2. Page 39	<p>The State has indicated the users will "log in" to the FAM but in later sections indicates that the FAM will be provided as a web service to ESB. Can the State please clarify whether you are looking for the FAM to be a stand-alone web application, be integrated directly into ESB via web services, and/or via another method?</p>
Response		<p>It is the intent of the State that the FAM interfaces via the ESB with the agency eligibility systems. All State staff will have the ability to query and view FAM data through their respective eligibility systems, yet selected management and Program Integrity staff plan to use the FAM directly to view data that has been cached, as well as administer identity authentication processes when necessary, thus it will need a user interface.</p>
Question 13	RFP Section VII, No. 6.1.2. Page 39	<p>The RFP states, "The FAM will be utilized by both DOM and MDHS staff and clients during the application and eligibility determination process." How many of each type of user does the state expect?</p>

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		DOM has approximately 950 staff count. MDHS has approximately 750 staff count. It is planned that there will not be more than 500 concurrent users of the FAM.
Question 14	RFP Section VII, No. 6.1.3. Page 39	<p>RFP Language: "The FAM shall have a sophisticated set of business rules, data caching, and storage to check verifications only when necessary. DOM and MDHS already have an extensive set of eligibility verifications native to their respective eligibility systems and do not intend to pay twice for the same data."</p> <p>Question: Will the State share the eligibility verification data sets native to the eligibility systems so that these are not proposed or priced in bidder's response and cost proposal?</p>
Response		Section VII, 6.3.2 identifies the governmental data sources that are currently being used by the State. Attachment E, which is a visionary document provided for general reference, also contains anticipated eligibility and authentication requirements. Vendors who can identify better sources of data for HOPE Act verifications should detail those sources in their response and provide line item costs for use in Section VIII separately. The State will determine which data sources are appropriate or of better quality than what is currently used. <i>Data source pricing is separate from the price of the solution configuration and maintenance.</i>
Question 15	RFP Section VII, No. 6.2. Page 40	Is the selected respondent expected to query LexisNexis and/or other third party data sources directly or would the vendor simply obtain results from these third party data sources via the ESB?
Response		The use of LexisNexis services is not required; it is the current Vendor used by both agencies for some data services. If the Vendor chooses not to use LexisNexis data, a similar data source will be required. The use of the ESB will be required for any non-solution proprietary data queries. The Vendor will be expected to coordinate those data source connections. It is the intent of the State to follow CMS MEET requirements with respect to modularity.
Question 16	RFP Section VII, No. 6.2. Page 40	Does the State intend to establish interfaces with and manage the interfaces of any new data sources proposed by the vendor or does the State envision the vendor establishing and managing these interfaces and transmitting data from these interfaces to the ESB?
Response		The State envisions that the Vendor will establish and manage all new interfaces that they propose to support the FAM. All non-solution proprietary data from those interfaces shall utilize the ESB for data communications.
Question 17	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3. Page 40	Is the intent for the system to be primarily a logic based rules system or is AI and machine learning part of the scope?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		<p>It is expected that there is the ability to detect fraudulent schemes proactively in the FAM. That subject is intended to be responded to by Vendors as part of Section VII, 10.12.16 and as part of Attachment A: Technical Requirements (RE-994). The State is interested in the use of any means of proactively identifying fraud and fraud schemes. Logic-based rules is seen as a minimum method for some of this identification, but the use of AI and machine learning, as explained by Vendors, may be a more attractive way to accomplish the goals of fraud detection as long as all other requirements are met.</p>
Question 18	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.2. Page 40	Can the State please provide your current CMS eligibility verification plan and/or a complete list of all data sources being utilized for eligibility verification?
Response		<p>Refer to Section VII, 6.3.2. for the data sources currently being used by the State.</p>
Question 19	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.3. Page 40	Can the State confirm that the selected vendor would not be responsible for financial or property asset verification data costs, including these costs when they result from the selected respondent's FAM enhanced eligibility verification services and/or quarterly eligibility verifications?
Response		<p>The Vendor is responsible for covering all costs with any proposed interfaces or data where they are providing the data and where the state does not already have a contract with a Vendor for that same data set, unless the Vendor can provide the data at a lower cost.</p> <p>Please see Section VIII: "The Vendor is expected to provide operational costs consisting of two parts, a fixed maintenance cost that includes some number of hours (which must be specified in the proposal) to be used for routine maintenance requests and a tiered per applicant rate (all detail must be specified in the cost proposal) that is discounted based on volume. The volume discounts will occur during a True-up on a billing cycle to be determined during contract negotiations. Any cost not listed in this section may result in the Vendor providing those products or services at no charge to the State or face disqualification."</p>
Question 20	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.4. Page 41	Is the work described in this section included in the core scope of work vendors are pricing their solution based on or would these contemplated changes be considered "future enhancements" and billed separately?
Response		<p>The State considers the additional scope presented in Section VII, 6.3.4 to be covered by a change order. The State wants to ensure that the option for these verifications to be added to the FAM is possible.</p>

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Question 21	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.4. Page 41	Which verification process does the State envision moving to the FAM upon successful implementation?
Response		The State considers the additional scope presented in Section VII, 6.3.4 to be covered by a change order. The State wants to ensure that the option for these verifications to be added to the FAM is possible. There will be program-specific verification processes to be elaborated at the time a change order is created.
Question 22	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.4. Page 41	How many business rules does the State currently implement and how many of those business rules would be migrated to the FAM upon successful implementation?
Response		At this time, the State does not have a FAM, yet will work with the selected Vendor to create business rules for the FAM verifications to occur. If the State chooses to add additional verifications into the FAM, there will be program-specific verification processes to be elaborated at the time a change order is created.
Question 23	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.4. Page 41	Do DOM and MDHS currently have the use of data verification sources for other state entities?
Response		Not at this time.
Question 24	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.5.1. Page 41	Does the State expect the selected vendor's identity authentication and verification service to be integrated into the CWP via web services calls, accessed via the vendor's stand-alone web application, and/or via some other method?
Response		The State expects authentication and verification services to be integrated into the CWP via web services calls and access via the Vendor's stand-alone web application. The State will consider other options offered by the Vendor.
Question 25	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.5.2. Page 41	Does the State expect the selected vendor's identity authentication and verification service to be integrated into the ESB via web services calls, accessed via the vendor's stand-alone web application, and/or via some other method?
Response		The State expects the Vendor's identity authentication and verification service to be integrated into the ESB via web service calls, and accessed through the FAM user interface.
Question 26	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.5.3. Page 41	Does the State expect the selected vendor's enhanced eligibility verification service to be integrated into the ESB via web services calls, accessed via the vendor's stand-alone web application, and/or via some other method?
Response		The State expects the Vendor's enhanced eligibility verification service to be integrated into the ESB via web service calls, and to be accessed through the FAM user interface.

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Question 27	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.5.3. Page 41	What is the total adult beneficiary population contained within the Medicaid, SNAP, TANF, and LIHEAP programs that MDHS wishes to monitor for incarcerations?
Response		The State intends to monitor incarceration status on the total adult beneficiary and applicant populations for the Medicaid, SNAP, TANF, and LIHEAP programs.
Question 28	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.5.3. Page 41	The Section 6.3.5.3 and the Hope Act (HB1090SG) makes reference to Incarceration Status as a means of an Enhanced Verification System. It is best practice to check for incarceration not only at the time of enrollment but on an ongoing basis. Does the State check for incarceration status today? If so, what are the types of incarceration sources that the State presently uses & what type of coverage is available today?
Response		The State uses SSA as a source for incarceration status. At this time incarceration status is reported on daily by the SSA to MDHS and monthly to DOM.
Question 29	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.5.3. Page 41	The Section 6.3.5.3 and the Hope Act (HB1090SG) makes reference to Incarceration Status as a means of an Enhanced Verification System. What specific incarceration rules are applied to State programs today?
Response		All DOM and MDHS programs conduct verification that the client is not incarcerated.
Question 30	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.5.3. Page 41	<p>RFP Language: "For Applicants applying for Medicaid, SNAP, TANF and LIHEAP, additional or more timely verifications shall be provided for data not currently available to each agency, for example, employment, wage and address verification, current incarceration status, etc."</p> <p><i>Question:</i> Will the State provide a detailed list of data currently available to each agency so that we can assess what data is needed to fulfill the requirements of the HOPE Act? For example, does the State currently access address, incarceration, and/or income data, and if so, is this data purchased from a third-party?</p>
Response		Section VII, 6.3.2 identifies the governmental data sources that are currently being used by the State. Attachment E, which is a visionary document provided for general reference, also contains anticipated eligibility and authentication requirements. Vendors who can identify better sources of data for HOPE Act verifications should detail those sources in their response and provide line item costs for use in Section VIII separately. The State will determine which data sources are appropriate or of better quality than what is currently used. <i>Data source pricing is separate from the price of the solution configuration and maintenance of the solution configuration and maintenance.</i>

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Question 31	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.6. Page 41	Can the State confirm whether the selected vendor would be responsible for identity and authentication data costs?
Response		Refer to Section VIII, Cost Information Submission, introductory language, beginning with Sentence 3: "The Vendor is expected to provide operational costs consisting of two parts, a fixed maintenance cost that includes some number of hours (which must be specified in the proposal) to be used for routine maintenance requests and a tiered per applicant rate (all detail must be specified in the cost proposal) that is discounted based on volume. The volume discounts will occur during a True-up on a billing cycle to be determined during contract negotiations. Any cost not listed in this section may result in the Vendor providing those products or services at no charge to the State or face disqualification."
Question 32	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.6. Page 41	The instructions for accessing the LexisNexis contract state that vendors should go to "Contracts by Agency" after clicking the URL and selecting "Contracts". However, once "Contracts" is selected, their does not appear to be a "Contracts by Agency" selection option. Can the State provide additional instruction or provide a copy of this contract?
Response		See Amendment #4, that provides instructions to access the contract and amendments in State of Mississippi Transparency.
Question 33	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.6. Page 41	<p>RFP Language: "The State of Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services (ITS) currently has an Agreement with LexisNexis to provide data services. The agreement can be viewed from the State of Mississippi Transparency site: http://www.transparency.mississippi.gov/ >Contracts>Contracts by Agency>Department of Human Services>Purchasing (General)>Vendor>LEXIS NEXIS RISK."</p> <p>Question: The agreement we located on the State of Mississippi Transparency site expired in 2015. Was the agreement extended by amendment(s) and if so, what is the amended expiration date? If the agreement was not amended, will the State provide the current agreement?</p>
Response		See Amendment #4, that provides instructions to access the contract and amendments in State of Mississippi Transparency.
Question 34	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.7. Page 41	DOM and MDHS receive negotiated pricing for data services through the agreement for the following: 6.3.7.1 Identity Verification and Authentication (LexisNexis Instant Verify and Instant Authenticate Services). 6.3.7.2 Asset Verification (Accuity Asset Verification Services – Financial; Benefit Assessment – Non-Financial).

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
		Do these prices include integration, hosting, reporting and others or simply data set access? Are SLA's similar to your NAC contract?
Response		Yes, pricing on the LexisNexis contract includes one-time implementation fees per program and hosting fees. The SLAs between the differing LexisNexis products are the same as the NAC. Accuity products may have a different SLA.
Question 35	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.7. Page 41	As a part of standard Asset Verification, will Mississippi want to secure DMV or motor vehicle data which could include watercraft, recreational vehicles, aircraft and others?
Response		For certain programs, real property is assessed for eligibility. This would include motor vehicle data which could include watercraft, recreational vehicles, aircraft and others.
Question 36	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.7. Page 41	RFP Language: "LexisNexis currently provides National Accuracy Clearinghouse (NAC) services for MDHS." Question: Is LexisNexis precluded from being a subcontractor to bidders?
Response		No, LexisNexis is not precluded from being a subcontractor to Vendors. Vendors can propose any data source they would like. The intent of providing the current Mississippi contract with LexisNexis is to offer pricing information in case a Vendor can provide better pricing. The State would prefer to use a contract with a lower price in place of the existing contract.
Question 37	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.7.1. Page 41	Section 6.3.7.1 defines that the State uses Identity Verification and Authentication services via current contracted vendors. How are these services being integrated and consumed today? What specific systems & corresponding departments within MDHS are served by these services today?
Response		The State currently uses electronic and manual identity verification and intends to use LexisNexis Identity Authentication products via a web interface until the FAM is implemented. In situations where manual processes are used, clients/applicants are asked questions about their cases to ensure they are the person they say they are.
Question 38	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.7.2. Page 42	Section 6.3.7.2 defines Asset Verification through Accuity Asset Verification Services for Financial means and a Benefit Assessment of the Non-Financial scope. What does the Benefit Assessment of the Non-Financial scope entail? Can the State please share an example of this report?
Response		The Benefit Assessment - Non-Financial product from LexisNexis includes information on ownership of real property, motor

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
		vehicles, watercraft, and aircraft. The State is unable to share a copy of this report.
Question 39	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.8. Page 42	<p>Section 6.3.8 makes the statement "...Vendors may propose an alternate set of data sources or verification sources with more competitive pricing that DOM and MDHS may choose to utilize... if deemed advantageous to the State."</p> <p>What does the State consider advantageous herein this section? Would the State be willing to consider value or other criteria factors in addition to price? Would the State be willing to consider best value (i.e. most cost effective with lower total cost) as the criteria factor for award rather than low price which does not attach itself directly to the value the state is receiving?</p>
Response		The State is interested in best value data sources. A particular data source may have a higher cost, yet provide more valuable information or require less overall data sources to be queried, which may lead to a lower overall cost.
Question 40	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.8. Page 42	<p>Question: We interpret this statement to indicate that the State has access to all data required to be compliant with the Hope Act and does NOT want bidders to include the cost of any data sources in its implementation costs (described on page 77 of the RFP), but rather these costs should be included as "Optional Services Replacement Costs" as described.</p>
Response		The assumption is incorrect. The State has access to data sources in Section VII, 6.3.2 with further detail in Attachment E, that may meet some of the Hope Act requirements, but it does not meet all requirements. Vendors should explain how the use of current State data sources as well as additional data sources will meet the requirements of the Hope Act and the overall Fraud and Abuse Module.
Question 41	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.8. Page 42	<p>The RFP states, "The State will only pay once per identity for a data service request regardless of which state agency submits the data service request."</p> <p>What defines a data service request? As an individual's data change over time, will that single payment cover new or updated data for an identity?</p>
Response		<p>It is the intent of the State that the data that is populated in the FAM be paid for once as appropriate (based on business rules determined during detailed design) and shared with all agencies that use the FAM with no additional incremental cost. The State understands that this data will need to be refreshed periodically and is aware that this activity may incur a cost based on the data source and its cost to the State or Vendor.</p> <p>For example, if DOM requests income information for a Medicaid applicant on day 1 (may incur fee from data source Vendor) and</p>

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
		MDHS later asks for that same income information on day 8 for a SNAP applicant that information would be sent to MDHS at no additional cost. Further, if the SNAP business rules for the FAM indicated that income data could not be 10 or more days old, and the same request occurred on day 20, it would be expected that the FAM re-query that information (possibly incurring an additional cost from the data source Vendor).
Question 42	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.9. Page 42	What is the data storage requirements needed for the FAM and what is the current storage capacity in bytes?
Response		The State is unaware of the data storage requirements of each Vendor-proposed solution. There is no current solution that fulfills the needs in this procurement, thus no current storage capacity requirements.
Question 43	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.9. Page 42	What is the retention schedule for storage of data?
Response		The State's current retention policy for stored data is seven years.
Question 44	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.9. Page 42	Can the State please share how interactions with the Fraud Abuse Module (FAM) are performed? In other words, who is the typical user and how does each interact with the FAM Front-End? Additionally, what are the specific expectations that the FAM is used in a system-to-system manner through the ESB?
Response		It is the intent of the State that the FAM interfaces via the ESB with the agency eligibility systems. All State staff will have the ability to query and view FAM data through their respective eligibility systems, yet selected management and Program Integrity staff plan to use the FAM directly to view data that has been cached, as well as administer identity authentication processes when necessary, thus it will need a user interface.
Question 45	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.10. Page 42	This section, as well as the Hope Act, reference "real-time eligibility services", including financial resource verification. However, Accuity's financial asset verification data is currently not available in real time. Can the State please clarify your expectations?
Response		The State acknowledges that Accuity is not a real-time interface and has created requirements to account for delayed transmittal of requests. The expectation is that the FAM's receipt of new and delayed information will be sent to the eligibility systems when received. Within Attachment A, RE-886 and RE-507 were created for this situation.
Question 46	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.11. Page 42	Can the State please provide a list of the data sources DOM and MDHS currently have access to which would be eligible for inclusion in the respondent's FAM and the key output data elements from each source?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		The State has access to data sources listed in Section VII, 6.3.2 with further detail in Attachment E. Attachment E is a visionary document that contains anticipated eligibility and authentication requirements.
Question 47	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.11. Page 42	Is it the State's intention to have the Prime Contractor provide 3rd party data sources directly to the State, or, does the State intend to procure these sources directly?
Response		Yes, the State intends for the prime contractor to provide any data sources that are not currently available to the State. In addition, the State would also be interested any value-added data sources or more economical data sources the State already has.
Question 48	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.11. Page 42	How does the state differentiate between determining eligibility and fraud detection?
Response		Eligibility determination is based upon program-specific regulations, managed by federal and state mandate, while fraud detection is part of each agency's Program Integrity unit and further defined in the Hope Act.
Question 49	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.11. Page 42	Does the state have a current process for fraud investigations? Will the state provide fraud investigators to follow up on fraud cases?
Response		Yes, the State has a current process for fraud investigations. Yes, the State will provide fraud investigators to follow up on fraud cases.
Question 50	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.14. Page 43	The Fraud and Abuse Module - MDHS Journey Map appears to have been drafted in February 2018. Can the State please indicate whether any of the planned data sources designated with a status of "new data source" in this document have been procured and are available for use as part of the selected vendor's FAM?
Response		Attachment E is a visionary document that contains anticipated eligibility and authentication requirements. Vendors should assume that no additional data sources have been procured or initiated, even if marked for a future or planned interface.
Question 51	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.14. Page 43	Can the State please indicate whether any of the planned data sources in the Fraud and Abuse Module - MDHS Journey Map will not be available to the selected vendor?
Response		Attachment E is a visionary document that contains anticipated eligibility and authentication requirements. Vendors should assume that no additional data sources have been procured or initiated, even if marked for a future or planned interface.

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Question 52	RFP Section VII, No. 6.3.14. Page 43	Can the State please indicate whether any of the planned data sources in the Fraud and Abuse Module - MDHS Journey Map will result in a data fee to be paid by the selected vendor?
Response		Attachment E is a visionary document that contains anticipated eligibility and authentication requirements. Vendors should assume that no additional data sources have been procured or initiated, even if marked for a future or planned interface. If post award data sources are established by the Vendor, related data fees will be addressed at that time.
Question 53	RFP Section VII, No. 6.4.1.1. Page 43	In the event that FNS executes a pilot of the vendor's proposed FAM, can the State confirm whether the implementation fee will be paid once sign-off to initiate the pilot has been granted? If not, can the State please clarify when you consider "implementation" to be complete and the corresponding payment owed to the vendor?
Response		The likelihood of a pilot implementation is unknown at this time. In the absence of a pilot, implementation fees will be paid upon full acceptance of the system by DOM and DHS. In the event of a pilot by DHS, Medicaid will pay 79% of implementation fees upon acceptance of the system. DHS will pay the remaining 21% of implementation fees upon acceptance of the piloted system. The one year warranty period will begin upon full acceptance of the system by both DOM and DHS.
Question 54	RFP Section VII, No. 6.4.1.1. Page 43	Can the State also confirm whether any applicable per-transaction fees and Maintenance, Operations, Support, and Hosting fees would be paid during the pilot?
Response		Maintenance, Operations, Support, and Hosting fees will be paid in accordance with the requirements and stipulations of RFP No. 4111. In the absence of a pilot, transaction fees will be eligible for payment upon full system acceptance. In the event of a pilot for DHS, transaction fees will be incurred, but will not become eligible for payment until DHS has fully accepted the system.
Question 55	RFP Section VII, No. 6.4.1.1. Page 43	In the event that FNS executes a pilot of the vendor's proposed FAM and there is a delay in statewide deployment, can the State please confirm whether Maintenance, Operations, Support, and Hosting fees would be paid during this time period?
Response		Maintenance, Operations, Support, and Hosting fees will be paid in accordance with the requirements and stipulations of RFP No. 4111.

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Question 56	RFP Section VII, No. 6.4.1.1. Page 43	<p>The RFP states, "FNS may require a minimum of a three-month duration pilot of the FAM for MDHS."</p> <p>How will the state determine if a pilot program is necessary? How will payment for the pilot be allocated?</p>
Response		<p>FNS will determine whether or not to require a minimum three-month pilot. In the event of a pilot by DHS, Medicaid will pay 79% of implementation fees upon acceptance of the system. DHS will pay the remaining 21% of implementation fees upon acceptance of the piloted system. The one year warranty period will begin upon full acceptance of the system by both DOM and DHS. No additional payment milestones will be necessary. Transaction fees incurred during the pilot will become eligible for payment upon full acceptance of the piloted system.</p>
Question 57	RFP Section VII, No. 8.3.2 Page 47	<p>If a vendor can satisfy any and all in-person needs of the State, as directed by the State, can the 50% onsite requirement be waived? In our experience, regular, in-person collaboration is critical during an implementation but not necessary at the 50% level following go-live.</p>
Response		<p>The State considers Section VII, 8.3.2 to be complete as written, but reserves the right to negotiate possible reduction of the 50% on-site requirement for the period from implementation through the end of the warranty period.</p>
Question 58		<p>Can the State please provide a sample Risk Assessment and Security Audit which vendors are expected to complete annually?</p>
Response		<p>The State is unable to share a sample of a Risk Assessment and/or Security Audit as they are sensitive and confidential.</p>
Question 59	RFP Section VII, No. 13.1 Page 56	<p>Can the State please estimate the frequency of onsite train-the-trainer sessions?</p>
Response		<p>In accordance with requirement 13.1, the State expects the Vendor to offer and describe adequate train-the-trainer resources in the Training Plan referenced in RFP Section VII 10.12.15.</p>
Question 60	RFP Section VII, No. 21.1 Page 72	<p>The RFP states that "contract payments will be contingent on a demonstration that the provided services resulted in savings that equal or exceed payments under the contract." How does the state define the savings for cases of ineligibility or fraud? Is there a set dollar value for every case discovered?</p>
Response		<p>Benefit Savings/Cost avoidance is the amount of state or federal benefit expenditures that would have occurred, or were anticipated to occur, without the agency's fraud prevention efforts. The case must be referred or identified through data analytics and/or services of the Fraud and Abuse Module and involved intervention at the application, reapplication, certification, recertification, or monitoring phase. The state</p>

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
		anticipates working collaboratively with the selected Vendor for the Fraud and Abuse Module to identify the criteria for determining the annualized savings from the contract in order to meet the mandates of Section 3 of the Hope Act and would anticipate accurate savings numbers change and improve over time.
Question 61	RFP Section VII, No. 22 Page 73	Does the evaluation criteria in the Scoring Methodology on Page 73 apply to the Optional Service Replacement Costs on Page 78? Does the State intend to apply other criteria to these replacement costs?
Response		It is the intent of the State to ensure an “apples-to-apples” comparison for all proposals by using the Total Five-Year Lifecycle Cost. The Optional Service Replacement Costs will be considered as part of the Total Five-Year Lifecycle Cost. All Vendors will be evaluated on their Total Maintenance, Operations, Support and Hosting Costs as listed on the Cost Information Submission Form. For the Optional Services Replacement Costs, Vendors will be evaluated either by their provided costs for these services or by the cost of services the State has already negotiated for similar services (e.g. verification services provided by LexisNexis).
Question 62	RFP Section VIII, Cost Page 77	In order to more tightly manage data costs, would Mississippi consider per transaction pricing for use of non-optional data sets to include: 6.3.5.1 Identity Authorization and Verification, 6.3.5.2 Asset Verification and 6.3.5.3 Enhanced Eligibility Verification?
Response		Yes, the State expects to see transaction pricing for all new data sources as specified in Sections VIII - Optional Services Replacement Costs - Item #4 which states: “Transaction Price: This should be the price per transaction for that service. If the price per transaction is based on tiers or volume, the Contractor should indicate that in the tables or in a subsequent write-up.”
Question 63	RFP Section IX, 1.5.2 Page 80	The State has mentioned a lowest and best approach prior to finalizing an award. Does the State intend to include a Best Value approach to evaluate proposals? How will the State assess the value of a proposed solution in both cost & non-cost categories?
Response		Refer to RFP Section VII. 22., for the scoring methodology. For Non-cost categories, Vendors who meet the required technical gate will be scored on a ten-point scale, according to the responses prescribed in Section VII. 19.2. Cost items will be scored based on Vendor’s response to the Section VIII, Cost Information Submission, which sets forth the total five-year lifecycle cost for the proposed solution and the fully

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
		<p>loaded, blended hourly change order rate included on Section VIII, Page 79.</p> <p>Section VIII, Page 78 of the RFP gives Vendors the opportunity to present competitive or innovative data sources that may represent cost savings to the State.</p> <p>Scores from the non-cost evaluation and the cost evaluation will be combined to determine each Vendor's final score.</p>
Question 64	RFP Attachment E Page 120	<p>In the Roadmap presentation, the State has identified a desire to contract with Equifax to obtain The Work Number data.</p> <p>Has this contract been executed? If not, does the State intend to execute this contract as part of the award from this procurement or should respondents assume that this will take place separately from this procurement?</p>
Response		<p>Equifax The Work Number data was only suggested as a data source identified that could be used to obtain wage and employment information. No relationship exists at this time and none is planned. The State expects Vendors to propose a data source for this type of information, whether it is in Attachment E or not.</p>
Question 65	RFP Attachment E Page 120	<p>The State has indicated that the DHHS Financial Institution Data Match program may be utilized as part of a vendor's enhanced eligibility verification service. Can the State please confirm: (1) whether vendors will have access to this data source; (2) whether vendors will be able to submit requests to and receive responses from this data source; (3) whether any frequency or category of assistance limitations exist that the vendor will need to abide by; (4) identify which financial institutions are included in this data match program (i.e. in-state only or other?); and (5) clarify the State's intention for making this data source available to the selected vendor.</p>
Response		<p>It has since been determined that the DHHS Financial Institution Data Match interface will not be available for use by the HHSTP or the FAM.</p>
Question 66	Attachment A RE-504	<p>How does the State define a redundant client request? Is there a specific timeframe or other aspect which makes a request redundant?</p>
Response		<p>Redundant data requests are defined as data requests that occur on data that has already been queried and cached. The solution is expected to have updatable rules based on program requirements that determine whether to use cached data or to re-query the data source again.</p>
Question 67	Attachment A RE-513	<p>How long must these error logs be retained for and what specifically does the State expect these logs will serve? Who is intended to use the appropriate error logs and what specific system will these be output to?</p>

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		Error logs will be used by the State to troubleshoot and better understand errors, unexpected responses and problems the Vendor recommends that we track. Error logs must be available in common file types. Retention of error logs will be determined during configuration and implementation of the awarded solution.
Question 68	Attachment A RE-522	Can the State please elaborate on what they are looking for in this requirement?
Response		The State's intent is that the solution will use the Master Client Index (MCI) to identify clients, rather than maintaining a list of clients.
Question 69	Attachment A RE-581	What third party identity verification and authentication services does the State expect the proposed solution to connect to? Is this an existing solution, or, is this to be provided by the bidding Vendor?
Response		The State does not have a preferred Vendor for identity verification and authentication. The Vendor can choose to propose the use of existing LexisNexis products and services, or propose a different data source.
Question 70	Attachment A RE-590	Can the State please describe and elaborate on your expectations around the selected vendor's interaction with the Master Client Index and ESB? Do we have to go through the ESB to connect to vendors we bring in or can we directly access our data vendors?
Response		The use of the ESB will be required for any non-solution proprietary data queries. The Vendor will be expected to coordinate those data source connections. The MCI is expected to be the source of truth for client identities, and will be available through the ESB. It is the intent of the State to follow CMS MEET requirements with respect to modularity.
Question 71	Attachment A RE-634	Does this requirement refer to a worker login to the vendor's system or is this requirement referring to the identity authentication service?
Response		The message is expected to go to the ESB and be handled by a Master Client Index (MCI) which stores client authentication status.
Question 72	Attachment A RE- 687	Can the State please share examples of a proposed solution's data entry fields meeting specific values? Is there a specific use-case or part of the application process which the State can share?
Response		The State expects business rules and/or logic in the FAM to check data entry fields in use by the web application based on the information it already knows about the field in question. In summary, fields such as date fields have validation rules.
Question 73	Attachment A - RE-697, 752, 756, 760, 761,	Can the State please provide the ETL or WSDL specifications for interacting with each of these third party sources?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	889, 890, 891, 892	
Response	RE-697	The State is unable to provide the ETL or WSDL specifications for interacting with this data source.
	RE-752	The State is unable to provide the ETL or WSDL specifications for interacting with Vendor-proposed data sources.
	RE-756	The State is unable to provide the ETL or WSDL specifications for interacting with Vendor-proposed data sources.
	RE-760	The State is unable to provide the ETL or WSDL specifications for interacting with this data source. In addition, at this time, the State does not intend for the FAM to interact directly with the Federal Data Services Hub (FDSH), but that it would receive FDSH information via the DOM eligibility system.
	RE-761	The State is unable to provide the ETL or WSDL specifications for interacting with this data source. In addition, at this time, the State does not intend for the FAM to interact directly with the Federal Data Services Hub (FDSH), but that it would receive FDSH information via the DOM eligibility system.
	RE-889	The State is unable to provide the ETL or WSDL specifications for interacting with this data source.
	RE-890	The State is unable to provide the ETL or WSDL specifications for interacting with Vendor-proposed data sources.
	RE-891	The State is unable to provide the ETL or WSDL specifications for interacting with Vendor-proposed data sources.
	RE-892	The State is unable to provide the ETL or WSDL specifications for interacting with this data source.
Question 74	Attachment A RE- 737	Is it the State's intention that the selected vendor would store applicant and beneficiary data such as name, date of birth, address, and social security number?
Response		The State intends that the Vendor stores only a primary key from the MCI to match the data to the person data saved, and will not be storing the name, date of birth, address, and social security number.
Question 75	Attachment A RE-994	Can the State please provide a complete list of all data the selected vendor will have access to via the State?
Response		In the absence of knowing what data the Vendor(s) are proposing, this will be negotiated upon project initiation.
Question 76	Attachment A RE- 877	Is the vendor expected to cache the data and report on it or use this data to respond to future requests?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		<p>At this time, the State does not intend for the FAM to interact directly with the Federal Data Services Hub (FDSH), but that it would receive FDSH information via the DOM eligibility system. That data is expected to be cached in the FAM.</p>

RFP responses are due July 17, 2019 at 3:00 p.m. (Central Time).

If you have any questions concerning the information above or if we can be of further assistance, please contact Jeannie Williford at 601-432-8052 or via email at jeannie.williford@its.ms.gov.

cc: ITS Project File Number 44460