



**State of Rhode Island
Department of Administration / Division of Purchases
One Capitol Hill, Providence, Rhode Island 02908-5855
Tel: (401) 574-8100 Fax: (401) 574-8387**

**Solicitation Information
May 21, 2013**

ADDENDUM # 1

RFP # 7464372

RFP Title: Rhode Island Outreach and Enrollment Support Program (OESP): Network Manager

Bid Opening Date & Time: June 4, 2013 at 11:00 AM (EST)

Notice to Vendors:

ATTACHED ARE VENDOR QUESTIONS WITH STATE RESPONSES.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS WILL BE ANSWERED.

**David J. Francis
Interdepartmental Project Manager**

Interested parties should monitor this website, on a regular basis, for any additional information that may be posted.

Vendor Questions for RFP #7464372 Rhode Island Outreach and Enrollment Support Program (OESP): Network Manager

Question 1: I have a question that pertains to the conflict of interest section of the RFP. We receive charitable donations from, and often collaborate at 2-1-1 with, supportive organizations in the health industry. Does this type of relationship nullify our opportunity to bid on this RFP as a Network Manager, or even partner with another entity at the Assister level? Please advise. Thank you.

Answer to question 1: No. This type of relationship does not appear to preclude you from bidding on this RFP. The only entities precluded by regulation from serving as the Network Manager (or as Assisters) are (1) health insurance issuers, (2) subsidiaries of health insurance issuers, (3) associations that include members from (or lobby on behalf of) the insurance industry, or (4) entities that receive compensation from issuers in connection with the enrollment of individuals into QHPs through the Exchange. 45 C.F.R. 155.210(d). Simply receiving contributions from the health industry, or even from health insurers, would not bar an entity from bidding on (or winning) this RFP.

However, it is important to the State that its Network Manager be unbiased. Please disclose any relationships with the health or insurance industry that might affect your organization's ability to remain impartial. Where appropriate, please also describe any measures taken or policies adopted to mitigate the effect of these potential conflicts.

Question 2: We want to ask if it may be possible through this RFP to be considered for a proposal to develop training and certification only, which is one portion of the work outlined in the RFP (Section 3.3. Function 2). Number 7 in the Instructions and Notifications to Vendors section seems to indicate that all bidders must submit a proposal which assumes responsibility for and describes a plan for accomplishing all areas of the work outlined in the RFP, but Section 3 of the RFP notes that multiple entities might ultimately be contracted for different areas of work.

Answer to question 2: In accordance with Section 1.1, Instructions and Notifications to Vendors, Number 7, it is intended that an award pursuant to this RFP will be made to a prime vendor, or prime vendor(s) who will assume responsibility for all aspects of the work. The State's intent in keeping open the possibility to contract with more than one vendor is only in an exceptional case at the State's discretion; i.e. if more than one bidder could provide the full suite of services requested and together those vendors may be better suited to work with the full target population rather than the State awarding to only one bidder. The State *strongly* prefers to contract with only one vendor to complete the work in this RFP.

Question 3: We would also like to express interest in submitting a proposal to develop reference and resource materials for assisters (these could be paper or web-based resources, or both) that would supplement training and provide a guide for assisters as they are counseling consumers. The scope of work in the RFP does not seem to include development of these resources. Is it correct that these materials are not part of the scope

of work outlined in this RFP? Would you consider a separate proposal for the development of these resources?

Answer to question 3: **The development of reference and resource materials are not part of the scope of work for this RFP. Please monitor purchasing.ri.gov for any forthcoming requests for proposals.**

Question 4: The RFP clearly states that the bidder must have a methodology for differentiating between the roles of navigator and in-person assisters as the funding for these roles are separate and distinct. It also states that assisters must be available to support individuals and families who qualify for Medicaid and CHIP. Will the bidder need to further allocate expenses and/or resources to allow the state to capture enhanced Federal Financial Participation (FFP) for enrollment of these individuals/families using the Exchange's Integrated Eligibility System (IES)?

Answer to question 4: **As described in Section 3.4 Function 3: Program Administration and Oversight, the Network Manager will serve as the fiscal conduit to the network of assisters. As such, the Manager must have appropriate fiscal controls in place, and be prepared to ensure compliance with any grant and contract terms and conditions as they are defined and developed in conjunction with our federal partners. Expense reporting standards specific to FFP are not currently anticipated.**

Question 5: Are a navigator and assister basically the same role/responsibilities? It would seem from the RFP that that is the case, and the need for the distinction between the two is the funding source, and that Establishment funds cannot be used for the navigator role. Please confirm.

Answer to question 5: **Yes. As described in Section 3.1, the role of an in-person assister is generally expected to mirror that of a navigator. The security standards and conflict of interest rules for both roles will be the same and training will depend on final role configuration. The distinction is required to support funding requirements.**

Question 6: The RFP states that the Network Manager will develop, select and manage assister and assister entities for service to individuals and families. In Section 3.2, licensed agents and brokers are listed as one group that may be included in the state's OESP, with a footnote that these brokers will be eligible to support small businesses in the SHOP exchange. Will all OESP entities be supporting small businesses in the SHOP exchange, and if so, should the Network Manager, under this proposal, expect to include assister organizations capable of performing this task?

Answer to question 6: **As described in Section 3.1 and shown in Figure 1, the target market for Assister Services are individuals and families.**

Additionally, Section 3.5 includes the following assumption: The needs of small business employers and employees will be addressed by licensed brokers

certified by the Exchange. Assister training must include some information on how the Exchange serves small businesses, but should focus primarily on the unique needs of the individual/household community and assisters will primarily support this market segment.