



Addendum No. 3

RFP P463-22- HEALTH SYSTEM/HEALTH PLAN/EMPLOYEE BENEFITS ACTUARIAL SERVICE AND RELATED CONSULTING

The purpose of this Addendum is to notify all potential respondents of any changes to the original RFP and to answer questions regarding the RFP. The answers provided in this Addendum hereby amend and/or modify the original RFP Document and Specifications. All Offerors are subject to the provisions of this addendum.

1. WRITTEN RESPONSES – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 1. In Exhibit A II. Purpose (page 12), it was noted that “Extensive experience and knowledge relating to reimbursement from health plans, Medicare and Medicaid is preferred.” Can you be a little more specific about the type of preferred experience and knowledge relating to Medicaid reimbursement? For example, are you referring to experience and knowledge of setting Medicaid hospital reimbursement rates in the FFS and managed care environment (such as state-directed payments)?

UNMH RESPONSE: Looking for demonstrated knowledge of various healthcare payment models as it relates to providing healthcare related actuarial services.

Question 2. Does UNMH self-insure employee health coverage/benefits rather than having those expenses fully insured by a commercial payer?

UNMH RESPONSE: Under our current model, UNMH provides healthcare to our employees as part of our program. However, the business model and whether we are insured, self-insured, stop-loss insured, etc., we do not believe is relevant to the RFP. The model under which we operate today may not be the model under which we operate tomorrow.

Question 3. Please describe the benefits offered and risk assumed for your employees.

UNMH RESPONSE: This RFP is not aimed at general consulting and actuarial in support of employee benefits. We are looking for consulting/actuarial support in connection with health benefits/health plans and related matters. In connection therewith, there is, of course, some element of risk assumed. These programs can be established under various risk models. However, detailed discussion of risk assumed is not relevant to a firm responding to this RFP, providing evidence of its credentials, or its proposed rates charged per hour.

Question 4. How many unique benefit plans do you offer?

UNMH RESPONSE: See response to question 3.

Question 5. Please describe any value-based or alternative payment arrangements with commercial payers, Medicare Advantage Organizations, Managed Medicaid organizations? Or do you expect to enter new models in the near future?

UNMH RESPONSE: Looking for demonstrated knowledge of various healthcare payment models as it relates to providing healthcare related actuarial services.

Question 6. Which payers do you contract with by LOB for FFS and for value-based contracts?

UNMH RESPONSE: UNMH does not believe the information requested is necessary for a firm to submit a responsive proposal.

Question 7. What percentage of your total revenue is under value-based contracts today? How do you expect this to change in the next few years?

UNMH RESPONSE: UNMH does not believe the information requested is necessary for a firm to submit a responsive proposal.

Question 8. Do you have an incumbent actuarial firm and if so, what services are being performed today?

UNMH RESPONSE: With respect to the specific subject matter of this RFP, there is no firm under contract.

Question 9. Can you provide more detail around the types of services you are seeking? For example, do any of the following apply to this RFP?

- a. Financial reporting/IBNR
- b. Contract review/negotiation
- c. Experience/Performance analysis
- d. Shared savings/loss reconciliation
- e. Medicare Repricing
- f. Forecasting/budgeting
- g. Population health reporting
- h. Employer Group renewal rating

UNMH RESPONSE: Looking for generalized actuarial service as it related to health care services and plans.

Question 10. A different team within our organization recently proposed on some work directly for the New Mexico Human Services Department. We do not believe this represents a conflict, but please confirm that you agree.

UNMH RESPONSE:

UNMH is not able to answer this question without knowing what services with NMHSD were proposed and contracted, and what disclosure/confidentiality obligations may exist. There is a potential for there to be a conflict of interest or confidentiality issues as UNMH and NMHSD have a business relationship.

Question 11. Are you seeking any services with respect to UNMH’s employee benefit plan, or are you referencing services related to employee benefit plans in general?

UNMH RESPONSE: Employee benefit plans in general with a focus on health related benefits.

Question 12. While we have extensive knowledge and expertise with respect to employee benefit plans, we do not feel we are fully qualified to lend any support to other public payors – i.e., Medicare, Medicaid. Your RFP seems to suggest that multiple firms could be selected. Is it acceptable, and is there value/logic, in submitting a proposal, recognizing that our focus would be on the employee benefit plan arena?

UNMH RESPONSE: This RFP is being issued to support the UNMH Finance department and is not aimed at general consulting and actuarial in support of UNMH Human Resources and employee benefits generally. We are looking for consulting/actuarial support in connection with health benefits/health plans/reimbursement and financial matters related thereto. We do not intend to make a separate award relating to general employee benefits work.

Question 13. Management Approach – can you elaborate on what is being requested in general? Also, can you elaborate on what is meant by “cost segregation studies”?

UNMH RESPONSE: We have endeavored to provide some clarity with these questions and answers, and we have edited the RFP to delete the reference to cost segregation.

Question 14. While we have a variety of compliance resources, the focus of our compliance efforts relate to the design and delivery of employee benefit programs. As such, we would not seem to offer support that is desired with respect to: EXPERIENCE WITH APPLICABLE PUBLIC AGENCIES AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW IN NEW MEXICO. Does that preclude or appreciatory limit the consideration of a proposal that we would submit?

UNMH RESPONSE: Please see the responses above. This is not a general benefits consultation RFP. This RFP is looking for firms that have experience with health plans and experience with the applicable regulatory agencies.

Question 15. Is there any possibility that the deadline for submission could be extended? With a requirement for hard copy submissions, that effectively requires that our proposal is finalized and shipped by sometime on Monday, May 23, which presents a very aggressive timeline.

UNMH RESPONSE: The RFP deadline has been amended as set forth in the applicable amendment(s). Please refer to the UNMH RFP website.

Question 16. Can you please clarify the lettering provided in 2.2.2 Proposal Content and Organization? It appears that there are two section Cs. Is this correct or should we re-letter the last three sections?

Also, can you please clarify why the first Section C has the word optional behind it?

- A. Table of Contents
- B. Signed Authorized Signature Page (Exhibit C) (Required)
- C. Proposal Summary (Optional)
- C. Exhibits
- D. Offeror's Additional Terms and Conditions (if applicable)
- E. Other Supporting Material (If applicable)

UNMH RESPONSE:

- A. Table of Contents
- B. Signed Authorized Signature Page (Exhibit C) (Required)
- C. Proposal Summary (Optional)
- D. Exhibits
- E. Offeror's Additional Terms and Conditions (if applicable)
- F. Other Supporting Material (If applicable)

Proposal Summary (Optional) is simply stating the Proposal summary is an optional piece if a vendor would like to include the summary great, but not required. All other sections of C. are required.

If there are any questions or inquiries in relation to this Addendum #1, Offerors may contact Shannon Rodgers at (505) 272-9571 or by email at sjrogers@salud.unm.edu.