

GLOBAL COMMITMENT TO HEALTH EVALUATION RFP QUESTIONS W/STATE RESPONSES

May 5, 2017

QUESTION	STATE RESPONSE
Has the State received CMS comments to the draft evaluation design plan?	Yes, the State received CMS comments to the draft evaluation plan on Tuesday, April 11, 2017. The document has been posted here: http://dvha.vermont.gov/administration/cms-feedback-vt-global-commitment-to-health-evaluation-design-04112017.pdf
Would you characterize the feedback from CMS as significantly altering the draft evaluation design?	The state does not anticipate significant changes to draft evaluation design as a result of the CMS feedback.
Will the State publish the final design plan prior to the proposal due date?	The State does not plan to publish the final design plan prior to the proposal due date. Rather, the State plans to work with the successful bidder to incorporate CMS feedback into a final evaluation design.
What contractor, if any, supported the State with development of the draft evaluation design plan? Will that contractor be precluded from bidding on this scope of work?	PHPG supported the State with the development of the draft evaluation design. No vendors are precluded from bidding on this scope of work.
Will the Pacific Health Policy Group (PHPG) be eligible to bid on this RFP given their current and historical work with the State?	No vendors are precluded from bidding on this scope of work. All vendors have access to the documents that were used to develop or modify the draft evaluation design.
Is there is a budget associated with this RFP and, if so, what are the annual budgets by year of the evaluation?	Appendix 1 of the Draft Evaluation Design referenced in the RFP contains a tentative evaluation budget. The budget includes total estimated costs for each year of the demonstration, as well as an annual breakdown of estimated staff, contractual, administrative, and other costs for all aspects of the evaluation such as any survey and measurement development, quantitative and qualitative data collection and cleaning, analyses, and reports generation.
Does the estimated budget indicated in the draft evaluation design plan for contractor costs include state and federal funds?	Yes, the estimated budget indicated in the draft evaluation design includes both state and federal funds.
Will there be changes to the estimated contractor budget?	At this time, the state does not anticipate significant changes to the draft evaluation design. If it is determined that the significant changes to the draft evaluation design are required – changes to the estimated budget might be necessary. The State will work with the successful bidder to incorporate the CMS feedback into a final evaluation design and adjust the budget if necessary.

<p>Is the State willing to share those changes at this time?</p>	<p>The state does not anticipate significant changes to draft evaluation budget. If it is determined that the significant changes to the draft evaluation design are required – the state will work with the successful bidder to adjust the budget if necessary.</p>
<p>Is the state willing to post responses as they become available?</p>	<p>While the state supported this position during the bidder’s conference – it was later determined that state policy requires that RFP responses must be posted in full.</p>
<p>Innovative Changes: On page 7 of the RFP, the language indicates the State will retain responsibility for conducting rapid cycle assessments of new payment and service delivery system reform investments. It also states that the independent evaluator will support the State efforts to complete rapid cycle assessments. Please elaborate on what role the State will play in these assessments versus the Contractor’s role in provide technical assistance support? For example, will the Contractor provide input about data analyses to conduct, but State staff will conduct the actual analyses?</p>	<p>It is anticipated that the contractor will provide rapid cycle evaluation technical assistance specific to design (time series analysis), methods, measure selection, identification of baselines and benchmarks, reporting and use of findings. State staff will be responsible for conducting the actual analyses (e.g., getting data, preparing data, developing/running queries, creating reports and other data visualizations).</p>
<p>Section 2.3 identifies “Innovative Changes” as a component of the evaluation, are these activities the same as those mentioned in the Draft Evaluation Design, dated February 21, 2017 on the bottom of page 11 (Section IIA) as the target for Rapid Cycle Assessment?</p>	<p>The “Innovative Changes” referenced in Section 2.3 of the RFP are the same as those mentioned at the bottom of page 11 (Section II.A) of the draft evaluation design.</p>
<p>Is the IMD component of the waiver to have its own separate draft and final Interim Reports and Summative Evaluation Reports 1 and 2 or is this component’s evaluation to be included as part of the overall waiver evaluation?</p>	<p>While the interim and summative evaluation reports shall include an assessment of the impact of providing Medicaid reimbursement for IMD services for beneficiaries in need of acute mental health or substance use disorder treatment, they should also include an assessment of whether the evaluators find the demonstration to be budget neutral, what impact the demonstration has on health outcomes, as well as any policy implications.</p>
<p>The Draft Evaluation Plan includes a tentative evaluation budget presented annually. Do the annual budget amounts presented in the plan represent budget caps per year? If the annual budget amounts represent budget caps, will the State accept a budget proposal that remains within the overall budget amount for the six-year period but proposes differing annual costs based on deliverable requirements?</p>	<p>At this time, the state does not anticipate significant changes to the draft evaluation design. If it is determined that the significant changes to the draft evaluation design are required – changes to the estimated budget might be necessary. The state will work with the successful bidder to finalize the evaluation design and budget if necessary.</p>
<p>Is it permissible for bidders who have Vermont experience to use State of Vermont personnel as one of the three references required in Section 4.3?</p>	<p>It is NOT permissible for bidders who have Vermont experience to use State of Vermont personnel as one of the three references required in Section 4.3.</p>

<p>What is the look back period for the list of all current or past State projects requested in Section 4.3?</p>	<p>Bidders should identify all current and past projects involving the State of Vermont relevant to the proposed project. There is no specific “look back period” associated with this request.</p>
<p>What documentation is the State requesting, i.e., Is the State requesting a writing sample, such as a sample evaluation report or something else?</p>	<p>The state is asking bidders to provide samples of any reporting documentation that may be applicable to the Detailed Requirements of the RFP. Sample 1115 or IMD evaluation reports are considered applicable writing examples.</p>
<p>Does the State want the cost proposal submitted separately from the narrative proposal?</p>	<p>Bidders should include a budget narrative along with their itemized budgets by evaluation component and deliverable for each year of the evaluation.</p>