

September 22, 2010

MONTANA STATE FUND  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL - ADDENDUM 2  
RFP NO. MSF 44  
RESPONSE DUE DATE: October 4, 2010 at 5:00 p.m.  
TITLE: WORKERS' COMPENSATION INSURANCE CLAIMS REVIEW

**ADDENDUM NO.2**

Please make the following addition to the above-referenced "Request for Proposal".

Attached are written questions received in response to this RFP. These questions, along with the Montana State Fund's response, become an official amendment to this RFP.

**Question 1. Page 3, OFFEROR'S RFP CHECKLIST**

- a. #1 indicates "**performance security and funding amount and source**". May we assume this is a generic checklist as we do not see these two items referenced later in the proposal?

Answer

Yes. This is generic language for all RFPs. Some specific language may not apply to the specific work requested.

- b. #5 indicates "**follow the format and provide point to point responses to all sections**". Some sections are informational only – do we still respond to all sections? Ex. contract section? (Please see our question 3 below.)

Answer

Yes. Refer to section 1.5.1. *Offerors must organize their proposal into sections that follow the format of this RFP, with tabs separating each section. **A point by point response to all numbered sections, subsections, and appendices is required.** If no explanation or clarification is required in the offeror's response to a specific subsection, the offeror shall indicate so in the point by point response, or utilize a blanket response for the entire section with the following statement: "**Offeror's Name**" understands and will comply*".

For example, Offeror could state, "Section 1: Project Overview and Instructions - Offeror understands and will comply."

- c. #8 indicates “**you must submit a signed cover sheet for each addenda issued along with your RFP response**”. Does this indicate we print off the addenda, create a cover sheet to the addenda, and attach the cover and addendum to the back of our response or to another location in the RFP response?

Answer

MSF requires only that you sign and return the Acknowledgment of Addendum for each Addendum. You do not have to submit additional signed cover sheets. One signed cover sheet with your original response to the RFP will be sufficient. Please refer to Section 1.3.3. ... *Offerors must sign and return with their RFP response an Acknowledgment of Addendum for any addendum issued.*

**Question 2. Page 5, PROJECT OVERVIEW AND INSTRUCTIONS**

a. 1.1 **CONTRACT TERM**

- i. The above paragraph indicates a possible 7 year duration. Does this indicate the MSF may contemplate having the claims audited for several ongoing years? We ask this as it could affect pricing.

Answer

The scope of this project is only for the immediate review as outlined in Section 3 – Scope of Project. MSF has no plans at this time to continue to engage the vendor for more than one review.

**Question 3. Page 6, 1.3.3 MSF’s response.** This question is the same as our #1 C. This indicates an Acknowledgement of addendum for any addendum must be signed and returned. Is the way of handling we ask about in our 1 C acceptable?

Answer

MSF requires only that you sign and return the Acknowledgment of Addendum for each Addendum. You do not have to submit additional signed cover sheets. One signed cover sheet with your original response to the RFP will be sufficient. Please refer to Section 1.3.3. ... *Offerors must sign and return with their RFP response an Acknowledgment of Addendum for any addendum issued.*

**Question 4.** Page 7, 1.5.1 **Organization of proposal.** Does this answer our question 1 b above with “the blanket response if applicable”?

Answer

Yes. As stated in 1.5.1., *If no explanation or clarification is required in the offeror’s response to a specific subsection, the offeror shall indicate so in the point by point response, or utilize a blanket response for the entire section with the following statement: “Offeror’s Name” understands and will comply”.*

For example, Offeror could state, “Section 1: Project Overview and Instructions - Offeror understands and will comply.”

**Question 5.** Page 8, 1.6.2 **Material submitted becomes MSF property** states that any idea submitted becomes MSF property. Does this mean that, after selection is made, ideas from one proposal may be suggested to be used on another company’s bid? If this is the case, are one hundred percent of all companies’ proposals FOIA actionable?

Answer

It is not the intent of MSF to transfer ideas from one vendor to another vendor. MSF expects vendors to rely on their own approach and ideas to complete the work and meet the objectives of the project. The specific scope and approach towards completing the project will be subject to contract negotiations with the successful vendor, but the basis for those discussions will be the individual vendor’s proposal, not a proposal from another vendor. Vendors responses will be scored, in part, on the merits of the approaches they propose to take, not on their ability to review and select others’ ideas.

Regarding information available as a result of an FOIA request, as referenced in 2.2 on page 8 of the RFP,

**2.2.1 Public Information.** All information received in response to this RFP, including copyrighted material, is deemed public information and will be made available for public viewing and copying shortly after the time for receipt of proposals has passed with the following three exceptions: (1) bona fide trade secrets meeting the requirements of the Uniform Trade Secrets Act, Title 30, chapter 14, part 4, MCA, that have been properly marked, separated, and documented; (2) matters involving individual safety as determined by MSF; and (3) other constitutional protections.

**2.2.2 Procurement Officer Review of Proposals.** Upon opening the proposals received in response to this RFP, the procurement officer in charge of the solicitation will review the proposals and separate out any information that meets the referenced exceptions in Section 2.2.1 above, providing the following conditions have been met:

- Confidential information is clearly marked and separated from the rest of the proposal.
- The proposal does not contain confidential material in the cost or price section.
- An affidavit from an offeror's legal counsel attesting to and explaining the validity of the trade secret claim as set out in Title 30, chapter 14, part 4, MCA, is attached to each proposal containing trade secrets. Counsel must use MSF of Montana "Affidavit for Trade Secret Confidentiality" form in requesting the trade secret claim. This affidavit form is available on the OneStop Vendor Information website at: <http://svc.mt.gov/gsd/OneStop/GSDDocuments.aspx> or by calling (406) 444-2575.

Information separated out under this process will be available for review only by the procurement officer, the evaluator/evaluation committee members, and limited other designees. Offerors must be prepared to pay all legal costs and fees associated with defending a claim for confidentiality in the event of a "right to know" (open records) request from another party.

Unless the information provided by vendors is properly identified as being confidential, and meets the standards as applied by MSF, information provided as part of an RFP response is public information.

**Question 6. Page 9, 2.3.8 REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS NOTICE**

- a. Does this section indicate the highest scoring offeror must have all the required documents **before** the award, or are some attainable within the 30 day contract negotiation window? As an example – the Section 7 page 21 COMPLIANCE WITH WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT independent contractors exemption, and other examples listed there and on other pages such as page 9 – "contract performance security", or on page 24 "certificate of authority."? We are able to provide the necessary documents at any time, but are trying to clarify the timeframe.

Answer

Documents will need to be provided prior to contract execution, not prior to contract award.

- b. On page 9 – can you help us completely understand contract performance security?

Answer

Contract performance security is not required for this RFP.

**Question 7.** Page 12, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph states your desire to use claim experts, claims QA Specialists, etc. We understand this but find the term “claim experts” to be generic? As these folks also employees or are they outside sources?

Answer

The claims experts are MSF employees with a significant background and expertise in claims that allows them to serve as a resource and provide claim guidance, mentoring and coaching to MSF claims staff.

**Question 8.** What is the role MSF envisions its claim handlers to play, other than assist with data gathering?

Answer

MSF claim expert involvement is limited to teaching vendor staff how to access the MSF claims system and information, interpretation of MSF or Montana workers' compensation system operation and jargon, gathering data, and serving as a resource for the vendor staff should questions arise.

**Question 9.** In 3.0 page 12 second paragraph, you state that retrieval of claim file data from MSF's electronic claims system will be performed at MSF's Helena, Montana office. Will loss data be made available electronically (by excel spreadsheet) - needed to select the claim sample and for loading selected files into the audit tool? Or will the successful vendor be required to come to the MSF Helena offices to download claim data?

Answer

Claim information, to select individual files to meet the project goals, can be made available prior to site work for file review selection. Details of what the successful vendor may need and what MSF can provide will be subject to contract negotiations and timelines. Specific claim loss data must be collected on site at the MSF offices in Helena, Montana.

**Question 10.** Have the MSP claims practices and quality management program been consistent since July 1, 1990 or have there been changes to either? If so, in what year?

Answer

In November, 2000, a formal quality assurance program was implemented and has been in place since that time. Although there have been clarifications and minor modifications over time, the overall program has been consistent. Claims management

practices have continued to evolve and change with changes in law and technology, but have been reasonably consistent over the last 24 months, which is the subject of the requested review. For purposes of this review, it is expected that the claim activity occurring in the last 24 months as well as MSF's practices and quality assurance processes during the last 24 months will be the focus of the review.

**Question 11.** Section 1.5.1 on page 7 states a need for "point-by-point response to all numbered sections, subsections and appedendices required. Does this mean we need to restate all of sections 1 and 2 and acknowledge our understanding/compliance?

Answer

Refer to section 1.5.1. *...If no explanation or clarification is required in the offeror's response to a specific subsection, the offeror shall indicate so in the point by point response, or utilize a blanket response for the entire section with the following statement: "**Offeror's Name**" understands and will comply".*

For example, Offeror could state, "Section 1: Project Overview and Instructions - Offeror understands and will comply."

**Question 12.** Does the claim information provided on page 13 include "zero valued" claims? If so, can you provide a revised list that excludes zero valued claims?

Answer

There are no zero valued claims included in the list and therefore, no revision of the list is required. Zero valued claims are claims where a liability determination has been made, and no liability exists.

The information provided includes claims with zero dollars incurred. These claims were in a pending status as liability had not yet been determined.

**Question 13.** Will MSF provide a copy of its claim handling and quality management practices in preparation of proposal responses?

Answer

MSF will provide copies of the claim handling and quality assurance practices to the successful candidate upon execution of the contract.

**Question 14.** In reference to the standard terms and conditions, REDUCTION OF FUNDING, page 25, if funds are not available, does MSF cover the cost of work already performed?

Answer

Yes, MSF would have a contractual obligation to pay for the work performed through the cancellation date.

**Question 15.** In accordance with the minimum qualifications, we are seeking a response as to our experience and capabilities in order to ascertain if the State of Montana believes our firm meets the minimum requirements as outlined in 3.1.3.

It is not clear if we will meet the RFP minimum requirements with regards to section 3.1.3. The requirement states: "Offeror shall provide a minimum of three (3) referenced that are using services of the type proposed in this RFP".

As you are aware, the Quality Assurance Department at Offeror conducts internal audits and operates independently from the business units. We do not have a resume' of external audits that will fulfill this requirement.

"Offeror's Quality Assurance Department works independently from the rest of our corporation and considers our internal business units to be our clients. Offeror conducted 1,854 comprehensive full file workers' compensation file audits in 2009 on internal files. Offeror conducted 2,195 file audits in 2008 and 3,397 file audits in 2007 for a total of 7,446 individual full file workers' compensation file audits over the past 3 years."

Answer

As a clarification of the language of 3.1.3 regarding external references, that is our intent. With this response, the language is amended to read:

**3.1.3** Offeror shall provide a minimum of three (3) external references that are using, or have used, services of the type proposed in this RFP. [Remaining language does not change]

See Addendum 2.

To the extent a vendor has provided this kind of service for internal clients only, they would not meet the minimum requirements for an eligible response.

**Question 16.** Section 3: Scope of Project - Page 11 - Noting the 7,386 open claims count --Should Offeror presume the random sampling of files reviewed will be only open files?

Answer

Refer to Section 3.0 Scope of Services. *MSF and vendor will mutually agree upon a representative sample of open and closed claims.*

**Question 17.** Section 3: Scope of Project - Page 12 - Noting a confidence level of no less than 90% -- Is there a corresponding margin of error level required by MSF?

Answer

MSF's approach to this has changed. The language of the RFP is amended to read as follows:

MSF and vendor will mutually agree upon a sufficiently large sample size so that results are reasonably applicable to the entire claim population.

See Addendum 2.

**Question 18.** Section 3.1: RFP Submission Requirements

3.1.4 - Page 14 --Is it possible to have more than the Project Manager attend the interview?

Answer

The participation of the Project Manager is required during the interview. The total number of vendor participants attending the interview is not limited.

**Question 19.** Section 5: Cost Proposal:

Page 16 - Is there a budget in place for the review? If so what is the maximum amount budgeted? What was the cost of the last review and how many files were reviewed?

Answer

MSF manages expenses to operate the organization including the costs of strategic initiatives. As such, MSF considers the cost of services outlined in the RFP in establishing the overall operating budget. However, since the evaluation of the RFP will focus on the quality of the described services to be provided in the response and the quality of the described methodology used to establish the Workers' Compensation Insurance Claims Review framework, MSF does not believe there is a benefit to discuss an estimated budget prior to receiving the responses. An additional factor to our

response to the above question is that the cost of the proposal is a part of the evaluation of the proposal. The responder should provide their best estimate for the cost of services provided per the RFP.

MSF has never undertaken as comprehensive a review prior to this effort.

**Question 20.** Why is this RFP being submitted by MSF at this time?

Answer

This review is not precipitated by a specific event. MSF is dedicated to identifying and implementing new and better ways to efficiently and effectively provide superior service. An outside review of our claims management and review of our Quality Assurance process is being requested to ensure MSF is applying the right claims practices; that we are measuring claim files against the claims practices appropriately, and that our claims Quality Assurance process is looking for and responding correctly to issues and successes.

**Question 21.** From our experience working with other state funds, these projects often have predetermined allowed budgets. Is there a budget for the requested services, and if so, what is that amount?

Answer

MSF manages expenses to operate the organization including the costs of strategic initiatives. As such, MSF considers the cost of services outlined in the RFP in establishing the overall operating budget.. However, since the evaluation of the RFP will focus on the quality of the described services to be provided in the response and the quality of the described methodology used to establish the Workers' Compensation Insurance Claims Review framework, MSF does not believe there is a benefit to discuss an estimated budget prior to receiving the responses. An additional factor to our response to the above question is that the cost of the proposal is a part of the evaluation of the proposal. The responder should provide their best estimate for the cost of services provided per the RFP.

**Question 22.** Please describe MSF's current claim management/handling philosophy and any recent changes to that philosophy.

Answer

It is the philosophy of Montana State Fund to provide appropriate benefits in a timely manner for compensable injuries in accordance with the Montana Workers' Compensation Act.

**Question 23.** We agree with MSF that parts of this project will depend upon collaboration between the Consultant and the MSF project team. Can you tell us how many internal MSF resources will be dedicated to the project? In addition, how much access will the Consultant have with the MSF project leader and team members?

Answer

The claim experts assisting with this project consist of eleven employees, four Quality Assurance Specialists and seven Claim Leads. Each of the Claim Leads will dedicate up to 40 hours to assist in the data gathering phase; each Quality Assurance Specialist will dedicate up to 120 hours during the data gathering phase. The Consultants will have continuous access to the MSF project leader and team members.

**Question 24.** How many of the Consultants project team members can be given access simultaneously to MSF's electronic claims?

Answer

MSF will be able to easily provide workstations with computer access for up to six people. If requested and agreed upon, additional workstations may be provided.

**Question 25.** Has MSF performed a claim review in the past? If so, will the results of that review be available to the consultants?

Answer

MSF underwent a major reorganization in Fiscal Year 2001. Since that time the Claim Program Team has provided quality assurance reviews for each examiner on a quarterly basis and a team level review on an annual basis. There have been claims reviews performed by external vendors since that time, but those reviews have been focused on specific aspects of claim management rather than overall claim handling. Given the current request is for an overall review of the claim process, past reviews are not comparable, but could be made available to the successful vendor.

**Question 26.** Appendix A: Contract - Section 4 – Ownership Rights

- We would like to clarify that information relating to the Agreement may be released as may be required by law, regulation, judicial or administrative process, or in accordance with applicable professional standards or rules, or in connection with litigation pertaining to the Agreement provided that we provide the State notice where possible for them to seek injunctive or other relief.

Answer

See Section 1.4.1 of the RFP- MSF is unable allow an exception unless submitted by the date of receipt of written questions and include an explanation of why the exception is being sought and its effect on the ability to respond to the RFP or perform the

contract. MSF is willing to address nonmaterial exceptions with the highest scoring offeror during contract negotiations.

**Question 27.** Appendix A: Contract - Section 6 – Access and Retention of Records

- We recognize the State’s need under certain circumstances to have the right to access certain books and records of its contractors. However, we believe that limits should be established on the proposed audit rights contained in this section. In addition, the agreement must clearly define the appropriate types of records that the Contractor is required to keep in light of the circumstances of the engagement as those records related to the amounts invoiced by Offeror to MSF throughout the term of the engagement, with the ability to redact any confidential information of its personnel or other clients.

Answer

This section of the contract is required by Montana law for MSF. MSF is willing to address nonmaterial exceptions with the highest scoring Offeror during contract negotiations.

**Question 28.** Appendix A: Contract - Section 8 – Hold Harmless/Indemnification

- Offeror is willing to provide indemnification to the State in connection with the services to be provided. This indemnification would need to be negotiated.

Answer

See Section 1.4.1 of the RFP- MSF is unable allow an exception unless submitted by the date of receipt of written questions. MSF is willing to address nonmaterial exceptions with the highest scoring Offeror during contract negotiations.

**Question 29.** Appendix A: Contract - Section 9 – Assignments

- We will need to subcontract certain services to our affiliates, so we would propose that this be clarified in the contract.

Answer

See 1.4.4 of the RFP. Any proposed subcontractors and the scope of their services should be identified in the response to this RFP.

**Question 30.** Appendix A: Contract - Section 12 – Insurance Requirements

- While we agree in principle with this provision, we will need to make certain minor changes to the insurance requirements in order to make these requirements consistent with the insurance that we (as well as other large professional services firms) maintain.

Answer

MSF is willing to address nonmaterial exceptions with the highest scoring Offeror during contract negotiations.

**Question 31.** Appendix A: Contract - Section 15 – Terminations

- While we agree in principle with the provisions of this Section, we believe termination for cause should be based on a material breach of contract and require 30 days written notice with the breaching party being given an opportunity to cure such breach during the notice period.

Answer

MSF is willing to include language in the contract for an opportunity to cure during the 30 day notice period, but will not include language on a “material” breach.

**Question 32.** Additional Terms

We would also like to discuss with the State the addition of certain other terms to the resulting contract, including

- (i) a commercially standard limitation on Offeror’s liability and
- (ii) (ii) a warranty provision which would clarify that we will warrant that our services will be performed by competent personnel and will be of professional quality consistent with generally accepted industry and applicable professional standards for the performance of such services and that no other express or implied warranties are provided.

Answer

See Section 1.4.1 of the RFP- MSF is unable allow an exception unless submitted by the date of receipt of written questions and include an explanation of why the exception is being sought and its effect on the ability to respond to the RFP or perform the contract. MSF is willing to address nonmaterial exceptions with the highest scoring offeror during contract negotiations.

**Question 33.** In Section 3.0 Scope of Services, page 12 of the RFP, it is indicated that the MSF desires to include the use of your claims experts, Claims QA Specialists and individual team Claims Leads in the vendor's data gathering process. We acknowledge that this means utilization of a "mixed team" of MSF claims staff and Offeror claim consultants. To that extent, how many MSF claim personnel do you anticipate will be available/utilized for this important project? Full time basis? Part time basis?

Answer

The claim experts assisting with this project consist of eleven employees, four Quality Assurance Specialists and seven Claim Leads. Each of the Claim Leads will dedicate up to 40 hours to assist in the data gathering phase; each Quality Assurance Specialist will dedicate up to 120 hours during the data gathering phase. The Consultants will have continuous access to the MSF project leader and team members.

**Question 34.** Also, in Section 3.0 Scope of Services, page 12 of the RFP, it states "MSF and vendor will mutually agree upon a representative sample of open and closed claims to provide results with a confidence level of no less than 90%". Typically, when we see that a prospective client is seeking review of a "representative" sample that usually does not contemplate results to any specific confidence or tolerance level. Reviews that are focused on obtaining a confidence or tolerance level typically involve review of a statistically valid sample of claim files. That said, we want to ensure our understanding that you do, in fact, wish to have a statistically valid sample to enable a 90% confidence level.

Answer

MSF's approach to this has changed. The language of the RFP is amended to read as follows:

MSF and vendor will mutually agree upon a sufficiently large sample size so that results are reasonably applicable to the entire claim population.

See Addendum 2.

**Question 35.** Further, with regard to the 90% confidence level, we are interested in knowing your target level of tolerance within the 90% confidence level. This will assist greatly in making the appropriate file selections by case size, complexity and overall review sample size to achieve your desired objectives.

Answer

MSF's approach to this has changed. The language of the RFP is amended to read as follows:

MSF and vendor will mutually agree upon a sufficiently large sample size so that results are reasonably applicable to the entire claim population.

See Addendum 2.

**Question 36.** From our reading of the RFP and the four specific objectives stated in Section 3.0 Scope of Services, page 11, this is clearly a qualitative review. Further, the RFP states that the review is limited to claims arising from July 1, 1990 and forward. Given that this is not a quantitative and/or case reserve review, and in our experience with similar reviews, claims activity that occurred more than two or three years ago can significantly alter and/or inappropriately skew qualitative results. It would be helpful to know if the intent is to include a significant sample of older claims (Ex: pre-2006) or to focus primarily (while including a smaller sample of older claims) on those claims reported within the last several years to achieve an understanding of quality of more recent claims activity.

Answer

For purposes of this review, it is expected that the claim activity occurring in the last 24 months as well as MSF's practices and quality assurance processes during the last 24 months will be evaluated.

**Question 37.** Will finalist interviews be conducted on October 25<sup>th</sup> or 26<sup>th</sup> as stated in Section 3.1.4, or November 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> as stated in the 'Schedule of Events'?

Answer

The correct dates for the onsite interviews are listed in the Schedule of Events. The interviews will take place on November 3<sup>rd</sup> and November 4<sup>th</sup>. The Information in Section 3.1.4. stating the interviews would be held on October 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> is incorrect.

**Question 38.** The claims history provided in Section 3.0 notes this review is limited to claims arising from July 1, 1990 forward and that as of July 1, 2010, there are 7,386 active open claims, of which 6,109 are wage loss and 1,277 are medical only. The open inventory charge on page 13 notes only 13 active open medical only claims assigned to Team 7. Would you please verify that this claims count excludes claims arising prior to July 1, 1990? Would you please also provide a similar chart showing claims closed by Team for claims arising since July 1, 1990?

Answer

Only claims arising on, or after, July 1, 1990, are to be included in the review. The claim count provided excludes claims arising prior to July 1, 1990. The team structure was not in place until November, 2000. Therefore, we are unable to provide information on claims closed by team for years prior to FY2001. Since that time, the average number of claims closed per month for all teams is 1,306.5.

**Question 39.** Section 3.0 notes claims professionals are organized into seven teams, with claims professionals in six teams managing both indemnity and medical only claims and two claims professionals in the seventh team managing medical only claims. Would you please provide an organizational chart for the seven teams showing team member titles and number of indemnity and medical only claims assigned to each member?

Answer

MSF is comprised of seven teams with Teams 1 through 6 handling only claims arising on or after July 1, 1990. Team 7 handles a small number of claims for this same period as well as all claims for injuries arising prior to July 1, 1990.

There are 51 claim examiners within the seven teams; the number of examiners per team ranges from 6 to 12. The team structure also includes one Claim Lead per team.

The following chart provides claim averages for medical only and indemnity claims:

	Indemnity Average per Examiner	Medical Average per Examiner
Teams 1 – 6 Examiners	108	25.04
Teams 1 – 6 Claim Leads	21.5	2.67
Team 7	60.15	1.86

**Question 40.** Do the MSF claim professionals perform claim investigations or is this assigned to independent field investigators?

Answer

The examiner is responsible for completing the investigation. MSF does not have field investigators.

**Question 41.** Who provides the MSF with ancillary claim services such as medical bill review, utilization review, nurse case management, independent field investigation, legal services for benefit issues, legal services for subrogation pursuit, vocational management and ergonomic services, injury prevention services, and electronic claims system components and maintenance?

Answer

MSF utilizes both in-house and contracted services for the services listed above. Upon signing of the contract MSF will work with the selected vendor and identify information necessary to complete the work contemplated in the contract.

**Question 42.** What is the total annual premium of the MSF policy holders for each of the years included in this study, beginning with fiscal year ending (FYE) 1991?

Answer

For clarification purposes, premium is not relevant to the review requested by the RFP.

However, the following chart provides the annual premium for MSF policy holders for the period of FY1991 through present.

<u>FY</u>	<u>NEP</u>
1991	\$102,448,520
1992	\$126,764,562
1993	\$169,992,779
1994	\$181,626,000
1995	\$152,839,000
1996	\$114,459,000
1997	\$88,154,000
1998	\$76,421,000
1999	\$70,169,550
2000	\$70,656,612
2001	\$74,510,374
2002	\$92,971,868
2003	\$117,776,580
2004	\$139,360,612
2005	\$189,378,858
2006	\$211,892,198
2007	\$238,202,708
2008	\$230,965,306
2009	\$203,976,354
2010	\$165,825,645 unaudited

**Question 43.** May we have a copy of the most recent claims review report, MSF standards and quality control practices guidelines, ancillary service contracts, Microsoft spreadsheet providing claims details in a single row per claim format, and most recent actuarial report before on-site work commences?

Answer

Upon signing of the contract MSF will work with the selected vendor and identify information necessary to complete the work contemplated in the contract.

**Question 44.** Please provide the two most recent claims review completion dates, audit firms, sample sizes, and fees.

Answer

MSF has never undertaken as comprehensive a review prior to this effort.

**Acknowledgment of Addendum:**

The offeror for this solicitation must acknowledge receipt of this addendum. This page must be submitted at the time and date set for the proposal response or the response may be disqualified from further consideration.

I acknowledge receipt of Addendum #2.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_