

THIS ADDENDUM COVERS CLARIFICATIONS TO THE RFP REFERENCED ABOVE.

The following questions were submitted for clarification, as per RFP Section 2. University response is provided below each question.

General:

1. Is UToledo replacing a vendor, or outsourcing from an internal team?

Response: Replacing a vendor

Attachment B, pages 11-14:

2. Can you please expand on the nature of the auto claims? What are the charges related to?

Response: Auto Accident Claims billable to Auto insurance and or 3rd party liability payers

3. The scope of this RFP includes only hospital (facility) billing, or will professional billing (PB) accounts also be included in the placements?

Response: This is for HB or Hospital facility billing only

4. Is there potential for including/expanding the awarded scope to include additional Complex Claim services (e.g., Workers' Comp and/or Veterans Affairs) to drive better fee rates, performance, etc?

Response: We are not looking to outsource Workers' Comp or VA at this time

5. Is the scope of work for Facility claims only, or are Physician claims also included in the scope?

Response: See response to question #3

6. Does the scope include HB and PB?

Response: See response to question #3

7. Will backlog be in scope? If so, please provide backlog data.

Response: Should be minimal back log, less than 1000 accounts

8. What is the average charge off date of the accounts?

Response: This is Accident-related project for billing and collecting on Automotive Claims and 3rd party liabilities

9. When will accounts be placed? Day 1?

Response: Day one when we are aware of accident-related liability

10. What is the average reimbursement from TPL payers or total TPL payments per month or year?

Response: Volumes are noted in the "Historical Placement Volumes (last 5 years) - payment is typically about 53% of billed charges or policy limits

11. Is there an expectation to close the account inventory by a certain time if not resolved within 1 year?

Response: Since these are accident-related claims, they are typically closed back for billing medical coverage when patient is attorney represented or for Medicare claim at 120 days

12. Many auto payers are now electronic on claims submission. However, there could be a few that would require paper submission. Would the selected vendor be responsible for submitting the paper claims with documentation?

Response: Yes, the current vendor has access to do this

13. There is no collection data provided in the RFP. Could the University of Toledo please provide the corresponding count and dollar amount of MVA/TPL collections over the past five years?

Response: collections for the following years: 2021 \$543,968, 2022 \$325,654, 2023 \$404,882, 2024 \$604,673, 2025 ½ year \$253,033

14. It appears that UToledo is acceptable to an off-site vendor (no local presence) and with the vendor working in their proprietary system (with data feeds going between Epic and the vendor system). Please validate this is accurate.

Response: The vendor currently works within our Epic system from off site

15. Will all MVA/TPL placements come over as day-one placements, or will some be delayed due to other HI contracts that must be billed primary?

Response: Day one, we bill MVA and TPL as primary but close back to health insurance if patient is attorney represented

16. Can you provide more details on the EPIC expectations and requirements?

Response: Vendor should be working with our Epic system to Bill and Follow up post notes and work from Work queues

17. Will the supplier be required to use EPIC or can they export the accounts into their own CRM system and provide updates to the University?

Response: We will expect that the work is done in Epic – but can be a topic of discussion

18. Historical Placement Volumes:

a. The volume of claims more than doubled from 2022 to 2023, can you please provide insight into the increase in claims?

Response: 2022 was a transition year from the legacy EHR system to the Epic System and there were some challenges getting the liability claims assigned to the vendor

b. The average charge of historical placements shows a year-over-year increase, starting at approximately \$7k and growing to over \$20k. Is there a known reason for the large increase in the average placed charge over the course of five years?

Response: See response above – We have also created reports to capture claims that may not have been registered as a liability account

c. I wanted to clarify since this is the gross amount. Are placements claims that were collected on? Do you have the actual reimbursements for the auto claims? Most companies and per the RFP, the fees are based on a percentage of those funds. Would appreciate the clarification.

Response: collections for the following years: 2021 \$543,968, 2022 \$325,654, 2023 \$404,882, 2024 \$604,673, 2025 ½ year \$253,033

19. **Page 12.5:** It notes the required cooperation with UHealth's contracted vendor management supplier (Healthfuse). We have no issue with this as it is a relatively frequent request, but we are wondering, is there any type of fee involved for us to go live with Healthfuse?

Response: There is no fee to the vendor for this service.

20. **Page 13, Section 8.7:** In situations where accounts are recalled for timely filing, will vendors be allowed to retain those accounts and continue follow-up efforts? If not, can you provide historical or estimated volumes of accounts that fall into this category?

Response: Yes, the vendor can retain those accounts and continue follow up efforts for liability payments (except in the case of Medicare claims as we have to stop collection activity if Medicare is billed conditionally)

21. **Page 13, Section 8.16:** Will vendors be permitted to work accounts from their proprietary system with daily/weekly note uploads back into Epic, as referenced in item #16, or is all work required to be performed directly within Epic?

Response: Typically, we prefer the work to be done in Epic, buwill allow for discussion around this

22. **Attachment E UToledo Service Agreement:** Are we required to submit redlines to the Service Agreement with our proposal response, or will there be an opportunity to negotiate contract terms only if selected for award?

Response: Redlines to service agreement are not a required submittal. Final terms and conditions will be negotiated with the awarded supplier.

No other changes

LATE PROPOSALS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

This clarification must be signed and returned with the required submittals listed in the RFP.

Company Name

Signature of Authorized Representative

Date