

***Request for Proposals
RFP-20-021-VF
Selected Third Party Administration of Employee Benefits***

**ADDENDUM NO. 4
Questions and Answers**

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q131: For Proposers bidding on combined Benefits Administration services (active, retiree, FSA, Cobra) and Voluntary Benefits (accident, critical illness, and universal life) solution, should the requested RFP Exhibits be completed by the benefits administrator, the carrier, or both? During these times of “social distancing” due to the pandemic, should documents be notarized prior to submitting the proposal, or can they be notarized upon finalist selection?

A131: We suggest that the entity responsible for delivering proposed services be the one that completes the appropriate questionnaire, rate exhibit, etc. Therefore, in the example noted in the question, this would imply the benefit admin firm complete its sections in Attachment A, whereas the voluntary benefits carrier complete appropriate portions of Attachment B.

With regard to notarizing documents, all documents need to be notarized prior to submission of the proposal. Please refer to question 23 of Addendum #3 posted on February 22, 2021 for additional information.

Q148: Can you explain the size of the employee dishonesty coverage? What is the reason for the \$10 Million limit? Is the City open to other solutions such as setting up collections to City controlled bank/trust account?

A148: Please see revised Insurance Requirements attached to this addendum. The Purpose of the employee dishonesty coverage is to insulate the Board from possible employee theft/fraud of bank accounts utilized to manage employee contributions.

Q149: Would the City be open to lowering the amount of coverage to a more reasonable level of coverage? If so, what level?

A149: Please see revised Insurance Requirements attached to this addendum.

Q201: On pg. 9 item E under Insurance Requirements, is the District requiring coverage of \$10 million per occurrence?

A201: Please see revised Insurance Requirements attached to this addendum.

Q213: Regarding question 45j. on the Tab 6 of Attachment B, can M-DCPS explain how it understands the terms Parent Company, Subsidiary, and the term “financial responsibility?”

A213: The purpose of this question is to confirm that the organization responding to this RFP agrees to honor all obligations presented in its proposal, even those that may be delivered by a subcontractor or subsidiary.

Q259: The Instruction to Proposers indicate that Level 2 background screening requirements will apply if Proposer has access to or control of school funds. Do you expect that the Proposer will be required to meet Level 2 background screening requirements?

A259: Yes, all on-site vendors are required to pass a level 2 background screening.

Q265: Will requested revisions to the Insurance Requirements be considered if submitted as part of a Proposal?

A265: Please see revised Insurance Requirements attached to this addendum. The Board will consider deviations that are not part of the minimum requirements submitted as part of Proposers' response.

Q266: Proposer will not be retaining any new subcontractors specifically for this contract. All subcontractors are already in place and service Proposer's entire client base. These specific subcontractors will be required in order to perform certain aspects of the services, and it is not practical for individual clients to have input into which subcontractors we use. Will the School Board consider removing the requirement that any subcontractor must first be approved by the Board? Would it be acceptable to modify that requirement so that the Proposer only has the obligation to inform the Board of all subcontractors who are used and/or replaced, along with relevant information about those subcontractors?

A266: Yes, the School Board will consider removing the requirement that any subcontractor must first be approved by the School Board, as long as the Proposer is responsible for assuring that all subcontractors abide by School Board policies and procedures.

Q267: It appears the Board is seeking an indemnity for all claims resulting from or incidental to the Awarded Proposer's performance under the Agreement. Will the Board consider adding clarifying language that the indemnity will only apply to the extent that the Awarded Proposer was negligent, failed to comply with applicable law, breached or failed to comply with obligations under the agreement, etc.? The intent of this clarification would be to clarify that the Awarded Proposer would not be liable merely for performing the services.

A267: The Board will consider deviations that are not part of the minimum requirements submitted as part of Proposers' response.

Q274: What SSO connections are in place today that would need to be supported by the selected vendor?

A274: There are no SSO connections in place today.