STATE OF CONNECTICUT
OFFICE OF THE HEALTHCARE ADVOCATE
HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OFFICE

REQUEST FOR QUOTATION (RFQ) FOR HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CONSULTING SERVICES
FOURTH Addendum

Release Date: 10/26/2017

1. This section [pg. 16 Section 4 Evaluation and Selection – 4.1.1 Criteria] states, regarding cost evaluation, "…Reasonableness of the offered rates and billing structure…"

   a. We understand "reasonableness" but will the State please define how the "reasonableness" criteria will be evaluated?

      Response: Reasonableness will be the subjective evaluation of whether the billing structure appears logical and aligns to the Respondent's experience and delivery capabilities.

   b. What is meant by "…billing structure…" and how that criteria will be evaluated?

      Response: Billing structure is specified in Attachment C: Budget Template on Page #24 of the RFQ.
      *Please note: a response to this question was left out of Addendum Three and is addressed here in its entirety.

   c. This section also notes "The order of these factors does not generally denote relative importance." What is the State's order of importance or weights for each of the noted criteria?

      Response: Ranking and weights will not be published during the active response period.

2. After development, is the state looking to host the solution or purchase as SaaS?

   Response: It is not the intent that Respondents should be bidding to provide the technical solution for either Service Areas 2. The scope of work intent is to focus efforts for ongoing advisory and planning services required to support the agile SDLC of the eCQM and HIE solution architectures.

3. Development will be performed on state data center or contractors?

   Response: It is *not* the intent that Respondents should be bidding to provide the technical solution for either Service Areas 2.

4. What are the security standard requirements for development?

   Response: It is *not* the intent that Respondents should be bidding to provide the technical solution for either Service Areas 2.

5. Does the state have a preferred technology platform? i.e. Microsoft

   Response: It is *not* the intent that Respondents should be bidding to provide the technical solution for either Service Areas 2.

6. Is system maintenance a separate service area?

   Response: It is *not* the intent that Respondents should be bidding to provide the technical solution for either Service Areas 2.

7. How many users will the eCQM Reporting System support?

   Response: It is not the intent that Respondents should be bidding to provide the technical solution for either Service Areas 2.

8. Will the eCQM be a highly available system? 24/7 access to users?

   Response: It is not the intent that Respondents should be bidding to provide the technical solution for either Service Areas 2.

9. To avoid conflicts between the definition of proposals and supporting procurements (service area 2.1: Meeting Facilitation, Strategic Planning Support, and Proposal Writing) and the other three service areas (2.2, 2.3, and 2.4), please confirm that the contractor selected to perform service area 2.1 is precluded from being awarded a contract to perform work in services areas 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4.

   Response: Please refer to the Third Amendment, Question #1.

10. In Section 3.2, Application Content (page 15), the RFP asks for references for each assigned key individual. In addition, Section 4.2.10, Key Personnel, describes the rights of the PMO

to regarding key personnel assignments. We understand the intent of these requirements, but would like to know what the specific Key Personnel requirements are for each of the four service areas as described in Section 21., 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 (i.e., a list with role names and descriptions for Key Personnel).

Response: Please refer to the Third Amendment, Question # 2.

11. Given the short duration (4 business days) between the answering of questions and proposal response submission date, we request that the State extend the due date of the proposal from October 20 to October 27th. This will give a little more time for bidders to appropriately incorporate the answers to questions in our responses.

Response: This has been documented in the Extension - Applicable Dates Addendum found at https://www.biznet.ct.gov/SCP_Search/BidDetail.aspx?CID=44497

12. Regarding 'Evidence of Qualified Entity', would it be adequate to include: 1) written assurance from our legal counsel that he is not aware of any facts that would prevent us from obtaining a CT business license; and 2) an indication of our intent to file for a CT business license if selected?

Response: Please refer to the Third Amendment, Question #4.

13. Regarding the 'good-faith effort' under the 'Small, Minority, or Women's Business Enterprise' requirement, is it the intent of the HIT PMO that such an effort be undertaken prior to submission of the response to the RFQ, or would it be adequate to include an indication of our intent to pursue such a "good-faith effort" after award and a description of the anticipated effort?

Response: Please refer to the Third Amendment, Question #5.

14. For the second service area within the Scope of Work (re eCQM), it is pretty clear that it is not the intent of the HIT PMO that a bidder will be bidding to provide the technical solution. For the third service area (re HIE), it is less clear. Is it the intent of the HIT PMO that respondents to the third service area within the SOW (re HIE) should be bidding to provide the technical solution?

Response: Please refer to the Third Amendment, Question #6.

15. Is there any preferred technology Stack that the HIT PMO is looking for or the platform needs to be technology agnostic?

Response: It is not the intent that Respondents should be bidding to provide the technical solution for either Service Areas 2 or 3. The scope of work intent is to focus efforts for the ongoing planning required to support the agile SDLC of the eCQM and HIE solution architectures.

16. Will the system be deployed in-premises, private cloud or public cloud?

    Response: Please refer to the Third Addendum, Question #8.

17. We would like further explanation about the meaning of this task, from section 2.4 "Developing benefits plan designs that incorporate data collection and usage needs." Is this referring to services or "benefits" that the HIE entity would offer, or is this describing health insurance plan design? Or something else?

    Response: Please refer to the Third Addendum, Question #9.

18. Will the proposal be reviewed by more than one team (i.e.., will the responses for each service area be reviewed by different teams)?

    Response: Please refer to the Third Addendum, Question #10.

19. Will the 4 service areas be delivered in parallel, or would there be some sequencing/ overlapping work?

    Response: This has not been determined as of this Q&A Response, but Service Areas have been defined to support parallel delivery.

20. Will the State implement technology solutions in State data centers, or is a vendor-hosted solution being considered?

    Response: It is not the intent that Respondents should be bidding to provide the technical solution for either Service Areas 2.

21. We still cannot access the links in the RFQ document. Can these linked documents be accessed via another source/website?

    Response: It was corrected and tested on September 29, 2017.

22. Format Requirements: Can tables be formatted in a font smaller than 11 pt?

    Response: Respondents can use a Calibri 10 pt font for tables only.

23. Transmittal Letter: Evidence of Qualified Entity – must the written assurance from the legal counsel be a statement placed within the transmittal letter or is this supposed to be attached as a separate document?

    Response: The written assurance can be a separate document and not will not count in the 2-page transmittal letter limit.

24. Statement of Respondent's Qualifications: Is there a page/font limit to this section?

    Response: Respondents are asked to limit this section response to (four) 4 pages.

25. Staff Qualifications: Is there a page/font limit to this section?

    Response: It is requested that at least two (2) individuals' written descriptions be contain on one (1) page. All resumes are to be contained in one (1) attachment, broken down by Contractor. Each resume will begin on a new page with the position title and if the position is key.

26. Staff Qualifications: Are there any suggested staffing models and can it be a mix of on-site vs. remote?

    Response: We are looking for the Respondents to include a staffing plan and on-site/remote mix.

27. Staff Qualifications/Resumes: Is there a limit to the number of personnel to be included?

    Response: We are not defining limits, as we are looking for the Respondents to determine the number of staff they feel are required to deliver each Service Area being proposed.

28. References: Is there a page/font limit to this section?

    Response: Respondents should limit the References Section content to five (5) pages.

29. References: You state the company must provide at least 3 client references for representative scope of work performed but then you state at least 2 references per key individual are required. Please clarify this breakdown.

Response: Respondents must provide at least three (3) client references for representative scope of work performed by the Respondent and must provide at least two (2) references for each of the staff identified as key.

30. Budget Template: The budget template requests a listing of personnel and rates for SOW areas 1-3, but not area 4 – development of sustainability models. Please clarify, if we are bidding for all four areas, that we are to provide this information for all areas and NOT only the ones listed currently.

Response: In Attachment C, under the column headers, there should be four (4) separate areas for each of the four (4) Service Areas. If Respondent is bidding on Service Area 4, please add that section in the Attachment C template.

31. Evaluation Criteria and Process: Will the proposal be evaluated for each SOW area separately? Is there an advantage to bid for all four areas?

Response: It is currently planned there will be common Reviewers to review all Service Areas responses. No, there is no advantage to bid on all four Service Areas, as each will be reviewed separately.

32. SOW Area 2.3: Is the bidding team expected to list, or provide a list of eCQM Solution Vendors as potential partners? This is in reference to page 8 of the RFQ: #6 - Partner with eCQM Solution vendor to create and document business deliverables for new and enhanced capabilities

Response: It is not the intent that Respondents should be bidding to provide the technical solution for either Service Areas 2 or 3. The scope of work intent is to focus efforts for ongoing advisory and planning services required to support the agile SDLC of the eCQM and HIE solution architectures.

To clarify, Section 2.2: eCQM Specific Tasks 3, 6, 7, 11, and 12 are deleted; Section 2.3: HIE Specific Tasks 6 is to be removed from Section 2.3 and moved under Section 2.2 and number it Task 15; Section 2.3, Task 7-c remove "eCQM", which will be covered under Section 2.3; and Section 2.3, Task 9-e remove and add it to Section 2.2 as Task 13-c.

33. Is there an overall page limit for the RFQ response?

Response: No there is no overall page limit for the response.

34. Is there a maximum funding/contract value for each service?

Response: No there is no maximum contract value for each Service Area.

35. Will all four services, including sustainability planning, be completed during the time period?

Response: While sustainability planning is primarily under Service Area 4: Development of Sustainability Models, there may be supporting tasks assigned under other Service Areas activities.

36. Within the references section, are three references required per service proposed for support?

Response: Respondents are required to provide three (3) references for each Service Area being proposed. Respondents can use a reference for multiple Service Areas bid, as long as the reference(s) covers the Service Areas.

37. What is the funding model for the HIE? When was that funding established?

Response: The funding for HIE is being discussed and reviewed by OHA/HITO.

38. Are there existing HIEs or existing forums to exchange information at the state level in Connecticut? What is the history with HIEs in Connecticut?

Response: The forum with background information can be found at: http://portal.ct.gov/office-of-the-lt-governor/health-it-advisory-council

39. Who are the major healthcare players that plan to participate and what EMR systems are they using?

Response: The expectation is that the major insurance carriers, self-insured employers, Medicaid and Medicare will all be identified and analyzed for appropriate participation as a part of respondent's assignments under this RFP. Many different EMR systems are in use throughout the State.

40. What are the major payers in the market that may be targeted for this project? Do you anticipate integration with payers as part of this project?

Response: The expectation is that the major insurance carriers, self-insured employers,

Medicaid and Medicare will all be identified and analyzed for appropriate participation as a part of respondent's assignments under this RFP.

41. Are there existing agreements or regulations in place for healthcare organizations to share information with the HIE? Are the agreements consistent across the healthcare organizations? If not, what is the plan to request healthcare organizations to participate in the HIE?

    Response: There are current conversations with health care organizations and will continue as part of the Service Area activities.

42. The eCQM Design Group recommendations makes mention of QCDR Certification as a base requirement. There is also mention of NCQA Certification. Is ONC Health IT Certification also an acceptable Certification?

    Response: Yes, although this RFQ is not for the eCQM solution, but simply for consultation.

43. Will SIM funding be available to offset the costs incurred on providers by their EHR vendors to implement and maintain the necessary interfaces with the HIE platform?

    Response: This question is not relevant to the RFP. Please direct questions related to the activities of the SIM program to Kelsey Lawlor at kelsey.lawler@ct.gov.

44. Did the Health IT Advisory Council determine milestones for the number of providers/organizations who have integrated with the HIE system for the period of performance?

    Response: No. The respondent will assist the HIT PMO develop recommendations in Service Area 2.3.

45. Mandatory Terms and Conditions is not an actual form, but a statement with no signature block. The Procurement Agreement Signatory Acceptance refers to it. Do the Mandatory Terms and Conditions actually need to be attached to the proposal?

    Response: The Respondents are to include a written statement that the "The Respondent accepts without qualification…All Mandatory Terms and Conditions", as covered in RFQ Section 3.2.

46. With respect to Small, Minority or Women's Business Enterprise expectations, we are ourselves a certified a small business in our home state but we are not based in CT. Do we still have requirements to use CT-based small businesses? Similarly, we rely on woman- and minority-owned businesses which are not based in CT. Does that fulfill this intention?

Response: Being certified as a woman-owned business entity in another state, or being certified by WBENC, or being classified as WOSB by the SBA satisfies the requirement of Section 32-9e as a small, minority or women's business enterprise.

47. Are we correct that the Gift and Campaign Contributions form and the Nondiscrimination Acceptance Form do not need to be sent with a proposal, but is only required of a winning bidder at the time the contract is signed? Is that what the parenthetical note on p. 15 of the RFP means?

Response: In accordance with RFQ Section 3.2, the Gift and Campaign Contributions and Nondiscrimination Acceptance Forms are to be submitted prior to contract by successful bidders.

48. Can CT indicate the rough budget level it has available for the work described in the RFP, preferably by service area?

Response: The budget levels will be determined by OHA/HITO post award for services.

49. With respect to the Budget Template (Attachment C):
    a. Does the "person to perform" column (column 2) need to include all staff by name or only key staff? If only key staff is it acceptable to list by role so that all staff are summarized on this template?

    Response: Respondents should include all staff and identify the ones they feel are key to the delivery of services within the Service Area(s) bid.

    b. How should other costs (such as travel) be described in the proposal? These costs do not seem to fit in the template.

    Response: Travel costs may be billed separate and will follow Federal General Services Administration Travel Regulations.

    c. Should the template only include sections for the Service Areas to which the contractor is responding?

Response: Yes, only include the Service Areas Respondents are bidding on.

    d. It appears that CT is only asking for a rate scale by labor category, not an actual budget with hours per task. Is this correct?

    Response: Respondents should include the tier of staff (such as BS Directors, Sr Managers, Managers, etc.) and hourly rates in highest hourly rate order within a tier, Staff Names, Expertise, Hourly Rate, Role Description, and any Pricing Incentives (such as BS Director being "no cost"), discounts, etc.

50. Can you please clarify Service Area #2 - Development and Implementation of an eCQM Reporting System? Are you looking for a vendor to propose eCQM system and/or develop this under this RFQ? Also, please clarify the following Specific Tasks:
    a. Support the harmonization of the collection of the CQMs
    b. Partner with eCQM Solution vendor to create and document business deliverables for new and enhanced capabilities
    c. Develop requirements documentation, provide subject matter expertise and develop solution components or integrations for the CQMs that provide the largest and immediate value to customers
    d. Support data aggregation, normalization, and validation at the state level
    e. Risk stratification analysis

Response: It is not the intent that Respondents should be bidding to provide the technical solution for either Service Areas 2 or 3. The scope of work intent is to focus efforts for ongoing advisory and planning services required to support the agile SDLC of the eCQM and HIE solution architectures.

To clarify, Section 2.2: eCQM Specific Tasks 3, 6, 7, 11, and 12 are deleted; Section 2.3: HIE Specific Tasks 6 is to be removed from Section 2.3 and moved under Section 2.2 and number it Task 15; Section 2.3, Task 7-c remove "eCQM", which will be covered under Section 2.3; and Section 2.3, Task 9-e remove and add it to Section 2.2 as Task 13-c.

51. Can you please clarify Service Area #3 - Development and Implementation of Health Information Exchange Services? Are you looking for a vendor to propose an HIE system and/or develop this under this RFQ? Also, please clarify the following Specific Tasks:
    a. Data Governance: Bidders shall have strong experience and expertise with data governance and Master Data Management (MDM) solutions. Does a Data Governance Organization currently exist? If not, are you looking for us to bid on putting that together?

Response: It is not the intent that Respondents should be bidding to provide the technical solution for either Service Areas 2 or 3. The scope of work intent is to focus efforts for ongoing advisory and planning services required to support the agile SDLC of the eCQM and HIE solution architectures.

To clarify, Section 2.2: eCQM Specific Tasks 3, 6, 7, 11, and 12 are deleted; Section 2.3: HIE Specific Tasks 6 is to be removed from Section 2.3 and moved under Section 2.2 and number it Task 15; Section 2.3, Task 7-c remove "eCQM", which will be covered under Section 2.3; and Section 2.3, Task 9-e remove and add it to Section 2.2 as Task 13-c.

52. In 4.1.1, it mentions that the evaluation team can be altered. Does the evaluation team consist of State employees only?

Response: It is currently planned there will be common Reviewers to review all Service Areas, and no.

53. General Questions:
    a. If the vendor is asked to propose on the development of the HIE, can we get access to the current use cases to determine the level of completeness for scoping efforts?
    b. Are you looking for a vender to develop and implement the HIE and eCQM systems using Agile SDLC?
    c. Are there any particular technologies you are looking to be implemented?
    d. Are you looking for an existing eCQM Reporting System, one that has been implemented?
    e. What data exists that will be used to develop the eCQM system?

Response: It is not the intent that Respondents should be bidding to provide the technical solution for either Service Areas 2 or 3. The scope of work intent is to focus efforts for ongoing advisory and planning services required to support the agile SDLC of the eCQM and HIE solution architectures.

54. Please elaborate further on the role of the selected vendor in the implementation of technologies associated with Section 2.3 Implementation of Health Information Exchange Services? Specifically, will the vendor be responsible for the determining the actual solution as well as the implementation of the core infrastructure and associated technology? Is the vendor able to propose their own HIE technology solution?

Response: It is not the intent that Respondents should be bidding to provide the technical solution for either Service Areas 2 or 3. The scope of work intent is to focus efforts for ongoing advisory and planning services required to support the agile SDLC of the eCQM and HIE solution architectures.

55. Please clarify what opportunities the successful bidder will be excluded from as stated in Section 4.2.11?

<u>Response:</u> The successful bidder may be precluded from bidding on future Health Information Technology contracts issued by the State of Connecticut directly related to the work conducted in relation to this contract, consulting services notwithstanding.

56. Does the State intend to make single or multiple awards for each of the items in the Scope of Work? If the State envisions multiple awards, what contract vehicle will be used and how does the State intend to compete/award work (e.g., establish a master services agreement under which awardees compete for task orders)?

    <u>Response:</u> It is the goal to select qualified vendor(s) to deliver the requirements within the Service Area(s). The quantity of vendors selected will depend on the evaluation of responses and the vendors' ability to deliver the criteria within Service Area(s).

57. Our questions were not answered in Addendum 3. Is there a reason for that?

    <u>Response:</u> Yes, they should be included here in Addendum 4.

58. Is the Application Content (Section 3.2) expected to be separate documents or can they be combined into a single RFP response?

    <u>Response:</u> They can be combined into a single RFQ response, but must conform to all stated instructions in terms of content, format and length.

59. Are these new requirements or an existing solution? What do we need to know about the existing solutions in place, if any?

    <u>Response:</u> These are new Service Area solutions for the State of CT.

60. Are addendums and other additional documents allowed to be submitted as part of the RFP Response beyond the requirements in Section 3.2?

    <u>Response:</u> Yes, addendums are allowed and required to be submitted.

61. Are documents that require notarizations allowed to be notarized in a state other than Connecticut?

    <u>Response:</u> Yes.