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

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

THIRD Addendum

Release Date: 10/20/2017

1. 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: Being awarded a contract for Service Area 1 would not preclude Contractors from being awarded work in any other Service Area.

2. 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: It is expected the Contractors bidding on the Service Areas would identify required Key Positions and provide a needs narrative along with individual resumes and a minimum of two references for each, including names of organizations and phone numbers for recently completed projects of similar scope.

3. 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: Dates have been extended. Extension – Application Dates Addendum

4. **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: Yes, it would be adequate to include (i) written assurance from Respondent's legal counsel that they are not aware of any facts that would prevent the contractor from obtaining a Connecticut business license and (ii) indication it is the Respondents intent, if selected, to provide written assurance to the PMO from its legal counsel that it is qualified to conduct business in Connecticut and is not prohibited by its articles of incorporation, bylaws, or the law under which it is incorporated from performing the services required under any resultant contract.

5. **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: The PMO requires that the resultant Contractor make a *"good-faith effort" to set aside a portion of this contract* for a small, minority or women's business enterprise as a subcontractor.

6. **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: 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. RFPs will be released in the upcoming months for the eCQM and HIE solution implementations.

7. **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.. 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. RFPs will be released in the upcoming months for the eCQM and HIE solution implementations.

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

   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. RFPs will be released in the upcoming months for the eCQM and HIE solution implementations.

9. **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: This reference intends to highlight the ability of the resultant contractor to leverage innovative reimbursement options for HIE services in their recommendations for sustainability methods. These methods may take into account strategies that associate intended benefits, usage needs, and cost. The methods may also consider relationships between payers, providers, and employers – for example, arrangements where HIE services are funded partly through an alternative payment model, or a modest fee on claims reimbursements, or other similar means.

10. **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: It is currently planned there will be common Reviewers to review all Service Areas responses.

11. If bidding on a service area, is the successful bidder required to meet all qualifications? Will bidders who specialize in specific services, but possibly not all services, within a service area be considered?

    Response: The intent is to select a Contractor that is the best fit to provide the services within each Service Area.

12. The links throughout the document are not active and do not have web addresses.

    Response: Corrected.

13. If the "strategic health information technology plan for the state" has been completed, what is the appropriate link to use to view the plan?

    Response: This plan has not been published.

14. If the "strategic health information technology plan for the state" has not been completed, in which of the four service areas defined in the RFQ will the activity take place?

    Response: Service Area 1: Meeting Facilitation, Strategic Planning Support, and Proposal Writing

15. If the "strategic health information technology plan for the state" has not been completed, when is it expected to be completed?

    Response: The timeframe for completion will be proposed and reviewed with the HIT Advisory Council based on acceptance of recommendations being developed by work groups currently in progress.

16. Reference is made to the Health IT Council; is this a different organization than the Health IT Advisory Council or are they the same?

    Response: They are the same.

17. How are the $11 million SIM designation, the $200K grant to the Lt. Governor's office by the CT Health foundation, and the HIE effort recently announced by the CT Medical Society being coordinated and what is the expected outcome(s)?

Response: This question is not relevant to this RFQ. Please direct questions regarding general activities of the Health Information Technology Office to Kelsey Lawlor at kelsey.lawlor@ct.gov.

18. What is the status of the HIT PMO's efforts in establishing the HIE entity?

    Response: The HIE entity planning is in progress in accordance with the diagram on pg. 6.

19. If the work is not complete, in which of the four service areas defined in the RFQ will the activity take place?

    Response: Service Area 1: Meeting Facilitation, Strategic Planning Support, and Proposal Writing.

20. It seems like there is a word missing near the end of the first sentence, "…opportunities for the to expand and/ or its services…" What is the missing word after "and/"?

    Response: Correction "…opportunities for the state to expand its services…"

21. Please define "toll gate process and reviews."

    Response: A toll gate is a control point where projects' phases are reviewed and approved (or not) to continue with the next phase.

22. There is no #8. Is Section 2.3 complete and correct in its current form or is relevant information missing?

    Response: In Section 2.3, existing Task 9 will become Task 8 and existing Task 10 will become new Task 9.

23. Does the "written assurance to the PMO from its legal counsel…" count as part of the 2 pages of the transmittal letter?

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

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

    Response: Yes.

25. In this section it says, "Describe the scope of work of contracts held by the organization in the past 5 years and specific associated achievements." What level of detail does the state expect for each such contract given the potential duplication of information the state is requesting under the References section on the same page?

    Response: The "Statement of Respondent's Qualification" section is a narrative to include a description of the scope of work, of contracted work within the past 5 years, that the Respondents feel will best show their qualifications for each of the service area(s) being proposed. The "References" section is for Respondents to provide at least three (3) clients as references for each of the service area(s) proposed.

26. Should we be selected, we intend to procure administrative support through a Connecticut-based subcontractor to round out our proposed team. Can we use a term such as "placeholder #1" throughout our response to indicate that a resource has not yet been identified? If not, what is the appropriate method to designate a personnel resource that has not yet been identified at the time our response to this RFQ is submitted?

    Response: If the position is not key, then identify the position by role title (such as "Admin") followed by "-TBH" (to be hired) and provide a short description of the role. Once the position is filled, the Contractor will be required to submit the required information, as per RFQ.

27. This section [Staff Qualifications] states, "Resumes for each proposed personnel and subcontractor should be attached as a single document." Is the state asking for one electronic document for each person or for a large electronic document containing the resumes of all proposed personnel displayed in a sequential manner?

    Response: One attachment for all resumes, broken down by Contractor. Each resume will begin on a new page with the position title and if the position is key.

28. Since the state has directed that all resumes submitted be in accordance with instructions under the Staff Qualifications section, would the state prefer that resumes are include under the Staff Qualifications section or under the References section of our response?

    Response: Please provide a single response attachment including all resumes.

29. In this section [References], it says, (1) “All responses must include references from at least three of the respondent’s clients who have utilized the organization…” and that (2) “All references must include a contact name, address and telephone number. It further states that (3) “all responses must include a list of public and private clients for whom the organization has provided services similar to those described in the RFQ, (4) with a description of the services provided”. It further states that respondents should, (5) “Provide a minimum of two references for each assigned key individual, including names and organizations and phone numbers for recently completed projects of similar scope.”

    In prior paragraphs on this page, it is stated that much of the above information should be contained in the Statement of Respondents Qualifications section or in the attachment containing personnel and subcontractor resumes that is part of the Staff Qualifications section. To prevent potential duplication of material within a response, minimize formatting differences between responses, and maximize consistency and clarity for the state’s reviewers, please indicate specifically where in the response, and how, each of these pieces of information described above should be provided.

    Response: Please put the response to the requested information under the sections as identified/outlined in the RFQ. Resumes will be a single attachment (see response to other questions).

30. In this section [Billing Rates and Structure] it says respondents are to include the following information in their response, “A tier rate schedule of hourly rates to be charged by personnel identified in the qualification statement above and the rate categories for additional personnel that may work on specific assignments.” What is the definition of “tier rate?” What is meant by “additional personnel” and where in the response, and how, should they be identified and described?

    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.)

31. The headings of the columns on this form [Attachment C] are neither self-explanatory nor defined in detail elsewhere in the RFQ. What information is expected from respondents in each column on this form? Please provide an example indicating the type of information that should be placed in each column.

    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.)

32. There is no provision to enter data for Service Area #4: Development of Sustainability Models [in Attachment C]. In what manner and format would the state prefer to receive this information?

    Response: In Attachment C, under the column headers, there should be four (4) separate areas for each of the four (4) Service Areas.

33. The RFQ states that the response to the vendor questions will be issued on October 16, 2017 – and proposals are due on October 20, 2017. With the short turnaround from answers issued and proposal due, would the State consider moving out the proposal response date to October 27, 2017?

    Response: Dates have been extended by 2 weeks as per below:

RFQ Release Date	09/27/17
Respondents Questions and Clarifications Deadline	10/25/17 12 p.m. Eastern Time
Response to Respondents Questions	10/30/17
Application Due Date:	11/03/17 3 p.m. Eastern Time
Anticipated Issuance of Notice of Award:	11/17/17
Anticipated Period of Performance:	12/01/17 - 09/30/19

34. Significant progress has clearly been made on a number of the areas to be addressed by the consulting services and the development of the RFQ. Does CT already retain the services of a strategic consulting partner for HIT consulting services – incumbent(s)? If so,

please provide the name of the incumbent(s) and will the incumbent(s) be able to bid for the scope of work defined in the RFQ?

Response: CedarBridge Group is the incumbent and they are able to bid.

35. From the RFQ: "It is expected that selected contracts will be paid for services rendered on a time and material basis."

    Question: What governance is in place and how will prioritization and investment decision be made for what tasks or services will be requested for the each of the four domains?

    Response: HITO/HIT PMO will direct services and tasks for each of the domains.

36. Who will be responsible and what structure will be employed to provide project oversight and management of the requested tasks/services and resulting deliverables?

    Response: HITO/HIT PMO and designated state partner agencies will provide oversight.

37. Question: Does the State envision, from this procurement effort, a list of qualified vendors who will then be asked to propose an approach and costs for the requested services and the State will select the final vendor to perform the tasks/services from the prequalified vendors? Or will the State go directly to a single qualified vendor to provide the needed services?

    Response: 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).

38. Question: Will CT consider contracting, through Task orders, for the actual tasks/services based on a fixed fee for defined deliverables?

    Response: No, as that would not support dynamic delivery.

39. In the RFQ page 8, the specific Task #6 "Partner with eCQM Solution vendor to create and document business deliverables for new and enhanced capabilities…"
    a. What is the status of acquiring the eCQM Solution Vendor? Has the eCQM Solution Vendor been identified and engaged at this point?

i. Response: An eCQM work group is developing details of an approach. No vendors have been identified.

b. **Is an eCQM Solution RFP envisaged?**

i. Response: Yes.

40. 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?**

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.