

Questions and Responses Document No. 3
PMS/QMS Request for Proposals
DHMH OPASS# 12-10806
October 2011

This list of questions and responses is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above-referenced RFP. The statements and interpretations contained in the following responses to questions by potential Offerors are not binding on the State, unless an addendum expressly amends the RFP. Nothing in the State’s response to these questions is to be construed as agreement to, or acceptance of, any statement or interpretation on the part of the vendor.

The Question # intentionally begins at 39 in this document.

Question #	Question	Answer
39	<i>Please confirm the correct “solicitation number” for this response. The RFP lists DHMH OPASS #12-10806 while the eMaryland Marketplace website lists DHMSO29964.</i>	For purposes of this solicitation, use the RFP solicitation number DHMH OPASS #12-10806.
40	Section 1.21 Standard Contract Page 11 <i>Will the successful Offeror have the opportunity to negotiate terms and conditions of the contract resulting from this RFP?</i>	There will be no negotiations with the successful Offeror.
41	Section 1.33 HIPAA – Business Associate Agreement Page 14 <i>Will the successful Offeror have the opportunity to negotiate the terms of Attachment J – Business Associate Agreement?</i>	See answer to Question #40.

Question #	Question	Answer
42	<p>Section 1.38 [1.38.2] Non-Disclosure Agreement Page 15</p> <p>a) <i>Is the Non-Disclosure Agreement referenced in this section attached as Attachment K (2) rather than Attachment G?</i></p> <p>b) <i>Will the successful Offeror have the opportunity to negotiate the terms of the Non-Disclosure Agreement referenced in this section?</i></p>	<p>See Addendum #3.</p> <p>See answer to Question #40.</p>
43	<p>1.39 Acceptance of Terms and Conditions Page 16</p> <p><i>Does this statement mean that Offerors may not condition their responses on having an opportunity to negotiate the terms and conditions of the resulting contract?</i></p>	<p>Correct.</p>
44	<p>Attachment A, 28. Liability Page 66</p> <p><i>Will the State agree to negotiate this section of the resulting contract with the successful Offeror?</i></p>	<p>See answer to Question #40.</p>
45	<p>Section 1.10 Page 9</p> <p>Proposals Due – Date and Time</p> <p>Section 1.10 states a Word file for the CD submission and section 4.2.2 states a PDF file for CD submission.</p> <p>Please provide clarification as to which file type is required.</p>	<p>See answer to Question #14 posted on 10/14/11.</p>

Question #	Question	Answer
46	<p>Section 2.1.3 Page 17</p> <p>Section 2.1.3 states a minimum of two (2) references are required. Section 4.4.3.8 states three (3) references are required.</p> <p>Please provide clarification as to the minimum number of references that are required.</p>	<p>See answer to Question #11 posted on 10/14/11.</p>
47	<p>Section 5 pages 53-55</p> <p>Can the State provide the number of evaluation points assigned to the Technical vs Financial proposals? Also what are the evaluation points assigned to each section of the Technical proposal?</p>	<p>Technical Proposals shall receive greater weight than Financial Proposals. See RFP § 5.1. The technical criteria are listed in descending order of importance in RFP § 5.2.</p>
48	<p>Section 2.1 Minimum Qualifications Page 17</p> <p>The Offeror shall include a minimum of two (2) references each from a public sector client for whom work similar to this project in size, strength, and scope has been completed within the last 10 years. The references shall include the name of each client reference, point of contact, telephone number, and email address. DHMH has the right to contact any references of its choosing as part of the evaluation process, including references not provided by the Offeror but otherwise known to DHMH</p> <p>Section 4.4.3.8 [c] Corporate Qualifications Page 48</p>	<p>See answer to Question #11 posted on 10/14/11.</p>

Question #	Question	Answer
	<p>At least three references from customers who are capable of documenting the Offeror's ability to provide the services specified in this RFP. Each reference shall be from a client for whom the Offeror provided service within the past five years and shall include the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Name of client organization2) Name, title, telephone number and e-mail address, if available, of point of contact for client organization3) Value, type, duration, and services provided <p><i>Please clarify the correct requirements for references.</i></p>	

Question #	Question	Answer
49	<p>Section 4.4 [4.4.1] Volume I – Technical Proposal Page 46</p> <p>The RFP sections are numbered for ease of reference, i.e., Section 1 Title and Table of Contents, Section 2 Transmittal Letter, Section 3 Executive Summary, etc. In addition to the instructions below, the Offeror’s Technical Proposal should be organized and numbered in the same manner as this RFP. This proposal organization will allow State officials and the Evaluation Committee to “map” Offeror responses directly to RFP requirements by Section number.</p> <p><i>We understand the State would like the Technical Proposal “numbered” in the same manner as the RFP however due to the current numbering format listed (i.e.4.4.3.1 Table of Contents, 4.4.3.2 Claim of Confidentiality etc.), would the State allow a more standardized format (i.e. 1. Table of Contents, 2. Claim of Confidentiality, etc.)?</i></p>	See answer to Question #25 posted on 10/18/11.
50	<p>Section 1.10 – Proposal Due Date/Time and Section 4.2.3.</p> <p>Will the state consider revising Section 4.2 to permit Offerors to submit the redacted version of the Technical proposal with their Oral Presentation?</p>	No.
51	<p>Section 1.14 – Oral Presentations.</p> <p>Will attendance at oral presentations be limited to key personnel?</p>	Attendance at oral presentations will be determined when a qualified Offeror is notified of the time and place of its oral presentation.

Question #	Question	Answer
52	<p>Section 3.4 – MERP Program Background.</p> <p>In Section 3.4, the state mentions how the SOA Integration Framework will allow a bi-directional real-time interface with CARES (Client Automated Resources Eligibility System). Will the state please provide additional details regarding how the Department of Human Resources is planning to coordinate system changes to CARES to coincide and reconcile with DHMH’s critical path for the MERP initiative?</p>	<p>The DHR approach is outside the scope of the RFP. The PMSQMS Contractor will monitor the interface development between DHR and DHMH.</p>
53	<p>Section 3.6.2.R.</p> <p>Does the state currently use Rational Requisite Pro?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

Question #	Question	Answer
54	<p>According to this diagram (dated 2007) (http://doit.maryland.gov/support/Documents/nwmd_about/nwmdc_ustomerutilization.pdf) the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene was utilizing networkMaryland.</p> <p>a. Is DHMH currently using networkMaryland in the same capacity as it was in 2007 (the date on the diagram)?</p> <p>b. Will the MERP vendor be required to migrate DHMH services currently utilizing networkMaryland to new network services?</p> <p>Will the MERP vendor be required to utilize networkMaryland and if so, in what capacities?</p>	<p>DHMH is currently conducting a procurement for a MERP contractor. That contractor will not required to utilize networkMaryland. Answers to the remaining questions are not necessary to develop a response to this RFP.</p>
55	<p>Section 1.10 Proposals Due – Date and Time Page 9</p> <p>An electronic version (CD) of the Technical Proposal in MS Word format must be enclosed with the original technical proposal. An electronic version (CD) of the Financial Proposal in MS Word format must be enclosed with the original financial proposal.</p> <p>Section 4.2.2 Proposals Page 45</p>	<p>See answer to Question #14 posted on 10/14/11.</p>

Question #	Question	Answer
	<p>An electronic version of Volume I- Technical Proposal and Volume II- Financial Proposal, both in searchable .pdf format, shall also be submitted as separate files for each "Volume", labeled Volume I-Technical Proposal and Volume II-Financial Proposal with the unbound originals, technical or financial volumes, as appropriate</p> <p>Section 4.5 Volume II – Financial Proposal Page 52</p> <p>Under separate sealed cover from the Technical Proposal and clearly identified in the format requirements identified in Section 4.2, the Contractor shall submit an original unbound copy, six (6)copies, and an electronic version in MS Word of the Financial Proposal.</p> <p><i>Please clarify the correct format of the response as well as the number of CDs required for each.</i></p>	

Question #	Question	Answer
56	<p>Section 4.4.3.8 [d] Corporate Qualifications Page 48</p> <p><i>Due to the large volume of our financial data (over 200 pgs), would the State consider accepting our proof of fiscal integrity, (i.e. financial statements) via a website link or on a CD?</i></p>	<p>An Offeror must submit hard copies and CDs of its Proposals, as set forth in the RFP.</p>
57	<p>Section 4.4.3.9 Experience and Qualifications of Proposed Staff Page 51</p> <p><i>On page 51 the State asks each proposed staff member to provide a “letter of intended commitment” to the project. What are the specific requirements for that letter?</i></p>	<p>The letters need to evidence that each proposed staff member agrees that he/she is committed to working on the project if the work is awarded to the Offeror that has proposed him/her.</p>
58	<p>Section 3.6.2.K.</p> <p>Will the state please clarify this requirement? The vendor’s understanding is that the Project Management Plans will be developed by the MERP vendor and managed, quality assured, and monitored for applicable updates by the PMSQMS vendor.</p>	<p>See answer to Question #21 posted on 10/14/11.</p>
59	<p>Section 3.6.4.2.</p> <p>The state writes “The Contractor shall perform the Performance Readiness Review (PRR) function in order to evaluate MERP application functions, including maintenance and hosting/data center services, on as-needed basis.”</p> <p>a. The RFP for</p>	<p>DHMH is currently conducting a procurement for a MERP contractor. When a contract is awarded, Maryland’s MMIS will be hosted and operated at the MERP Contractor’s Data Center.</p>

Question #	Question	Answer
	<p>Medicaid Restructuring Project (MERP) – DHMH OPASS 11-10366 references the Annapolis Data Center (section 1.4.2.5.16.1). Please clarify what function the Annapolis Data Center will perform in the MERP initiative.</p> <p>The RFP for MERP (same reference as letter ‘a’) also mentions the Contractor’s data center regarding Succession activities (section 1.4.2.8.7). Please clarify that the state has required the MERP vendor to provide hosting and data center services for the MERP application. Or, if the MERP vendor is only required to provide partial hosting and/or data center services, please delineate the state’s responsibility versus the MERP vendor’s responsibility.</p>	
60	<p>Section 3.6.3.A and Section 3.6.3.I.</p> <p>These requirements appear duplicative. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Section 3.6.3.I provides more detail and deliverable timing for the QA/QC plan described in Section 3.6.3.A.</p>

Question #	Question	Answer
61	<p>Section 1.5 Page 8</p> <p>Procurement Officer <i>Please confirm the correct “contact person” for this response. The RFP lists Sharon Gambrill while the eMaryland Marketplace website lists Zena Morris.</i></p>	<p>Contact information in the RFP takes precedence over contacts listed on eMaryland Marketplace website.</p>
62	<p>Section 3.9.3 Criminal Background Check Page 42</p> <p><i>We understand the Contractor must provide criminal background check for every new employee. Can the State provide information on the cost and timeframe required for a State Police criminal background check?</i></p>	<p>No.</p>

Question #	Question	Answer
63	<p>In Section 3.6.1.I, the state requests recommendations to implement Microsoft SharePoint. In section 3.6.3, the state mentions a “defect tracker.” In Section 3.6.4.L, the state mentions a “cost/projection tool.” In section 3.6.1.J, the state mentions a Project/Portfolio Management (PPM) tool, presumably to provide project dashboard reporting for real-time status. And in section 3.6.2.N, the state requests a tool to track and monitor how MERP is meeting/exceeding its Service Level Agreements (SLAs).</p> <p>a. Which of these tools is currently in use today?</p> <p>b. Is it the state’s expectation that the vendor will implement, manage, utilize the tool(s) to meet stated requirements?</p> <p>What is the state’s expectation for the tools at the conclusion of the engagement? Should the vendor be expected to transition the tool to the state for continued use, or transition the tool out of the state, leaving the state its data in a usable format?</p>	<p>a. None of these tools are currently in use today.</p> <p>b. Yes.</p> <p>All tools should be transitioned to the State or its designee for continued use.</p>

Question #	Question	Answer
64	<p>Section 1.20 Offeror Responsibilities Page 11</p> <p>Our company is a subsidiary of a parent organization. When responding to RFPs, we typically provide financial information that relates to our parent organization, and we may incidentally provide information about our parent organization when responding to questions regarding our corporate history or structure.</p> <p>a) Are we correct in understanding that if <u>any</u> information in our response relates to the parent organization, we are required to include in our proposal an explicit statement in that our parent organization will guarantee our performance?</p> <p>b) Where within the proposal should the statement be included?</p> <p>c) If no information regarding the parent organization is included in the response, then the parent organization guarantee, including Section 29, Parent Company Guarantee, of the Standard Contract is not applicable?</p>	<p>a) Yes, as set forth in RFP § 1.20.</p> <p>b) Include where applicable, such as in response to RFP § 4.4.3.8.</p> <p>c) Correct.</p>

Question #	Question	Answer
65	<p>Section 3.5 Roles and Responsibilities Page 21</p> <p><i>This section provides that the Contractor shall not subcontract the delivery of all or any part of the services without the express prior written consent of the OSOP Project Manager. We sometimes contract with individual consultants or consulting firms to provide services to us in a staff augmentation role. These independent consultants may provide a portion of the proposed services for this project. Would these independent consultants be considered “subcontractors” and therefore subject to this prior approval requirement and other requirements applicable to subcontractors under the RFP?</i></p>	<p>Work that is not self-performed by the contractor is subject to the prior written consent of the State.</p>

Question #	Question	Answer
66	<p>Section 3.12 [3.12.6] Insurance Requirement Page 44</p> <p>a) <i>We cannot name the State as an additional insured on our Professional Liability policy, will the State agree to an exception for that requirement?</i></p> <p>b) <i>Our insurance carriers will not provide notice of cancellation, etc. to anyone but us. We have been told by our carriers that this is now an industry-wide practice. We are willing to provide the State 60 days advance notice of cancellation, etc. should it ever be necessary. Will the State agree to modify this requirement so that the Contractor rather than the insurance carrier may provide the required notice?</i></p>	<p>a) Yes, the State agrees that for the Professional Liability insurance, it need not be named as an additional insured.</p> <p>b) Yes, the State will accept the standard ACORD language regarding policy cancellation. However, the Contractor is obligated to provide the 60 days' advance notice set forth in RFP § 3.12.6.</p>

Question #	Question	Answer
67	<p>Section 3.12 [3.1.2.7] Insurance Requirement Page 44</p> <p><i>This section requires subcontractors to maintain levels of insurance that are similar to those required of the Contractor. Some smaller subcontractors may not be able to afford the same level of insurance as the Contractor. Since Contractors are required to carry insurance, will the State eliminate the insurance requirement for subcontractors or allow these requirements to be negotiated as needed?</i></p>	<p>The State will not modify this section.</p>
68	<p>Attachment F page 91</p> <p>Is the State requiring that vendors propose the staff included in the financial forms and ensure the proposed scope of work can be performed for the hours and price? Can vendors propose the staff required to complete their proposed scope of work? Since proposal prices will vary based on the number of staff assigned, how will the evaluation of pricing work? How do vendors propose additional staff using the specified forms?</p>	<p>The contract resulting from this RFP will be a time and materials contract. See RFP § 1.3. The labor categories, hours, and proposed rates will be used for evaluation purposes.</p> <p>An Offeror should set forth its detailed staffing plan in its Technical Proposal. See RFP § 4.4.3.9.</p>
69	<p>Section 3.8.3 Pages 35-36</p> <p>Section 3.8.3 states that “It is up to the Contractor to propose the mix of project staff and their approach to meet the needs of DHMH in supporting this effort and to crosswalk these functions to the requirements and the Contractor’s understanding of the</p>	<p>See answer to Question #68.</p>

Question #	Question	Answer
	<p>work.” “The proposed mixture of project staff must include: Project Manager, Cultural Change Manager, Business Process Consultant, Quality Assurance Manager, Quality Assurance Specialist, Project Control Specialist”</p> <p>Attachment F Financial Proposal Form lists 9 positions that should be included in the Financial proposal.</p> <p>Please clarify if the State requires all proposers to provide these 9 positions or if proposers are allowed to include more or less positions that the proposer requires to meet the scope of work and deliverables required by the RFP.</p>	
70	<p><i>Reference: RFP page iii & RFP page 45, Section 4.2.1</i></p> <p><i>Page iii of the RFP states that proposals are to be sent to the attention of “Zena Morris”. In page 45 of the RFP, Section 4.2.1, proposals are to be sent to the “Contract Monitor” which according to page iii is “John Bohns”.</i></p> <p>Therefore, should proposals be sent to the attention of both Zena Morris and John Bohns? Please clarify.</p>	See Addendum #3.

Question #	Question	Answer
71	<p>Section 1.32 – Federal Funding Acknowledgement and Certifications.</p> <p>Will the state please provide clarification on what “programmatic conditions” may apply to this contract?</p>	<p>The contract is subject to State and Federal approval.</p>
72	<p>Section 4.4.3.4 Executive Summary Page 47</p> <p><i>This section indicates that Offerors should include any exceptions in the Executive Summary, but Section 1.21 seems to indicate that exceptions included in the proposal will result in rejection. May Offerors include exceptions in the Executive Summary with their proposals without being subject to automatic rejection?</i></p>	<p>Exceptions to mandatory Contract provisions are not allowed. Exceptions to non-mandatory provisions may not be granted.</p>
73	<p>Section 3.6.3.A page 28 Section 3.6.3.I page 29 Section 3.7.2 page 34</p> <p>QA/QC Plan Deliverable Please clarify if the QA/QC in 3.6.3.A is the same deliverable as the QA/QC Plan defined in 3.6.3 I.</p> <p>Please clarify if the QA/QC plan deliverable is due 30 or 45 days from Notice to Proceed.</p>	<p>See answer to Question #60.</p> <p>See Addendum #3.</p>

Question #	Question	Answer
74	<p>Section 3.7.2 Page 34</p> <p>QA/QC Plan Deliverable The Acceptance Criteria for this deliverable refers to the requirements traceability process (see 7.9 above).</p> <p>Please clarify or correct the reference to 7.9 as there is no RFP section 7.9.</p>	See Addendum #3.