

RFP 2023-0600-5230 - 0621-102
 Medicaid Billing and Clinical Documentation Information Management System
 AMD#2 - September 7, 2023

Q#	Document / Section	Page / Row	Question
1	General Question	N/A	Does DOH intend for all provider organizations using the system to adhere to a common workflow and standardized assessments?

Response: For Behavioral Health Treatment Providers, DOH intends the system to collect Minimal Data Set (MDS) in accordance to reporting requirements established by the state and federal reporting cadences. Organizations may choose to utilize the assessment tools and workflow established in the system. Organizations may also select to utilize their own Electronic Health Record system that may have a different work flow. The application must have an Electronic Health Record and Billing System that adheres to Alaska Medicaid Documentation and billing regulations, the standard documentation guidelines of accreditation organizations such as Joint Commission, CARF or COA and connect with the Division of Behavioral Health Electronic Billing payor system. For organizations that utilize the system for Case Management for the Alcohol Safety Action Program, the system will adhere to a common workflow practice as all ASAP locations will use this system for Case Management. The Alaska Therapeutic Court System will also use this system for their primary case management system however the case management needed between ASAP and Therapeutic Courts is substantially different.

2	RFP, Sec. 1.07 Return Instructions	6, 7	Please confirm naming conventions for separate attachments to the Technical Proposal (e.g., WBS, resumes).
---	------------------------------------	------	--

Response: The file naming convention of documents submitted by offerors do not require restrictive specification. So long as the file name can be readily associated with offeror and content of file attachment. Vendor A is replaced by organization's name, followed by a brief description related to document subject matter for example: "Vendor A - Technical Proposal", or "Vendor A - Cost Proposal", or "Vendor A - Atch 1", etc., where Vendor A indicates the interested offeror, followed by file content description that is being submitted.

3	RFP, Task 7: Perform Data Conversion and Migration	29	DOH indicates a data conversion and migration from the existing IT solution. Can DOH confirm that migrated data will originate from the existing WITS database only?
---	--	----	--

Response: The data migration will originate from the two WITS databases. The first database is AKAIMS, Alaska's version of the WITS product. The second database is the TEDS reporting database which is also developed by WITS. The current infrastructure allows AKAIMS and external Data Submitters to pass Minimal Data Set from the originating record system, through the Health Information Exchange (HIE) to the TEDS Reporting Database which both stores the data to generate in-house reports and to package the data for the TEDS submission. Solution of single database or two separate databases are both acceptable so long as the functions that the ability to accept data from external data submissions and TEDS extract from the data is achieved.

4	RFP, Sec. 4.02 Special Formatting Requirements (Table 7) and	58, 60	Table 7 states that Form B is considered anonymous, however, the instructions in 4.04 state "Offerors must also provide a personnel roster that identifies each person who will work on the contract..."
---	--	--------	--

Response: In Section 4.02, there exists a note regarding anonymity which says: "Anonymity: Some Submittal Forms listed below must not contain any names that can be used to identify who the Offeror is (such as company names, Offeror name, company letterhead, personnel names, project names, Subcontractor names, manufacturer or supplier names, or product names)."

RFP, Sec. 4.04 Experience and Qualifications (Form B)	By identifying team members it may give indication as to who the Offeror is. Please confirm how and where the roster should be presented.
---	---

Response: Section 4.04 is updated as follows: "Offerors must also provide a personnel roster that identifies each functional role and/or position title working on the contract, location(s) where work will be performed and the percent of time allocation to the project. The Offeror must identify which position roles/titles are key positions."

Q#	Document / Section	Page / Row	Question
----	--------------------	------------	----------

Resumes for key positions personnel must be included as a separate attachment and will not count towards the page limit for this section. Resumes may be redacted in the attachment so as not to identify first/last names of staff holding key positions. Offerors must address the requirements found in Section 3.01(e) Contractor Staffing Requirements and should describe how the experience and qualifications of key personnel holding the current key positions are relevant to the project and will support its success. For key positions personnel with minimum mandatory requirements provided by DOH, Offerors should clearly describe how the proposed project team members experience meet the requirements."

5	RFP, Sec. 4.02 Special Formatting Requirements (Table 7) and	60	The RFP states "Offerors must also provide a personnel roster that identifies each person who will work on the contract, along with their titles and location(s) where work will be performed and the percent of time they will be allocated to the project. The Offeror must identify which project team members are key personnel."
---	--	----	---

Response: This language is found in Section 4.04 and has been revised as shown in previous response to question 4 above.

RFP, Sec. 4.04 Experience and Qualifications (Form B)	To the extent this personnel roster includes personnel not identified as key, will DOH please provide guidance with regard to what might constitute "work on the contract"? For example, does DOH want a personnel roster that includes any individual who may support the contract regardless of the significance of that support? Or is there some minimum anticipated level of support (e.g., hours per month or year) offerors may assume triggers the need to include personnel on the requested roster?
--	---

Response: DOH is not requesting information at this time for staff within the organization who may occupy intermittent project supportive roles, and is focused on requesting position information pertaining to the key functional roles for the majority of time throughout the duration of this project. Supportive roles are fine to include within the documentation information if that is currently the format available for the organization to utilize.

6	RFP, Sec. 4.02 Special Formatting Requirements (Table 7) and	58, 61	Table 7 states that Form D is considered anonymous, however, the instructions in 4.06 state "The Offeror must also provide organizational chart(s) that clearly show the Offeror's proposed staffing model for all services. The organizational chart(s) must depict each proposed personnel member role and number of full-time equivalents (FTEs)..."
---	--	--------	---

Response: Submittal Form B referenced in Table 7 remains "anonymous". Section 4.06 is updated as follows: "The Offeror must also provide organizational chart(s) that clearly show the Offeror's proposed staffing model for all services. The organizational chart(s) must depict each proposed functional role and/or position title personnel member role and number of full-time equivalents (FTEs) per role, the reporting structure, the relationship of roles, and the primary point of contact between the Offeror and DOH for both DDI and M&O services."

RFP, Sec. 4.06 Approach and Methodologies Used for the Project (Form D)	Please confirm that the organizational chart(s) should list proposed positions only and no staff names should be included.
---	--

Response: Correct, therefore the second to last paragraph of Section 4.06 is revised as follows: ""Offerors must also provide a personnel roster that identifies each functional role and/or position title working on the contract, location(s) where work will be performed and the percent of time allocation to the project. The Offeror must identify which position roles/titles are key positions."

Resumes for key positions personnel must be included as a separate attachment and will not count towards the page limit for this section. Resumes may be redacted in the attachment so as not to identify first/last names of staff holding key positions. Offerors must address the requirements found in Section 3.01(e) Contractor Staffing Requirements and should describe how the experience and qualifications of key personnel holding the current key positions are relevant to the project and will support its success. For key positions personnel with minimum mandatory requirements provided by DOH, Offerors should clearly describe how the proposed project team members experience meet the requirements."

7	RFP, Sec. 7.01 Standard Contract Provisions	79	Section 7.01 states "The Contractor will be required to sign and submit the State's Standard Agreement Form for Professional Services Contracts. The Contractor must comply with the contract provisions set out in this attachment. No alteration of these provisions will be permitted without prior written approval from the Department of Law. Objections to any of the provisions in Appendix A must be set out in the Offeror's proposal in a separate document. . Please include the following information with any change that you are proposing:
---	--	----	--

Q#	Document / Section	Page / Row	Question
			1. Identify the provision the Offeror takes exception with 2. Identify why the provision is unjust, unreasonable, etc. 3. Identify exactly what suggested changes should be made" Should offerors follow the same process for setting forth objections (or exceptions) to the other Appendices attached to the State's Standard Agreement Form? Should offerors follow the same process for submitting objections or exceptions to other sections of the RFP?

Response: Yes, offerors should follow the same process for setting forth objections (or exceptions) to other Standard Agreement Appendices.

Per Section 1.05 Required Review: "Offerors should carefully review this solicitation for defects and questionable or objectionable material. Respondents should send comments concerning defects and questionable or objectionable material in writing and to the procurement officer at least ten (10) days before the deadline for receipt of proposals. This will allow time for the issuance of any necessary amendments. It will also help prevent the opening of a defective proposal and exposure of the Offeror's proposals upon which the award could not be made."

8	RFP, Sec. 9. Service-Level Agreements	84	Section 9.0 states in part "DOH may add or adjust SLAs by mutual agreement between DOH and the Contractor during the term of the Contract to align with changes to the business, organizational objectives, and technology. DDI SLAs may be negotiated during contract discussions prior to contract signing. M&O, Hosting, and Customer Service SLAs may be negotiated prior to system acceptance and implementation." Should offerors set for proposed objections/exceptions to the SLAs in order to facilitate the referenced negotiations? Or may offerors assume that a failure to set forth such objections not will not preclude adjustments to SLA terms during the referenced negotiations?
---	---------------------------------------	----	---

Response: Offerors are not precluded from negotiating SLA adjustments during the contract negotiations. Offerors are not required to propose objections/exceptions to the contract SLAs in order to facilitate SLA negotiations."

9	Attachment 13, Req. ID T117	Row 119	Requirement T117 states the Solution will share the high-level client index across multiple interfaces. Will DOH provide what controls would need to be in place in terms of sharing specially protected health information covered under 42CFR Part 2?
---	-----------------------------	---------	---

Response: DOH will follow HIPAA regulations and Protected Health Information (PHI) covered under 42 CFR, Part 2 and provide controls that adhere to compliance. As this is an RFP, specific technology methodology to achieve this goal may be too prescriptive. This RFP contains a Business Associates Agreement (BAA) which spell out our control requirements for sharing of PHI.

10	Attachment 13, Req. ID T117	Row 119	Requirement T117 states the Solution will share the high-level client index across multiple interfaces. Which interfaces does the client index need to be shared across?
----	-----------------------------	---------	--

Response: At present, the system will need capabilities to connect to the department's Master Client Index (MCI) and to the Alaska Health Information Exchange (HIE). Data modernization is one of the goals of the departments which includes reviewing the many systems utilized and find ways to connect them to improve interoperability and reduce duplicative data entry while following legal privacy requirements such as HIPAA and 42 CFR, Part 2. As these other systems within the department are in review and/or development, defining the exact future state is not possible. A shared understanding that there will be other systems and the ability to share information is an overarching goal of this RFP.

11	Attachment 13, Req. ID F207	Row 209	Please confirm the number of residential and/or inpatient units required within the scope of this procurement.
----	-----------------------------	---------	--

Response: As of 8/18/2023 the system contains 63 facilities consisting of 35 Substance Use Disorder or Withdrawal Management and 28 Mental Health residential and/or inpatient facilities. As the Division of Behavioral Health recognizes the need for additional facilities at the higher level of care and encourage opening additional facilities.

12	Attachment 13, Req. ID 317	Row 319	What are the current language requirements for 2023-2024? What are the expected language requirements for the next few years?
----	----------------------------	---------	---

Response: English is the primary language of the application and at present, there are not decisions made to add additional languages. The state maintains the ability to add additional language capabilities in various parts of the solution if the need arises at a later date. This does not prohibit the vendor from responding to this solicitation if the ability for adding various languages is not presently developed.

13	Attachment 13, Req. ID. 457	Row 459	How many Providers/Prescribers are expected to use CPOE?
----	-----------------------------	---------	--

Response: Computerized provider order entry (CPOE) is not heavily utilized in the current division data system. As a primary component of the RFP is to align with data modernization efforts increasing usability and efficiency of the application, it is not possible to forecast the number of providers expected to use the CPOE in the future.

Q#	Document / Section	Page / Row	Question
14	Attachment 13, Req. ID F670	Row 672	In addition to Medicaid and Medicare, what are the commercial insurance payers that will need to be set up and billed electronically?

Response: The ability to bill for services is one of the methods of fiscal sustainability for organizations. Electronic billing streamlines and modernizes this process. Defining which commercial insurances that are used most frequently was not part of the needs assessment. The ability for the system to have the flexibility to develop 837s and 835s that connect to multiple insurance types, both government and commercial is the requirement including the ability to build a sequential billing if an individual is covered under multiple payor plans or if a plan has a deductible or co-pay for claims reconciliation.

15	Attachment 13, Req. ID F704	Row 706	What Third Party Fiscal agent systems or clearinghouses are currently being considered as part of this RFP?
----	---------------------------------------	---------	---

Response: The ability to bill for services is one of the methods of fiscal sustainability for organizations. Electronic billing streamlines and modernizes this process. Defining which clearing houses that are used most frequently was not part of the needs assessment. The ability for the system to have the flexibility to develop 837s and 835s that connect to clearing houses or if the clearing house has a different electronic submission and reconciliation is the requirement including the ability to build a sequential billing if an individual is covered under multiple payor plans or if a plan has a deductible or co-pay for claims reconciliation.

16	Sec. 4.010 DOH IT Requirements	64	The RFP states <i>“For each question where the Response Required Column is “Yes” refer to the reference section number in the corresponding IT reference document to find background material regarding the question. Provide answers to required questions either in the body of the Offeror response to the RFP or the comments column of the spreadsheet.”</i> However, there is no Response Required Column in Attachment 14. Please confirm that offerors should answer every question listed in the attachment.
----	--	----	---

Response: *No Response Required Column*

- o Correct. That was removed but the default RFP instructions haven't been updated.
- o For now, until a new version of Dept Technical Requirements is drafted, respondents will need to respond to all.
- o There are some that are clearly for SaaS and others clearly for On-Prem. Depending on their proposed solution they can indicate “N/A-Does not apply SaaS solution” or vice versa.

17	Attachment 14. Required Vendor Response	8	According to Sec. 4.01 RFP Submittal Forms on page 58 <i>“Offerors shall not re-create these forms, create their own forms, or edit the format structure of the forms unless permitted to-do so.”</i> Will the state allow offerors to widen the column for their comments/responses in Attachment 14?
----	--	---	---

Response: Yes, offerors can widen the columns.

18	Sec. 1.012 RFP Schedule	8	Since the pre-proposal conference has not been rescheduled, will the state consider granting a four week extension?
----	-----------------------------------	---	---

Response: The state granted a four week extension with Amendment 1 of this solicitation. The pre-proposal meeting will not be held, and the schedule has been updated accordingly in Section 1.012. There is no adjustment to the forward dates in the RFP Schedule and remains consistent with RFP Amendment 1 schedule adjustment which was posted to the online public notices website previously.