

STATE OF ALASKA

Department of Health

Division of Senior and Disabilities Services



Medicaid Administrative Claiming (MAC) Time Study

RFP NUMBER 2026-1600-0208

Amendment # 4

August 28, 2026

This amendment is being issued to answer questions 44-49 submitted by potential offerors and to update the RFP.

Offerors must use Submittal Form A – Offeror Information to acknowledge this amendment.

Failure to acknowledge this amendment will result in proposal being found non-responsive.

Name: Anneliese Zlitni

Procurement Officer

Email: anneliese.zlitni@alaska.gov

Questions submitted by potential offerors and answers from the State:

Q #	Req. ID	Questions Received	Response Provided
1	General	Our approach for the Random Moment Time Study (RMTS) is to use a brief survey within a SurveyMonkey-like system to capture what staff are doing at a given random moment. The survey will ask staff to identify what they were doing at that specific moment using activity codes and does not capture any protected health information (PHI) or other client identifying information. However, the IT specifications and requirements contained within this solicitation appear to treat this as a full IT solution, comparable to a Medicaid case management system. Is it possible to reduce or eliminate these requirements given the scope of services?	It is not possible to reduce or eliminate these requirements. However, if controls are not applicable to an offeror's system, their response may be marked "N/A."
2	General	If it is not possible to reduce or eliminate the IT requirements, we have the following questions about which DOH IT requirements apply to this system.	Our standard questions must be answered by offerors even if they are not applicable, as systems vary in applicable requirements.
3	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 2	Many different standards are listed here, including HIPAA, CJIS, IRS, and Medicaid requirements. Which of these would actually apply to an RMTS that is not collecting PHI, criminal justice information, tax information, or similar protected data?	DOH IT utilizes this standardized template required for all IT-related projects. Even if controls are minimal or there are multiple responses of "N/A," all requirements must be addressed. If none apply, mark "N/A."
4	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 3	The State is asking for the ability to review or scan the software's source code. Would this still be expected when the RMTS uses an existing Software as a Service (SaaS) platform that the contractor utilizes to administer the surveys?	Yes. SaaS solution must be identified and justification why the solution meets requirements must be documented.
5	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 4	This item lists several different security standards, including CIS, NIST, ISO, OWASP, and FIPS. Which of these standards are actually required for the RMTS?	Depending on the offeror's proposed solution, different standards may apply. Please provide explanation. If none apply, this would be not applicable.

Q #	Req. ID	Questions Received	Response Provided
6	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 5	When an existing SaaS platform is being used, would documentation of the SaaS provider's own security testing satisfy this requirement?	Because the State does not have knowledge of all potential offerors' security details, it is not possible to positively confirm which SaaS solutions would satisfy the requirement. Offeror would need to explain the details of the security solution for it to be assessed by SOA DOH IT.
7	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 8	This requires specific procedures for destroying PHI, PII, and other protected information. What types of PHI, PII, or other protected information does the State expect the RMTS to contain?	The State does not expect any RMTS to contain PII or PHI. If this does not apply to offeror's proposed solution, offeror may choose the "N/A" response from the provided dropdown list.
8	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 9	Is six years of detailed system security logs necessary for the RMTS, or would retaining the RMTS data and reporting records meet the State's needs?	Simply retaining the data is not adequate for regulatory authority retention requirements. Audit records must also be retained for at least ninety (90) days.
9	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 10	It appears that the RMTS would need to go through the State's formal Authority to Operate process. Is an ATO required for this type of RMTS solution, and if so, what would be required to obtain one?	Yes, Authority to Operate (ATO) is required for prevailing offeror. Requirements depend upon prevailing offeror's solution and would be assessed following offeror selection.
10	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 11	Would a formal security plan for tracking and addressing identified security issues need to be in place at implementation, or only if a security issue is identified?	The system will require an approved security plan or ATO at implementation.
11	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 12	If the RMTS does not connect directly with any State systems, is this requirement applicable?	The State does not expect RMTS to connect directly with State systems, therefore this requirement is not applicable.
12	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 13	Is FIPS encryption necessary for the RMTS if the system does not contain PHI or other sensitive State information?	This would depend upon offeror's system solution. Please provide explanation.
13	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 14	Is FedRAMP compliance necessary for this RMTS based on the type and sensitivity of the information that will actually be collected?	Yes, offeror's system solution must be FedRAMP compliant.

Q #	Req. ID	Questions Received	Response Provided
14	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 15	The requirement asks the system to track a wide range of user activity, including when information is viewed, changed, deleted, printed, or searched. Which of these detailed tracking requirements are necessary for an RMTS that is being used to collect brief staff activity responses rather than maintain client records?	This would depend upon offeror's system solution. Please provide explanation.
15	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 16	Which DOH and industry security standards are specifically applicable to the RMTS?	This would depend upon offeror's system solution. Please provide explanation.
16	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 17	What accessibility documentation is required for the RMTS, and what documentation would be sufficient to demonstrate that the platform meets the applicable accessibility requirements?	Reference Submittal Form G, Req. ID 17, "To demonstrate conformance, the Contractor shall, upon delivery, provide one or more of the following: c. A current Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT®) 2.4 WCAG edition; d. A Website Accessibility Evaluation Report using the Website Accessibility Conformance Evaluation Methodology for WCAG 2.1 Level AA; or e. Equivalent documentation verifying compliance with WCAG 2.1 Level AA."
17	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 20	What minimum level of availability is required for the RMTS?	Reference Submittal Form G, Req. ID 20, "The offeror attests to the level of availability that they will deliver. The highest availability standard for systems is 99.999% or "five nines"—or about 5 minutes and 15 seconds of downtime per year (see table below). To achieve five nines, all components of the system must work seamlessly together. Software applications, compute resources, networking functionality, and physical data center services must be highly available to achieve five nines." Highest level of availability (99.999%) should, at the minimum, be in place during normal business hours, i.e., 08:00 - 17:00

Q #	Req. ID	Questions Received	Response Provided
18	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 21	For an RMTS hosted through an existing SaaS platform, can the database security requirements be met through the SaaS provider's standard security measures?	This would depend upon offeror's system solution. Please provide explanation.
19	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 23	Would this apply only to major changes affecting Alaska's RMTS, or also to routine platform updates made by the SaaS solution?	Yes, this would apply also to routine platform updates made by the SaaS solution.
20	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 24	If the RMTS is not expected to directly integrate with another State system, can this item be considered not applicable?	This would depend upon offeror's system solution. If offeror believes this is not applicable to their system solution, they have the dropdown option to choose "N/A" and provide explanation.
21	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 25	Since the RMTS will not create or maintain Medicaid client records, can the State confirm that this does not apply?	This requirement does not apply; this RFP is not asking for solutions that create, read, or update client, consumer, or other person demographic data.
22	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 26	For RMTS participants, is State SSO necessary, or can participants securely access their individual time study surveys through the SaaS solution used by the vendor?	No, State SSO is not necessary. Yes, participants should be able to access their individual time study surveys through the SaaS solution used by the vendor.
23	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 27	Since the RMTS does not serve as a financial, accounting, payroll, or human resources system, can this requirement be considered not applicable?	Yes.
24	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 30	Can the backup requirement be met through the SaaS's standard backup process along with regular vendor downloads and backups of the RMTS data?	This would depend upon offeror's system solution.
25	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 32	If no dedicated mobile application is being proposed for the RMTS, can this item be considered not applicable?	Yes.
26	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 33	For an RMTS, are all of the reporting and data capabilities listed in IT33 necessary, or only those needed to administer the time study, export data, and support MAC claiming?	This would depend on how potential vendor transmits or exports data and other elements. Please provide explanation.
27	RFP Section 1.02 - Budget	Is the \$4,000,000 budget cap a total for all years of the contract including option years or just the initial two-year term?	The budget of \$4,000,000.00 is for the entire term of the ten-year contract.

Q #	Req. ID	Questions Received	Response Provided
28	RFP Section 1.01 - Schedule	Would you consider extending the proposal due date to allow bidders to consider the responses to questions?	The deadline for receipt of proposals is extended to September 7, 2026.
29	Submittal Form H - Cost Proposal	Is it correct that Section D (Additional Agency Pricing Information) of the cost form is not part of the price evaluation? This question is based on Excel row 49 ("Total Evaluated Program Costs for up to 62 Agencies.")	This understanding is correct.
30	Submittal Form H - Cost Proposal	Are the rates entered into Section G (Rate Information) of the cost form part of the evaluation? If so, how do these rates get incorporated into the price evaluation formula detailed in RFP Sec. 5.08 (Contract Cost)?	These rates are for initial information at time of solicitation and are not formulated into total evaluated costs. Cost Proposal protections are modified to make formulas reviewable. Reference "Changes to the RFP" below.
31	Submittal Form B - Experience and Qualifications	Should the resumes of the primary project manager and other key personnel be included in vendor's response in Submittal Form B? If so, do the resume(s) count against the 5-page limit?	Primary project manager resume does not count against the page limitation for Submittal Form B and should simply be included on the Submittal Forms pdf. Reference "Changes to the RFP" below.
32	NWD MAC Operations Manual - Page 3	Can you please confirm that the time study will create only one statewide statistic?	A percentage of Medicaid-related time is captured for each agency for the quarter through the RMTS, also aggregated into a statewide table. Reference Attachment 4 - MAC Operations Manual, page 30.
33	NWD MAC Operations Manual - Page 3	For the stratified sample, can the vendor assume each agency has a set time of operation (e.g., Mon – Fri 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.) and all staff have that schedule, or is the expectation that the vendor will collect a unique work schedule for each staff member?	SDS does not have an expectation of collecting unique work schedules, though the division is open to offerors' solutions proposing this.
34	NWD MAC Operations Manual - Page 4	Will the cost pools from each agency be combined into a statewide cost pool which will be allocated according to statewide statistic?	The agency cost pools will be aggregated into the statewide cost pool. Reference Attachment 4 - MAC Operations Manual, page 4.
35	RFP Section 1.02 - Budget	The budget provided is substantially higher than what is needed for the scope of work. Can the agency provide information on how the budget amount was determined?	SDS budgeted for the total possible ten (10) years of the contract. SDS factored in the possibility of onboarding and maintaining up to forty (40) additional agencies in the RMTS.

Q #	Req. ID	Questions Received	Response Provided
36	General	Given recent scrutiny expressed by federal agencies on the validity and statistical accuracy of stratified random moment time studies, is the agency open to other RMTS approaches?	No, this RFP is for a stratified RMTS.
37	General	Since a stratified RMTS has been shown to produce less administrative claiming than traditional time studies, is the agency open to other RMTS approaches?	No, this RFP is for a stratified RMTS.
38	RFP Section 1.07 - Return Instructions	The technical proposal and cost proposal must be saved as separate documents and emailed. To clarify, the technical proposal consists of Submittal Forms A-F and the Submittal Form G? Or are 3 attachments expected for final submission: Technical Proposal (Submittal Forms A-F), Submittal Form G, and Submittal Form H?	Submittal Form G is an IT document and therefore should be submitted as a third attachment. Three (3) attachments must accompany offerors' emails: Submittal Forms A-F; Submittal Form G; and Submittal Form H.
39	RFP Section 3.03 - Deliverables	For the twice daily stratified RMTS, does the agency have a preference on how the stratification occurs? Moments sent at the same time each day to a randomly selected group, or moments sent during two time periods (e.g., morning and afternoon) but the times themselves are random?	Reference Attachment 4 – MAC Operations Manual, page 24, for agency preference.
40	RFP Section 3.03 - Deliverables	Regarding item 1.b.iii, "Identify a five (5) percent sample for local agency quality review and include mechanisms for documenting and verifying supervisor review," has the agency received advisement or federal approval of a 5% sample in lieu of the standard 10% subsample requirements that is considered best practice?	Yes, a five (5) percent review monthly.

Q #	Req. ID	Questions Received	Response Provided
41	RFP Section 3.03 - Deliverables	Regarding item 4.c.i, "Work with local agencies to complete and submit their quarterly cost reports using the approved methodology and with designated deadlines," is the agency open to online cost report submissions?	The State understands the potential offeror's question to be directed at permissibility of the contracting agency (DOH- SDS) to be open to accessing cost report submissions via a website. This would require a link to access the website where the cost reports would be stored. In the event this is the correct understanding of what the potential offeror is asking, be aware that the SOA maintains strict protocols regarding links and security and would need to obtain permission before accessing any external website. Reference Attachment 4, MAC Operations Manual, page 29, "As the oversight agency, SDS has the following responsibilities in relation to the cost pool...Maintain a complete audit trail, traceable to appropriate cost ledgers, payroll runs, and other appropriate financial statements, for all expenditures submitted for claiming." If the State permitted storage of cost reports on such a website, it would be unable to meet the expectations laid out in the above-referenced section. The expectation would be that the ultimate vendor would work virtually with local agencies, followed by submission, to the State, of an Excel document via email attachment.
42	RFP Section 3.12 - Subcontractors	Is the agency open to a partnership that satisfies the Alaska Offeror Preference?	Given the section referenced for this question, it is understood that the potential offeror is inquiring about the allowability of a partnership, i.e., the involvement of a subcontractor, in which the primary contractor and subcontractor both qualify for the Alaska Offeror Preference. Reference RFP Section 3.12 - Subcontractors, "Subcontractors will not be allowed" and RFP Section 3.13 - Joint Ventures, "Joint ventures will not be allowed." These prohibitions apply regardless of whether any offerors qualify for the Alaska Offeror Preference or not.

Q #	Req. ID	Questions Received	Response Provided
43	Submittal Form H - Cost Proposal, Line 10	When is the agency's preferred timeline for [User Acceptance Test] UAT with the 11 agencies? What is the agency's preferred length of UAT with a September start and January go live?	It is the State's understanding that the potential offeror's first reference to <i>agency</i> refers to the contracting agency, SOA. The length of time taken for testing would depend upon the complexity of the ultimate vendor's systems. Additionally, the UAT would need to be completed with enough time allowed for the following to be finalized and in place prior to the January go-live date: *receipt and response to feedback; *any corrections or changes required; and *user training to be completed.
44	RFP Sections 1.03 Deadline for Receipt of Proposals; 1.11 - RFP Schedule; and 1.07 - Return Instructions	If we are reading the RFP correctly, the revised RFP in Section 1.03 now states the due date is September 6, 2026. However, in Amendment #3, Question 28, the state documents the revised due date as September 7, 2026. We are hoping the State can please: 1. Clarify the due date as either September 6th or September 7th. 2. Confirm that the due date falls on a Labor Day weekend and there will be no issues with submitting and receiving emails at the State during this time.	The revised deadline for receipt of proposals in Monday, September 7 at 23:59. Reference updated RFP Sections 1.03 - Deadline for Receipt of Proposals and 1.11 - RFP Schedule as well as changes noted below. The State of Alaska does not discontinue receiving emails on State or Federal holidays. Emails travel through servers as normal. However, be aware that at all times, regardless of holiday or ordinary business day, transmission is not instantaneous. Reference RFP Section 1.07 - Return Instructions.
45	RFP Sections 1.03 Deadline for Receipt of Proposals; 1.11 - RFP Schedule; and 1.07 - Return Instructions	The response to Question #28 indicates that the proposal due date has been extended to Sept. 7; the revised RFP indicates Sept. 6. The former is Labor Day and the latter is a Sunday. Would you consider extending by several business days?	Reference answer to question #44.
46	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 3	Amendment #3 response 4 confirmed the SaaS solution must be identified and justification provided for how it meets requirements. For a SaaS solution where the offeror does not have access to the underlying platform's source code, what would DOH require as sufficient justification for this item?	Reference Submittal Form G, Req. IT 3(d), "Source Code Scanning – The offeror shall work with DOH staff to facilitate static code scanning for all product and third-party files using a DOH approved scanning solution."

Q #	Req. ID	Questions Received	Response Provided
47	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 5	For a SaaS solution hosted on infrastructure not owned by the offeror, what would DOH require as sufficient justification for this item?	Sufficient justification for this item would be pen/vulnerability testing results from a reputable organization such as VeraCode,
48	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 14	Amendment 3 responses to numerous Submittal Form G items (e.g., Req. IDs 5, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 26, 30, 33) indicate that IT requirements are intended to be assessed based on the offeror's specific proposed solution and the actual sensitivity of data involved ("This would depend upon offeror's system solution. Please provide explanation."), and responses to Req. IDs 7, 12, 25, and 26 confirm that this RMTS is not expected to process PHI/PII, connect directly to State systems, or function as a client records system. FedRAMP Authorization is a designation typically pursued by cloud service providers to serve federal agencies directly. Given that this requirement does not appear to stem from an applicable federal mandate and the RMTS presents a materially different risk profile than the systems FedRAMP is designed to govern, can the State clarify the specific rationale for applying an unconditional FedRAMP Authorization requirement in Req. ID 14, and will the State reconsider this item to align with the same explanation-based, case-by-case approach used for other items on Form G?	If offeror believes this item is not applicable, they have the option to choose "N/A" and provide an explanation.
49	Submittal Form G, Req. IT 33	Amendment #3 response 26 indicated that reporting requirements would depend on how the vendor transmits or exports data. Can DOH confirm whether all listed sub-items under IT33 must be addressed individually, or only those applicable to the offeror's proposed approach?	Reference Submittal Form G, Req. IT 33, "The Offeror attests that any reporting capability <u>contained within the solution</u> will employ Embedded Data Analytics, features." If offeror believes that any of the requirements listed in IT33 are not applicable, they have the option to state this in their explanation.

Change 1: RFP Section 1.03 – Deadline for Receipt of Proposals is updated to reflect the corrected deadline for receipt of proposals: September 7 at 23:59.

Change 2: RFP Section 1.11 – RFP Schedule is updated. Note that this is the State’s best estimate for the schedule that will be followed.

End of Amendment 4