



**State of Rhode Island
Department of Administration / Division of Purchases
One Capitol Hill, Providence, Rhode Island 02908-5855
Tel: (401) 574-8100 Fax: (401) 574-8387**

**Solicitation Information
April 15, 2014**

ADDENDUM # 2

RFP#7548605

RFP Title: Analytics for Rhode Island's All-Payer Claims Database

Bid Opening Date & Time: Friday, May 2, 2014 at 10:00 AM (Eastern Time)

Notice to Vendors:

ATTACHED ARE VENDOR QUESTIONS WITH STATE RESPONSES.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS WILL BE ANSWERED.

**David J. Francis
Interdepartmental Project Manager**

Interested parties should monitor this website, on a regular basis, for any additional information that may be posted.

Vendor Questions for RFP #7548605 Analytics for Rhode Island's All-Payer Claims Database

Question 1: The previously released RFI for the APCD project mentioned the possibility of two RFPs – one for Data Analysis and another for Hosting Services. Will the state be releasing a separate RFP for Hosting Services, or are hosting services being delivered already under an existing contract?

Answer to question 1: Based on feedback received during the RFI process, the current RFP is seeking a vendor that can deliver a complete end-to-end analytic solution as outlined in the Scope of Work. This includes hosting of the reporting and querying solution. Bidders should propose their hosting solution, as well as all hosting options if multiple options are available.

Question 2: May font be decreased to no less than 8 points in tables and graphics?

Answer to question 2: A font size of no less than 9 points may be used for figures, tables and diagrams

Question 3: May compressed fonts be used?

Answer to question 3: The RFP does not specify a particular font which bidders should use. Responses should be easily readable when printed.

Question 4: May 11 x 17 landscape be used for graphics?

Answer to question 4: Bidders should comply with the formatting and page limit specifications outlined in Section 4 of the RFP.

Question 5: For how many pages would an 11x17 page count?

Answer to question 5: Bidders should comply with the formatting and page limit specifications outlined in Section 4 of the RFP.

Question 6: May 8.5x11 landscape be used?

Answer to question 6: The formatting guidelines for the RFP response do not specify portrait or landscape view. Landscape orientation may be used.

Question 7: Should CD also contain redacted copy?

Answer to question 7: As specified in the RFP, there will be no public opening and reading of responses received by the Division of Purchases pursuant to this RFP. Any confidential material should be marked as "confidential", but the state determines what is deemed confidential. No redacted copy should be included on the CD.

Question 8: Should the marking "Original" appear on each page of the original submission?

Answer to question 8: The original copy should be marked as such; the RFP does not specify how bidders should do this.

Question 9: Should resumes be attached as an Appendix?

Answer to question 9: Resumes should be included in the Staffing Plan section of the proposal response.

Question 10: Do Appendices D, E, and F count against the page count?

Answer to question 10: Appendices D-F must be included in the Cost Proposal. The Cost Proposal should not exceed 5 pages, including the budget narrative.

Question 11: Should Appendices D, E, and F be placed in the cost volume?

Answer to question 11: Appendices D-F must be included in the Cost Proposal. Once completed, the templates can be copy and pasted into the Cost Proposal in Microsoft Word format. The Cost Proposal should not exceed 5 pages, including the budget narrative.

Question 12: Should bidder cover sheet be bound in the Cost Proposal?

Answer to question 12: No, RIVIP Bidder Certification form should be submitted in the original Technical Proposal only.

Question 13: Should W-9 be bound in the Cost Proposal?

Answer to question 13: No, the W9 form should be submitted in the original Technical Proposal only.

Question 14: Do the bidder cover sheet and the W-9 count against Cost Proposal page count?

Answer to question 14: No. Please refer to the page limit specifications outlined in Section 4 of the RFP.

Question 15: Will the State provide office space?

Answer to question 15: The State will provide office space for vendor staff; however, vendors will be responsible for equipping their staff with technological resources (e.g. computers).

Question 16: Will the RI Department of Administration provide detail on any binding insurance requirements that may be included in a final contract?

Answer to question 16: The successful vendor will need to meet the insurance requirements found within the General Conditions of Purchases, Item #31, found here: <http://www.purchasing.ri.gov/RIVIP/publicdocuments/RULES2011/ATTA.pdf>, as well as any other requirement deemed fit by the state at the time of award.

Question 17: Can you provide any more detail regarding the Liquidated Damages clause in the RFP—in particular the size of the penalty?

Answer to question 17: This section is negotiable and can be replaced by the Retainage Section of the sample contract (see answer to Question # 84).

Question 18: Are the APCD vendors listed on page 8 eligible to bid on this procurement?

Answer to question 18: The lockbox vendor is ineligible to bid on this procurement and it is our understanding that no other existing APCD vendors will bid (e.g. Data Aggregator, Project Management vendor).

Question 19: Is access to queries and reports only supported for users on the private RI State network, or should access also be supported for authorized/credentialed users with only Internet access?

Answer to question 19: As outlined in Appendix A, the reporting and querying software solution must be accessible to users from remote locations. The State may also wish to grant access to users off of the RI State network in the future.

Question 20: What operating systems, applications and database platforms are currently approved for use by the State of Rhode Island?

Answer to question 20: Bidders are free to use any industry standard software and hardware to produce the reports and analytic data requested and defined within the Scope of Work. Data extracts transmitted to the State of RI (e.g. extract to MMIS and the Exchange) are required to be in acceptable industry standard formats; proprietary formats will not be accepted. Acceptable formats include MS office products, CSV files, Oracle and SQL Server databases, XML, etc. This sharing of data must include data definition language to understand the record and file format. Any sharing of data with the State of RI will be discussed prior to transmission and the format will be agreed upon at that time.

Question 21: Is Rhode Island open to a cloud-based solution for hosting the Reporting and Querying Software and its data?

Answer to question 21: Rhode Island is open to all responsive models. Bidders should propose their solution, as well as all hosting options if multiple options are available.

Question 22: In Instructions and Notifications to Bidders #15, a HIPAA agreement is referenced. However, it is our understanding the Data Aggregator will provide de-identified data. Why might a HIPAA agreement be required?

Answer to question 22: The terms of this section are negotiable. The data extract received by the selected Vendor may contain elements that are consistent with the HIPAA definition of a Limited Data Set (LDS). LDS files are defined by HIPAA as "...protected health information from which certain specified direct identifiers of individuals and their relatives, household members, and employers have been removed. A limited data set may be used and disclosed for research, health care operations, and public health purposes, provided the recipient enters into a data use agreement promising specified safeguards for the protected health information within the limited data set."

Question 23: Will the content of the Data Dictionary document provided by the Data Aggregator contain all required specifications needed to support Task 1: Validation and Quality Assurance?

Answer to question 23: No, the data dictionary will contain the definitions for each field present in the Data Extract file provided by the Data Aggregator and some additional metadata. Bidders should identify additional information that they may require.

Question 24: Given that funding ends on December 31, 2014, what is the remaining budget allocated to the work covered by this RFP?

Answer to question 24: The State does not have a set budget for the work outlined in this RFP. Bidders should provide the best possible price for providing all of the

deliverables outlined in the Scope of Work. The State is anticipating sufficient funds to carry out all APCD related activities in 2014 and 2015.

Question 25: Do all other current vendors (Freedman, Arcadia Healthcare Solutions, and Onpoint Health Data) provide “local, on the ground resources?”

Answer to question 25: Freedman Healthcare provides local, on the ground resources. Arcadia Healthcare Solutions and Onpoint Health Data do not.

Question 26: Are current OHIC vendors precluded from responding to this RFP?

Answer to question 26: The lockbox vendor is ineligible to bid on this procurement and it is our understanding that the other OHIC vendors will not bid.

Question 27: Are all of the Tasks expected to be hosted by the vendor?

Answer to question 27: The current RFP is seeking a vendor that can deliver a complete end-to-end analytic solution as outlined in the Scope of Work. This includes hosting of the reporting and querying solution. Bidders should propose their hosting solution, as well as all hosting options if multiple options are available.

Question 28: Does the Data Aggregator also integrate Medicaid data or is this integration expected as part of this project?

Answer to question 28: The selected Analytic Vendor will receive Medicaid data as part of the data extract provided by the Data Aggregator. While Medicaid data integration is not a part of the current Scope of Services, the selected Analytic Vendor shall produce and deliver a custom data extract that will be loaded directly into the Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) data warehouse (see 15 of the RFP).

Question 29: Will the Data Aggregator be providing any distinct groupers as a part of their final data set? If so, which ones? (Task 2A- 12)

Answer to question 29: No

Question 30: Will the Data Aggregator be calculating/providing any episode of care methodology? (Task 2A- 13)

Answer to question 30: No

Question 31: Do any of the primary RI stakeholders currently have any projects which utilize either “branded” episode groupers or episode of care methodology? If so, please indicate which grouper and/or EOC methodology used and the purpose. (Task 2A- 13)

Answer to question 31: OHIC worked with Xerox on a payment variation study, which used 3M's grouping and potentially preventable readmission algorithms.

Question 32: What is the expected size (in TB) of the data extracts for the Test File (9/1/2014), the Historic File (3/1/2015), and the monthly updates thereafter? (Task 2A- 13)

Answer to question 32: Based on a rough estimate, the expected size of the data extracts received from the Data Aggregator will be the following:

Name of Extract	# of Months of Data Included	Estimated Size (in GB)
Test File	1	10-12 GB
Historic File	36	380-420 GB
Year to Date File	11	110-130 GB
Regular Monthly File	1	10-12 GB

Each data extract will include the eligibility, medical claims, pharmacy claims, and provider files. It is estimated that five (5) years of RI-APCD data will require approximately 4-8 TB’s (“terabytes”) of space.

Question 33: Section 3 Scope of Work; How much weight or evaluation points will be assigned to a vendor for meeting the following statement “Given the collaboration required to achieve these goals, preference will be given to vendors providing dedicated, local, on the ground resources”?

Answer to question 33: Please review the evaluation criteria found in Section 6: Evaluation and Selection, page 22.

Question 34: What signifies Task One completion and when will the Data Analytics Vendor get paid?

Answer to question 34: Please review the section entitled Overall Purchasing Structure of this RFP, page 21. Task 1 will be ongoing, and will be paid on a Time and Materials basis.

Question 35: Does the State have a preferred attribution methodology?

Answer to question 35: No

Question 36: Are the Lockbox Vendor and Data Aggregator Vendor providing Provider-Member attribution?

Answer to question 36: Yes. The Data Aggregator will provide the selected vendor with clean, updated Master Patient and Provider tables, and all supporting reference tables.

Question 37: Does the State have a preferred episode grouper methodology?

Answer to question 37: Please see answer to Question #31.

Question 38: Please provide the number of records (and in GB) for each entity (Eligibility, Member, Provider, Payer, Medical Claims, Pharmacy Claims and Dental Claims) that make up the 5 years of RI-APCD Data?

Answer to question 38: Please see answer to Question # 32.

Question 40: What is the number of Level 1 users and Level 2 users?

Answer to question 40: As outlined under Task 2B, page 14, bidders should propose training and technical assistance for up to 5 state-agency "super users" and at least 20 other state-agency users (assume at least half are Level 3). This is the minimum number of users. Bidders should clearly articulate all other assumptions made in proposal responses, including those about the breakdown of users by access level.

Question 41: Please provide an approximate percentage of levels of complexity/sophistication in terms of Simple, Medium & Complex for the 50 reports. Is there an initial list of all 50 reports available (besides the three targeted for Reporting Packages 3, 4 & 5) and could it be shared? Can RI-APCD provide the preliminary list of reporting specifications?

Answer to question 41: The State is currently working to put together the preliminary list of reporting specifications; this document is not yet available. As mentioned in the RFP, Page 14, reports will be based on data available in the reporting and querying software (e.g. data provided in the data extract from the Data Aggregator plus value-added components provided by the selected Vendor) and will serve the interest of State Agencies as well as researchers and businesses (e.g. Emergency Department visits by region and facility; inpatient hospital admissions that result in 30-day readmissions by age, sex, plan type, and disease condition; variation between highest and lowest paid providers by procedure codes, sites of care, and provider types). Bidders should clearly articulate any other assumptions made in responding to this proposal.

Question 42: For the CS-RI report, has RI-APCD already identified a Risk-Adjustment methodology for utilization and PMPM spend statistics? If so please name the methodology?

Answer to question 42: RIAPCD has not chosen a risk adjustment methodology. Bidders should provide a description of the method(s) they propose using for commercial, Medicare, and Medicaid populations, as part of their proposal response. CSI-RI is not yet risk -adjusted.

Question 43: Please identify the CSI-RI analytics vendor?

Answer to question 43: The main current CSI-RI vendors include Research Triangle International (RTI), UMass, and Rhode Island Quality Institute.

Question 44: Please identify the current MMIS vendor? Will the MMIS vendor accept a flat file extract prescribed by Bidder or should the Bidder custom develop this extract based on MMIS vendor's specifications?

Answer to question 44: The selected Vendor shall work with the State and the MMIS vendor to develop this extract. Bidders should clearly articulate any assumptions they make in responding to, and pricing out, their RFP response.

Question 45: Please identify the current RI-Health Insurance Exchange vendor? Will the RI Health Insurance Exchange Vendor accept a flat file extract prescribed by Bidder or should the Bidder custom develop this extract based on RI Health Insurance Exchange vendor's specifications? Can RI-APCD provide any information on potential data elements that the RI Health Insurance Exchange extract may contain?

Answer to question 45: The selected Vendor shall work with the State and the RI-Health Insurance Exchange vendor to develop this extract. Bidders should clearly articulate any assumptions they make in responding to, and pricing out, their RFP response.

Question 46: Can the state please clarify whether the Bidder needs to (A) Provide hourly rates for various types of resources that could be leveraged for future envisioned activities under Task 4? OR (B) Use hourly rates for a mix of resources that may be required for future envisioned activities under Task 4 but limit the cost of Task 4 activities to 10% of Bidder's proposal for Task 1 through Task 3?

Answer to question 46: A. Task 4 activities are not being evaluated; therefore, no budget for Task 4 activities should be submitted.

Question 47: Due to the technical proposal narration page limit can we use an Appendix section for sample screen shots, resumes and will those documents be counted towards the technical proposal page limit?

Answer to question 47: As outlined in Section 4 (pg. 20), resumes should be included in the Staffing Plan response section, and will not count towards the page limit. Screen shots should be included in the appropriate response section and will count towards the page limit of the relevant section. No appendices should be included in the Technical Proposal.

Question 48: Does the State have a specific threshold for determining fiscal solvency and financial capability of a firm to perform the work sought by this RFP?

Answer to question 48: Bidders must provide a written attestation of the fiscal solvency and financial capability of their firm to perform the work outlined in this RFP. Selected Vendors will be required to submit additional financial information, as outlined in Section 4 (pg. 17).

Question 49: Appendix A Data Completeness; Provider Directory is given as an example of non-Data Aggregator source. Please help clarify the following:

- a. Is this provider directory the NPPES file?
- b. Appears the Data Analytics vendor is expected to harmonize and map / link information between this external Provider Directory and Data Aggregator provided Provider Directory:
 - i. Why shouldn't this be done by the Data Aggregator?
 - ii. What is the use case for use of externally sourced provider data in Analytics?
 - iii. Is it possible that not all provider records from either source cannot be mapped/linked? if so what is expected data quality enhancement envisioned by the State?

Answer to question 49: The provider directory is not the same as the NPPES file. The state is working on potentially building an authoritative provider directory that includes information and relationships about how providers are organized both at the individual-to-entity level and the entity-to-entity level (i.e. which providers belong to what practice, which practices are affiliated, etc.). It would be important to have the APCD use the same provider directory information in the analysis of the APCD once this provider directory is available. Integration of this provider directory will be discussed with the State, if and when this provider directory becomes available.

Question 50: Appendix A Data Quality; what does the State specifically mean by this statement "Data must reflect most current version of each claim" when all versions of a claim are expected to be sent by the Data Aggregator to the Data Analytics vendor?

Answer to question 50: The intent of this is to ensure that the selected vendor can apply versioning logic and report on the "most current" version of each claim (e.g. the final state of the claim). The vast majority of reporting will be based on the most current version of each claim; although, the selected vendor should be able to produce point-in-time reports to the extent that the data supports such reporting.

Question 51: Can the state please explain the meaning behind the statement "Capacity to create totals, and sum duplicate rows of information" in Appendix A?

Answer to question 51: The Reporting and Querying Software Solution should allow designated state staff to easily search and manage the large APCD dataset. This includes the capacity to sum values by using total rows, and to find, filter and eliminate duplicate records, if applicable.

Question 52: Would the State of Rhode Island Department of Administration, Division of Purchases please consider a modest extension of two or three weeks in order for us to incorporate the answers to the questions in our proposal solution?

Answer to question 52: As per Addendum #1, issued on April 7, 2014, the closing date for this RFP has been changed from Tuesday April 22, 2014 at 10:00 AM (ET) to Friday, May 2, 2014 at 10:00 AM (ET).

Question 53: RIVIP Bidder Certification Cover Form – Please confirm that a “public copy” of the response is not required to be submitted since this is not a public works project.

Answer to question 53: Public copy is not required.

Question 54: In which section of the response packet should the W9 be placed?

Answer to question 54: The W-9 should be included at the top of the original Technical Proposal.

Question 55: Does participation of a MBE as part of a vendor’s proposal impact the evaluation scoring?

Answer to question 55: No.

Question 56: Other than a statement attesting to the vendor’s financial strength, does any supporting documentation need to be provided with the response?

Answer to question 56: No. The selected Vendor will be required to submit additional financial information, as outlined in Section 4 (pg. 17).

Question 57: Can attachments be used to supplement the response and would attachments count toward the page limit? For example, can the work plan be provided as an attachment and not count toward the 10 page limit for the Narrative Response to Required Tasks?

Answer to question 57: All sections of the proposal response should comply with the page limits outlined in Section 4, page 17. No appendices should be included in the Technical Proposal.

Question 58: RFP states, “ensuring receipt of RI-APCD data extracts from the Data Aggregator” does RI have a standard format it transmits data between systems that will be leveraged for the purposes of this activity? Agreed upon security protocol other agencies use we should align with?

Answer to question 58: As mentioned in footnote # 4, page 11, the Data Aggregator currently uses SFTP; however, Bidders may propose alternative data transmission strategies. Bidders should also propose a data security protocol and data quality strategy as part of their proposal response.

Question 59: RFP states, “producing analytic-ready data sets” but nowhere does it state the definition of or specific analytics that the state wishes to do like regression analysis? R? Predictive modeling? Therefore, should we assume that meeting the reporting and query requirements outlined on page 14 in TASK THREE meets the “analytics ready” requirement?

Answer to question 59: As mentioned in the RFP (Pg. 14), reports will be based on data available in the reporting and querying software (e.g. data provided in the data extract from the Data Aggregator plus value-added components provided by the selected Vendor) and will serve the interest of State Agencies as well as researchers and businesses (e.g. Emergency Department visits by region and facility; inpatient hospital admissions that result in 30-day readmissions by age, sex, plan type, and disease condition; variation between highest and lowest paid providers by procedure codes, sites of care, and provider types). Any other assumptions made by bidders in responding to this proposal, should be clearly articulated.

Question 60: The RFP states, “translate State data needs into reports of varying complexity”. Can the state provide examples of the different complexities it is referring to here? We assume that across the 50 possible reports there is a wide spectrum of complexity.

Answer to question 60: The State is currently working to develop the preliminary list of reporting specifications; this list is not yet available. Please see answer to Question #59 for further clarification.

Question 61: The RFP states that “vendor shall develop comprehensive data quality strategy”. Does the State have an existing data quality tool it uses we can leverage? Would the state allow a vendor to utilize a data quality tool, for a free trial period that the tool vendor offers, for the limited part of this engagement that includes data quality related tasks? Or consider paying for a data quality tool for this engagement?

Answer to question 61: Bidders must propose a detailed data quality strategy as part of their proposal response. The State does not currently have a preferred method. All assumptions (including all proposed licenses) must be included in the Budget Narrative section of the Cost Proposal.

Question 62: Is the Data Aggregator responsible for data quality as well?

Answer to question 62: Yes. The Data Aggregator is responsible for performing data quality validation of incoming APCD files from data submitters (e.g. missing data, data completeness thresholds, etc.), maintaining a reliable and secure database environment, and working with the State and the selected vendor to evaluate and address data quality concerns identified by the selected vendor.

Question 63: RFP states, “vendor must be able to make changes to their data quality strategy in response to State feedback”. How will this feedback be provided? At a given date and time? Can the State provide feedback multiple times requiring multiple changes?

Answer to question 63: The selected Vendor will work the State and the Project Management vendor to develop an appropriate schedule for providing feedback and making changes to the proposed data quality strategy. The State anticipates that the bulk of this work will occur at the outset of contract activities.

Question 64: RFP states, “data extracts received from the Data Aggregator will contain updated versions of all RI-APCD data to date, and are meant to replace previously transmitted extracts entirely” – does the state wish to enable change data capture so the analytic capabilities include the ability to reference data that was previously available in a data field that has since been updated with new data and replaced?

Answer to question 64: Please refer to Appendix A: Business and Technical Requirements for Reporting and Querying Software Solution. Any proposed capabilities that extend beyond these minimum specifications, should be clearly articulated in the proposal response.

Question 65: RFP states, “deliver a total of up to fifty (50) unique reports” – what is the definition of a unique report? Is it a unique combination of dimensions and measures? Or unique [mutually exclusive] content?

Answer to question 65: Each report will consist of a combination of measures, dimensions, and/or value-added components. Each report will not necessarily contain mutually-exclusive content from other reports.

Question 66: For the purposes of the technical solution requirements defined in Task Two – does the state wish to leverage one and only one reporting and analytic solution? Or would it consider multiple to ensure all requirements are met?

Answer to question 66: Bidders are free to propose any model and/or combination of services to successfully complete all tasks outlined in the Scope of Work.

Question 67: On page 6, paragraphs 1 and 4, you state that the Rhode Island APCD is currently receiving data from seven commercial plans, Medicare and Medicaid. Yet the timeline proposed on page 10 talks about importing the test file and historic file later in 2014. What is the present state of the APCD? Is there a dataset currently available for analytic activities? How will the APCD evolve in 2014 and 2015?

Answer to question 67: Please refer to the data submission timeline on Page 10. The first test file data will come into the Lockbox on 5/15/14 and to the Data Aggregator by 6/15/14. Currently, seven commercial plans, Medicare, and Medicaid are required to submit data to the RI-APCD.

Question 68: How large a database do you expect? How many lives covered? How many claims per year?

Answer to question 68: Please see answer to Question # 32. It is estimated that five (5) years of RIAPCD data will require approximately 4-8 TBs of space.

Question 69: Will the data aggregator perform any quality assurance and data validation activities on the claims files, or are those tasks solely the responsibility of the data analytics contractor?

Answer to question 69: The Data Aggregator runs intake processes to evaluate whether the submitted data files conform to data submission requirements.

Question 70: Will the data aggregator transform all claims from public and private payers into a common format? In particular, who will be responsible for integrating the Medicaid data (this is not mentioned in the RFP)?

Answer to question 70: Yes, the Data Aggregator will integrate all claims received (from both public and private payers) into a single data extract. HP Enterprise Services, the State's Medicaid agent, will submit Medicaid data to the RI-APCD.

Question 71: On page 11, the RFP mentions providing “dedicated, local, on the ground resources.” Could you please elaborate on the scope of the desired resources?

Answer to question 71: Given the collaboration required to achieve the analytic goals outlined in the Scope of Work, preference will be given to vendors providing dedicated, local, on the ground resources. Local on the ground resources will be taken into account when assigning points in the Staffing Plan section of the Evaluation Criteria. At a minimum, on-the-ground staff resources should be available to provide training and technical assistance to state-agency users, as outlined under Task 2A, page 13 of the RFP.

Question 72: The RFP mentions using “industry standard” methodologies for creating condition categories, patient risk scores and episode grouping. Do you already have methodology in place for these purposes, or are there particular methodologies that you would prefer to implement?

Answer to question 72: The State does not have preferred methodologies for risk adjustment, condition categories, or episode groupers in the APCD. Bidders should provide a description of their proposed methodologies, and why they proposing using them, as part of their response.

Question 73: Are bidders expected to suggest the outlines of reporting packages in their responses to the RFP? How do we budget for these packages in our responses without the specific details of what they will contain?

Answer to question 73: Bidders should do their best to price out the reporting packages based on information available in the RFP and the response to Question # 41. Bidders should clearly articulate any other assumptions made in responding to this proposal, in their response.

Question 74: Are bidders expected to provide a proposed budget for Task 4? What should this budget contain given that the nature of these special activities has yet to be determined?

Answer to question 74: No, bidders should not propose a budget for Task 4. Bidders should include fully-loaded hourly rates for staff/subcontractors that could be used for optional Task 4 activities, in Appendix F.

Question 75: In terms of access rights and functions, what is the difference between a level 3 user of the analytic software and a “super user”?

Answer to question 75: Please refer to the specifications provided in Appendix A; no further delineation has been made by the State.

Question 76: The right side of the table in Appendix B (page 28) runs off the page. Could you please provide a complete version of Appendix B?

Answer to question 76: Please try accessing the RFP through the RI Purchasing website.

Question 77: Requiring submission of our proposals by 10 AM, Tuesday, April 22 effectively requires that bidders complete their proposals on Friday, April 18 since it is risky to rely on mail services to deliver by 10 AM. April 18 is Good Friday, with April 20 being Easter. In addition, April 15-22 is Passover. We will have a number of staff absences in this period. Would it be possible to extend the deadline by several days, say until Friday April 25?

Answer to question 77: As per Addendum #1, issued on April 7, 2014, the closing date for this RFP has been changed from Tuesday April 22, 2014 at 10:00 AM (ET) to Friday, May 2, 2014 at 10:00 AM (ET).

Question 78: How big is the existing Rhode Island All-Payer Claims Database (RI-APCD) database (GB) and how big is it expected to grow over the next 5 years.

Answer to question 78: The first test file data will come into the Lockbox on 5/15/14 and to the Data Aggregator by 6/15/14. It is estimated that five (5) years of RIAPCD data will require approximately 4-8 TBs ('terabyte') of space.

Question 79: How many years of data currently reside in the database to date?

Answer to question 79: Currently, the RI APCD does not have any data. Data submission will begin on 5/15/14 to the Lockbox, and 6/15/2014 to the Data Aggregator. Please refer to the Data Submission timeline on page 10 of the RFP.

Question 80: Will we be able to use the existing RI-APCD database from the Aggregator or is a different or subset database to be used? Would the analytics vendor need to build any portion of the database layer?

Answer to question 80: The analytic vendor is not expected to use the Data Aggregators database. The expectation is that the analytic vendor will receive an extract and build a new layer designed specifically to support reporting.

Question 81: The proposal states: "On-the-ground staff resources to provide training and technical assistance, as needed, for up to 5 state-agency "super-users" and at least 20 other state-agency users (assume at least half are "Level 3" users6);" Can we assume this is the number of total users and licenses needed?

Answer to question 81: These are the minimum requirements. Any assumptions made beyond these minimum requirements should be clearly articulated in the proposal response.

Question 82: Could use more definition around ‘implements the value-added components’ such as episode groupers, patient-level risk scores, etc.

Answer to question 82: Value-added components which the selected vendor will be accountable for producing include: distinct condition categories and patient-level risk scores, a patient-provider attribution methodology, and grouping patient claims into distinct episodes of care. Please see RFP pages 12-13 for additional information on each.

Question 83: Would the State please provide the estimated number of providers, medical claims, pharmacy claims and patients the State is assuming for 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018 so that the proper number of software licenses and hardware requirements can be determined.

Answer to question 83: The Rhode Island population is approximately 1.1 million. The number of licensed doctors is approximately 13, 000. The number of records in each file is not yet known since data submission will begin on 5/15/14, but bidders should be able to make estimates based on the historic pattern of usage for different types of payers.

Question 84: Would the State please provide a clear description of how the 5% retainage is going to be applied. Which tasks are going to be affected by the 5% retainage? (Addendum B #6 Retainage)

Answer to question 84: The terms of this section are negotiable, although one example for how to operate the retainage requirement is to withhold 5% on each invoice.

Question 85: Appendix F, which governs the costs for the Optional Extension Years, does not account for the hardware and hosting of the infrastructure, storage, auditing, and disaster recovery to run the data warehouse that the reporting and analytic tools will use for those optional years. Can the State please provide a structure in the cost model to provide those costs? (5: Cost Proposal)

Answer to question 85: As outlined in Task 2B and the instructions for Appendix F, all software, licenses, hardware, disaster recovery, etc. should be included in the License Fees for the Optional Extension Years (Appendix F), and explained in the budget narrative.

Question 86: What external systems beyond the APCD will the state wish to use Analytics and Reporting for? For example, will HIE or HIX interfaces be needed?

Answer to question 86: The State has not yet determined this. These possible activities may constitute optional Task 4 activities in the future.

Question 87: What is the budget contemplated for the APCD Analytics contract? Does Rhode Island already have the appropriate licenses with the AMA, ADA, ASA and others?

Answer to question 87: The State does not have a set budget for the work outlined in this RFP. Bidders should provide the best possible price for providing all of the deliverables outlined in the Scope of Work. All assumptions (including all proposed licenses) must be included in the Budget Narrative section of the Cost Proposal.

Question 88: With respect to the articulated preference for dedicated, local on-the-ground resources, is it anticipated that such staffing must be available on-site within 24 hours or dedicated times of the week or month?

Answer to question 88: Given the collaboration required to achieve the goals outlined in the Scope of Work, preference will be given to vendors providing dedicated, local, on the ground resources. The selected vendor will be working closely with State staff and the APCD Project Management Vendor to translate the preliminary list of reporting specifications, and refine reports based on State feedback. In addition, on the ground resources should be available to provide training and technical assistance, for up to 5 state-agency “super-users” and at least 20 other state-agency users.

Question 89: If the proposal is more specific on a topic than the contract, should interested vendors presume the specificity of the proposal overrides the content in the contract? For example, the proposal requests a one-year license to use the Reporting and Querying Software, while the contract provides for Rhode Island to own all work products produced under the Agreement, including software. Can the state clarify whether it requires ownership or just a license to use the software?

Answer to question 89: The specificity of the RFP should override the sample contract language, where appropriate, because this sample is in draft form. The selected vendor will be required to complete and sign a final contract, the contents of which will trump the RFP. Either option regarding ownership of work products is acceptable to the State. Bidders should clearly explain their proposed model in their response and budget narrative.

Question 90: On page 15 of the RFP, an existing vendor is referenced. Can the state provide more detail regarding the quantity and information that will be transferred, and what the existing data mapping decisions and attribution algorithms are?

Answer to question 90: The main current CSI-RI vendors are Research Triangle International (RTI), UMass, and Rhode Island Quality Institute. The current CSI-RI reports are available on www.pcmhri.org .

Question 91: How many users of each user role are expected? (Appendix A p.26)

Answer to question 91: The RFP states, "up to 5 state-agency "super-users" and at least 20 other state-agency users". These are the minimum requirements. Any assumptions made beyond these minimum requirements should be clearly articulated in the proposal response.

Question 92: In the requirement "Capacity to view most recent Reporting Packages," what does "most recent reporting package" mean? Related to this, what is the requirement, if any, for viewing the reporting packages which are not the most recent? (Appendix A p.27)

Answer to question 92: Each reporting package will consist of up to 10 new reports, as well as updates to all previously released reports. These updated versions should be made available on the software tool. There is no requirement for providing outdated reports, although bidders are free to propose this function.

Question 93: Would the Vendor for this procurement be responsible for Hosting the Reporting and Querying solution, or, will the state or some other 3rd party take on the hosting responsibility? Please clarify whether hosting is a mandatory requirement for qualification.

Answer to question 93: The current RFP is seeking a vendor that can deliver a complete end-to-end analytic solution as outlined in the Scope of Work. This includes hosting of the reporting and querying solution. Bidders should propose their hosting solution, as well as all hosting options if multiple options are available. If a separate hosting Subcontractor will be used, a detailed description of annual audits and reports regarding data center controls and operations, must be provided. If a separate hosting Subcontractor will not be used, vendors must, at their cost, conduct an annual security assessment, performed by an independent third-party security provider, to verify that the environment containing the RI-APCD data is secure

Question 94: Is the state open to development work being carried out from an offshore location outside the United States? Please clarify.

Answer to question 94: Given that de-identified data provided to the selected vendor may contain Personal Health Information (PHI) or Personal Identifiable Information (PII) as defined under HIPAA (e.g. zip codes, age), all RIAPCD data is

required to be handled within the United States. Similarly, all development work required to support RIAPCD data as defined in this Scope of Work, is required to be carried out within the United States.

If a separate hosting Subcontractor will be used, a detailed description of annual audits and reports regarding data center controls and operations, including Service Organization Control (SOC) Reports, Type 1 and Type 2, must be provided. If a separate hosting Subcontractor will not be used, vendors must, at their cost, conduct an annual security assessment, performed by an independent third-party security provider, to verify that the environment containing the RI-APCD data is secure. All test results, as well as remediation plans, must be submitted to the State within 2 weeks of assessment

Training to all vendor staff regarding HIPAA, HITECH and all related Privacy Laws, is also required. Vendor will be responsible for all data breaches/misuse whether it is done by their staff or a subcontractor.

Question 95: The RFP mentions that the State will purchase a one (1) year license based on acceptance of the reporting and querying software. Does this mean that the Intellectual Property (IP) right to the “Reporting and Querying Software” will reside with the vendor?

Answer to question 95: Bidders should clearly define all licensing restrictions in their proposal response.

Question 96: Please provide some indicative estimate of the budget available for this procurement.

Answer to question 96: The State does not have a set budget for the work outlined in this RFP. Bidders should provide the best possible price for providing all of the deliverables outlined in the Scope of Work.

Question 97: Please confirm if the above referenced RFP is assuming the effort be completed in Rhode Island’s environment or in Analytics Partners environment as a cloud solution?

Answer to question 97: Rhode Island does not have a preferred database platform and is open to all responsive models. Bidders should propose their solutions and all options, if multiple options are available.

Question 98: What is the frequency that the awarded vendor would receive new files?

Answer to question 98: Please refer to the Data Submission Timeline on page 10 of the RFP.

Question 99: Is there an incremental option?

Answer to question 99: Unclear as to what this question is referring to.

Question 100: Is there a defined budget for the Business Intelligence piece? If yes how much?

Answer to question 100: The State does not have a set budget for the work outlined in this RFP. Bidders should provide the best possible price for providing all of the deliverables.

Question 101: Is Hosting required?

Answer to question 101: The current RFP is seeking a vendor that can deliver a complete end-to-end analytic solution as outlined in the Scope of Work. This includes hosting of the reporting and querying solution.

Question 102: How many total users will there be and what is the breakdown by user type?

Answer to question 102: The RFP mentions, "up to 5 state-agency "super-users" and at least 20 other state-agency users". These users are further defined in Appendix A. These are the minimum requirements. Any assumptions made beyond these minimum requirements should be clearly articulated in the proposal response.

Question 103: Does the agency plan on producing any public facing reports

Answer to question 103: The reports included in the Reporting Packages will serve both the interest of State Agencies as well as the interest of researchers and businesses. The State has not yet determined whether these reports will also be made available to the general public. All reports should be clear and easy to understand.

Question 104: Regarding Item 16 on Page 5. Vendors must certify that they are "eligible entities" under 45 CFR 155.110. We have reviewed that regulation and have not been able to identify any additional related guidance that defines an "eligible entity." We would like to know whether there is additional federal or state guidance the State of Rhode Island can provide to better define what is an eligible entity, particularly with respect to §155.110(a)(1)(ii).

Answer to question 104: Because the RI-APCD is partially funded by the State's Level II Exchange Establishment Grant, the selected vendor may need to certify that they are an "eligible entity" as described in section 1311(f)(3) of the Affordable Care Act and 45 CFR 155.110, provisions which set forth the kinds of entities that are eligible to perform one or more Exchange functions. Entities that are health insurance issuers or treated as such because they're part of the same "control group" of corporations under a provision of the IRS Code are prohibited from performing Exchange functions.

Question 105: May a vendor be allowed to include a restrictive legend on Business Proposal/Cost elements that it deems to be confidential and proprietary, and if such a legend is included will it prevent those marked items from being made publicly available?

Answer to question 105: As specified in the RFP, there will be no public opening and reading of cost responses received by the Division of Purchases pursuant to this RFP. Any confidential material should be marked as "confidential", but the state determines what is deemed confidential.

Question 106: Are there any additional formatting requirements such as single/double-spacing?

Answer to question 106: Please refer to the formatting specifications in Section 4, pg. 17. There are no requirements beyond what is included in the RFP.

Question 107: On page 20, the RFP states that each project must, at a minimum, have a project manager. Are each of the major tasks considered a separate project?

Answer to question 107: Bidders must assign a single Project Manager to be the point-of-contact for all tasks in the Scope of Work, not for each individual task.

Question 108: Appendix F, Extension Years. This schedule includes rates for only the first extension year (2016). Can bidders assume a COLA in 2017 and 2018?

Answer to question 108: If a Cost of Living Adjustment is assumed for optional years, bidders should articulate this in the budget narrative.

Question 109: Will the state kindly confirm a date for posting the responses to vendor questions?

Answer to question 109: Responses to questions will be posted as quickly as possible.

Question 110: Is the State at liberty to share its overall budget for APCD Analytics with prospective bidders? This information will be helpful to bidders to ensure that we propose solutions that fit within your budget.

Answer to question 110: No.

Question 111: Is there an analytical software package commonly used today by the intended APCD user community, such as SAS, SQL, or MS/Excel?

Answer to question 111: No, there is currently no standard reporting tool used by the APCD community.

Question 112: Would you confirm our understanding that only the successful vendor is required to submit a MBE plan to the MBE compliance officer?

Answer to question 112: Yes, only the successful vendor must meet this requirement at the time of tentative selection.

Question 113: The State is currently receiving data from seven commercial plans, Medicare, and Medicaid. Could you please provide an estimate of the total number of covered lives and the annual claims volume represented in the data? Bidders will need this information to appropriately size hardware and determine software licensing costs

Answer to question 113: Please see answers to Questions #32 and #83.

Question 114: Regarding members that opt-out, will aggregated summaries of these people/claims be provided to the Analytics Vendor to determine what portion of the data is missing?

Answer to question 114: The only information that will be provided to the selected Analytic Vendor is the total number of members who opt-out of the RI APCD. No further disaggregation (e.g. opt-outs by insurance provider, plan type, age, etc.) will be available.

Question 115: Regarding members that opt-out, what level of detail might be provided the Analytics Vendor for these opt-outs if any, for example, xx members, \$xxx allowed, \$xxx paid or perhaps de-identified summaries such as xxx PCP visits, xxx ER visits, etc.

Answer to question 115: Please see answer to Question #114.

Question 116: Regarding data quality checking, does the Data Aggregator check for completeness to determine if any data is missing, i.e., data fields or periods that are expected

but do not appear in the feeds the aggregator receives from the data sources? What checks does the Aggregator perform, if any?

Answer to question 116: Yes, the Data Aggregator is responsible for performing data quality validation of incoming APCD files from data submitters (e.g. missing data, data completeness thresholds, etc.), maintaining a reliable and secure database environment, and working with the State and the selected vendor to evaluate and address data quality concerns identified by the selected vendor.

Question 117: Can the State provide an estimate as to the number of service-level records you expect to receive from Medicare when all 3 years of historic data is reported, per the Data Submission Timeline on page 10?

Answer to question 117: Please see answers to Questions #32 and #83. All other assumptions should be clearly articulated in the proposal response.

Question 118: Can the State provide an estimate as to the number of service-level records you expect to receive from Medicaid when all 3 years of historic data is reported, per the Data Submission Timeline on page 10?

Answer to question 118: Please see answers to Questions #32 and #83. All other assumptions should be clearly articulated in the proposal response.

Question 119: Regarding data quality checking, does the Data Aggregator check for completeness to determine if any data is missing, i.e., data fields or periods that are expected but do not appear in the feeds the aggregator receives from the data sources? What checks does the Aggregator perform, if any?

Answer to question 119: The Data Aggregator is responsible for performing data quality validation of incoming APCD files from data submitters (e.g. missing data, data completeness thresholds, etc.), maintaining a reliable and secure database environment, and working with the State and the selected vendor to evaluate and address data quality concerns identified by the selected vendor.

Question 120: The price for the “Value-Added Components” is to be included in the firm fixed price; is that correct?

Answer to question 120: Yes. All cost components should also be included in the Budget Narrative.

Question 121: Regarding Task 2B, please confirm that the State expects to receive and pay for the 1-year license by December 31, 2014, per the Schedule of Major Deliverables on page 16.

Answer to question 121: Correct.

Question 122: The State's commitment to only a one-year software license makes it difficult for the bidders to provide a cost-effective price. Most software licenses require a large initial license fee. Does the State's budget for the first 18 months take this fact into account?

Answer to question 122: Yes, the State is aware of this. Bidders can choose to reiterate this in their proposal response, if they desire.

Question 123: In the description of Task 3, the RFP says, "All data in the Reporting Packages must be based on data available in the reporting and querying software." The CSI-RI Report will include distinction between CSI patients and CSI comparison group patients. Will the reporting and querying software also have to make it possible for users to distinguish between these two groups?

Answer to question 123: Users of the reporting and querying software should be able to develop the same custom queries produced in the reporting packages, based on their user access level.

Question 124: Are the current CSI-RI reports publicly available, and if so, would you provide them for us to view?

Answer to question 124: They are available on www.pcmhri.org

Question 125: The RFP indicates that the list of State-approved reporting specifications will be completed by July 2014. Can the State provide any more information about the type of reports of interest, the scope and scale of the reports or any other information other reports mentioned on pages 14-15?

Answer to question 125: Please see answer to Question #41.

Question 126: Section 3, Scope of Work, Task Three Reporting, pages 14-15. This section indicates that, of the total of 50 unique reports to be developed (5 packages of 10 reports each), the State has identified three agency-specific reports or report sets – the CSI-RI reports, the MMIS extract, and the extract for the RI Health Insurance Exchange. To assist bidders in understanding how the State is defining scope, would you please clarify further what constitutes a report versus a report set and how these count toward the total of 50? In particular, the CSI-RI reports appear to include a series of separate reports – will the set count as 1 report or several?

Answer to question 126: The CSI-RI Report will count as 1 report - even though it has several components. Please refer to answer to Question # 41 for additional information on report contents.

Question 127: Is it correct to assume that Reporting Packages 3, 4, and 5 could include more reports and/or extracts than just the nine (9) cited on page 15 (3 CSI-RI reports, 3 MMIS extracts, and 3 RI HIE extracts)?

Answer to question 127: As mentioned in footnote #8 (pg. 15), these three already identified reports will count towards the maximum of 10 reports in each Reporting Package 3-5. So for example, Reporting Package 3 will contain the three specific reports listed, and then up to 7 additional reports as agreed upon by the Project Management vendor and the State

Question 128: For Task Three, does the State currently get reports to evaluate these initiatives, and if so, would the State make them available to the bidders to review?

Answer to question 128: Current CSI-RI reports are available on www.pcmhri.org. Extracts to MMIS and the Health Insurance Exchange, as outlined in the RFP, have not been previously produced.

Question 129: Section 3, Scope of Work, Task Three Reporting, page 15. This section states that the Analytic Vendor must continue to generate the CSI-RI reports, MMIS extracts, and RI HIE extracts on a quarterly basis if the contract is extended beyond the initial term. However, the Cost Proposal instructions on page 20 specify that the Appendix F license fees for Optional Extension Years should not include any new reports or updates to previously generated reports. Please advise on whether the noted reports/extracts will be generated in the option years and, if so, where the cost for these reports should be shown.

Answer to question 129: The cost of updating reports and/or producing new reports should not be included in the price for the Optional Extension Years. If the State decides to extend the contract with the selected vendor beyond the initial contract term, the costs of producing these quarterly reports may be included under the Task 4 Special Enhancement Activities.

Question 130: For Task Three, should the Analytics Vendor anticipate presenting all report results at each quarterly Executive Committee Meeting (a single quarterly meeting) or just the report results for the CSI-RI Reports?

Answer to question 130: Just the report results for the CSI-RI.

Question 131: To produce the CSI-RI Report, the vendor will need to identify patients at the CSI practice site and patients at a comparison group. Would the attribution algorithm and data mapping decisions the RI-APCD Analytics Vendor receives from the CSI-RI Analytic Vendor be used to identify these patients in the RI-APCD data we receive from the Data Aggregator?

Answer to question 131: Yes, the current CSI analytic vendor will transfer relevant practice information, including previous patient assignment decisions. However, the analytic vendor should propose a unified patient attribution method for patients of commercial payers that do not auto-assign members to a primary care physician.

Question 132: Section 3, Scope of Work, Task Three Reporting, page 15. Has the ability to recreate these patient groups using the RI-APCD data already been ascertained?

Answer to question 132: For the patient groups required for the CSI-RI report, yes.

Question 133: To produce the extract for the RI Health Insurance Exchange, will the Exchange provide the Analytics Vendor with information on what enrollees should be identified as Exchange and off-Exchange? Or is this distinction available in the RI-APCD data the vendor receives from the Data Aggregator?

Answer to question 133: The data extract delivered from the Data Aggregator will contain a "purchased through the Exchange" indicator flag.

Question 134: Can the state kindly confirm that the section labeled "*Narrative Response to Minimum Qualifications* (page 17) is the same as "*Narrative Response to Specific Requirements*" (page 18)?

Answer to question 134: Yes, these are the same.

Question 135: The instructions for Appendix F – Optional Extension Years indicate that bidders are not to include any costs for new reports or updates to previously generated reports in the extension periods. Please clarify whether the Analytic Vendor will be expected to receive quarterly data extracts and load these into the Query and Reporting Software during the extension periods.

Answer to question 135: Yes, the license fee for the Optional Extension Years should include receipt and loading of quarterly data extracts from the Data Aggregator into the Reporting and Querying Software. However, the Optional Extension Year price should not include updating previously released reports or producing new reports. Please see answer to Question #129 for further clarification.

Question 136: Tasks 2A and 2B will be paid as a Firm Fixed Price upon completion of each respective deliverable. Regarding Task 2A, would the State consider paying for sub-deliverables within the Task 2A Major Deliverable to Develop and Demonstrate Reporting and Querying Software, such as Requirements Validation?

Answer to question 136: Please refer to the Section entitled "Overall Purchasing Structure of this RFP".

Question 137: Will the State consider allowing the bidders to propose a fixed fee for the Reporting task (Task Three) instead of a Time & Materials rate? Federal law does not permit us to discount T&M labor rates below the rates we quote to the Federal government. However, firm fixed pricing affords the option to bundle the services using discounted personnel costs.

Answer to question 137: No, Task 3 needs to be bid on a Time and Materials rate.

Question 138: The following language is somewhat confusing: "Data must be refreshed within fifteen (15) calendar days of receiving each data extract from Data Aggregator. Data must also be refreshed at the same time as new Reporting Packages are uploaded (See RI-APCD Data Submission Timeline and Appendix B)." Is it correct to assume that the State expects the analytics database to be updated (refreshed) once per quarter, after which new quarterly reports are to be delivered?

Answer to question 138: Correct. The vendor will receive quarterly data extracts from the Data Aggregator. The vendor will be expected to update/"refresh" the querying and reporting software within 15 calendar days of receiving this extract. The analytic vendor is also expected to update existing reports and deliver any new reports scheduled for the release, by the dates outlined in Appendix B.

Question 139: What does the State consider to be "data completeness" in this context?

Answer to question 139: All fields available in the data extract from the Data Aggregator must be available in the software solution.

Question 140: Will the State consider removing Tasks 2A and 2B from this worksheet since those tasks will be quoted as a firm fixed price? T&M labor rates cannot be discounted beyond rates offered in Federal Government contracts. Firm Fixed pricing affords the option to bundle the services using discounted personnel costs.

Answer to question 140: No. Task 2A and 2B need to be bid on as a firm fixed price.

Question 141: Task 2B is shown as a 2014 cost in the schedule, however in Section 3 Scope of Work, Task 2B is defined as the license fee for 2015. Is the calculation correct as shown or should the State classify Task 2B as a 2015 cost?

Answer to question 141: Please refer to the Schedule of Major Deliverables, page 16. The State anticipates purchasing the 1-year license for 2015 prior to the start of the 2015 calendar year.