



**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**

**October 11, 2016**

<b>ADDENDUM # 1</b>
---------------------

**RFP: # 7550978**

**Title: Data Vendor for the Rhode Island All-Payer Claims Database**

**Bid Closing Date & Time: October 21, 2016 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 #7550978 Data Vendor for the Rhode Island All-Payer Claims Database**

Question 1: The Division of Purchases website states that solicitation #7550978 will be opened on 10/19 at 10am, but the front page of the RFP states that the submission deadline is 10/21 at 10am. Please validate submission date.

Answer to question 1: The submission deadline for RFP 7550978 is October 21, 2016 at 10:00 AM ET. The website will be corrected through this addendum.

Question 2: The requirements state that all historical RI APCD data both raw unprocessed and the processed data extracts must be consumed. Are there any requirements to actually report on the historical data or can it be archived? P.17, section ii

Answer to question 2: Vendors must re-process raw historic data based on their new approved business rules, as well as maintain the “legacy” processed data (as processed by the existing Data Aggregator Vendor). The State may ask the Vendor to provide Technical Support [Task 3C(4)] and/or ad-hoc analytic support [Task 3C(5)] pertaining to either the re-processed or raw historic data. In addition, as stated on Page 30 of the RFP, Vendor should be able to produce and transmit data sets on an ad-hoc basis to State agencies and external vendors as directed by the ISW, as part of any work executed under Domain 5: Special Projects/Enhancements. These ad-hoc data sets may include historic data.

Question 3: In the ad-hoc analytic support section, the ad-hoc analytics support is quoted as not exceeding 15 hours/month. What does the scope of this support include? P.29, section 5

Answer to question 3: Ad-hoc analytic support includes assisting the State with using the RI APCD data to answer questions related to policy analysis, program management, population health, and the quality, cost or utilization of healthcare services in Rhode Island. Vendor may be asked to develop and execute queries, data sets, and/or analytic reports in support of this function.

Question 4: This section references testing the functionality of cubes. Is the expectation that the vendor is creating data cubes as a part of the development of analytics? We did not see cubes listed as a requirement. P. 32, section 4

Answer to question 4: The State expects that the Vendor may develop data cubes and/or reports as part of mapping the RI APCD data to either state-owned Cognos or Tableau business intelligence tools (Task 4A). However, the State is open to all responsive models.

Question 5: Under the Method of Calculation of Credit states ...” Contractor shall not be paid for deliverables that are not delivered before the next quarterly cycle begins (e.g. if Cycle Q2 deliverable is outstanding as of Cycle Q3 data submission deadline, Contractor will not receive payment for Cycle Q2 deliverable).” Is the intention of this credit to delay payment until the Deliverable is complete, or is ISW indicating that late Deliverables will not be paid at all, which is essentially a 100% credit? P. 46, Table 1: Service Level Requirements as Performance Factors

Answer to question 5: The intent of the Service Level Credits is to ensure that all deliverables are delivered sequentially and by the specified deadlines (or as close to the deadlines as possible). Late deliverables are subject to the formulas set forth in the Service Level Requirements in the RFP (Exhibit C, Table 1).

Question 6: For the “Submission Deadline”, is the time of 10:00 (Eastern Time) AM or PM?

Answer to question 6: The submission deadline for RFP 7550978 is October 21, 2016 at 10:00 AM ET.

Question 7: Can ‘Lockbox Vendor’ participate in more than one bid (i.e., act as a subcontractor for more than one bidder)?

Answer to question 7: Yes

Question 8: Who owns the current domain of the opt-out website?

Answer to question 8: The current Lockbox Vendor, Arcadia Solutions, owns the domain of the opt-out website and will transfer ownership of the domain (and the several, similarly named domains that automatically redirect to the official domain) to the new Lockbox Vendor, if applicable.

Question 9: Will the new ‘Lockbox’ vendor incur costs associated with the domain transfer? If yes, what type of costs and amounts would be incurred by the new ‘Lockbox Vendor’?

Answer to question 9: The current Lockbox Vendor, Arcadia, will transfer ownership of the domain name to the new Lockbox Vendor as needed, at no charge. The current domain name registration expires on January 22,

2017, at which point the new Lockbox Vendor would have to re-register the domain name and pay any registration fees.

Question 10: If the Data Aggregator collects data more frequently than on a quarterly basis, will the State want value added components to be likewise refreshed and delivered more frequently than on a quarterly basis?

Answer to question 10: The Vendor is required to securely transmit the fully-processed RI APCD data, on a quarterly basis, to the State Data Center. Bidders are free to propose a more aggressive/more frequent processing timeline if they wish.

Question 11: For third party methodologies, such as MEGs, ETGs, CRGs, EAPGs and APR-DRGs, is the State's requirement for transparency of methodologies limited to how the vendor will integrate and implement these methodologies? Or, does the State require these third party vendors to expose their proprietary methodologies through the vendor?

Answer to question 11: No. The State's requirement for using transparent "open-source" groupers does not apply to the proprietary value-added components outlined in Task 1B(3)(d) or the optional activities at the end of Task 3B.

Question 12: For the required 3M analytics (i.e., CRG, EAPGs, APR-DRGs), who will be required to obtain and own the licenses?

Answer to question 12: The Vendor will be required to obtain the licenses necessary to perform the work outlined in the RFP; however, 3M waives the license cost for many of their groupers for use on behalf of a State for internal state purposes.

Question 13: For the RI Care Transformation Collaborative (CTC), among several requirements, the vendor will be required to provide analytic support for "three analytic cohorts". Does the State have definitions for these "three analytic cohorts"?

Answer to question 13: Yes. The State will provide a lookup table which groups healthcare providers (by their National Provider ID) to each CTC practice site and each of the three analytic cohorts.

Question 14: For Domain Three, Task 3C, can the "Data Extract" be transmitted more frequently than quarterly?

Answer to question 14: The Vendor is required to securely transmit the fully-processed RI APCD data, on a quarterly basis, to the State Data

Center. Bidders are free to propose a more aggressive/more frequent processing timeline if they wish.

Question 15: For Domain Three, Task 3C, can the “Data Extract” be transmitted as a transport database?

Answer to question 15: The State is open to all responsive models. Bidders should propose their solutions, as well as all data transmission options, if multiple options are available.

Question 16: For Domain Four, Task 4A, who will have ultimate responsibility for designing the BI interface and layout, the State or the Vendor?

Answer to question 16: The Vendor will have ultimate responsibility for designing the BI interface and layout, with input from the State and contingent on State approval.

Question 17: For Domain Four, Task 4A, who will have ultimate responsibility for building the BI User Portal, the State or the Vendor?

Answer to question 17: The State does not anticipate that there will be a BI user portal separate from the BI user login at this time. Once users log in, their specific permissions will control individual and shared project and data element access.

Question 18: For Domain Five, RFP states, “Altogether, Domain five work cannot exceed 10% of the initial award.”

- a. Will Domain Five work be requested and defined all at once, at the same time?
- b. To calculate the ‘not to exceed 10%’ requirement, how would State define “initial award”? Does “initial award” cover the costs for entire period of the contract?

Answer to question 18: Any Domain Five work will be agreed to in writing, by both the State and the vendor, before any enhancement work begins. If agreed to by both parties, the State will issue a formal change order to the Contract, increasing the value of the contract to allow for the additional work. Work under Domain Five will not necessarily all be defined at once; there may be a single or multiple change orders throughout the duration of the Contract term. The initial award is the original contract value.

Question 19: For the “Staffing Plan” (page 37), do “on-the-ground” resources represent Vendor resources working onsite at the State’s location(s)?

Answer to question 19: On-the-ground resources include any Vendor staff that can attend regular and ad-hoc meetings, in-person, in Providence and Cranston, RI.

Question 20: For ‘Budget Narrative’ section, what are considered “additional cost savings”? Since the “Cost Proposal Worksheet” is populated based on resource hours and staff effort, could “additional cost savings” include any discounts Vendor would apply to “Cost Proposal”?

Answer to question 20: Additional cost savings should include any savings that the state would gain from selecting the Vendor to perform the work outlined in the RFP. This includes any discounts that the Vendor can offer or any efficiencies that would be realized by selecting the Vendor (i.e. if the Vendor already performs work for the state, is headquartered locally, already owns the necessary licenses, etc.)

Question 21: Will the “Cost Proposal” be evaluated in total, inclusive of any “additional cost savings” detailed in the “Budget Narrative”?

Answer to question 21: The Cost Proposal should include the actual costs that the Vendor will charge EOHHS to perform the required services. The Cost Proposal will be evaluated according to the formula described in *Section 7: Evaluation and Selection*.

Question 22: Will the State allow for negotiation of and modification to certain sections of the “Agreement” and corresponding “Addendums”? If so, are there any specific sections that are non-negotiable and cannot be modified?

Answer to question 22: EOHHS may choose at its discretion to work with the selected vendor to modify the terms and conditions of the base contract (Appendix 1 of the RFP) on a selective basis. However, *Paragraph 12: Liability and Indemnification* and *Paragraph 35: Governing Law* of the base contract are not likely to be altered. See also Attachment A: State of Rhode Island General Conditions of Purchase, available at: <https://www.purchasing.ri.gov/RIVIP/publicdocuments/ATTA.pdf>.

Question 23: p. 13 (first bullet at bottom of page) – “Going forward, RI APCD data will be stored and hosted within the RI State Data Center,....” Does this mean the final, consolidated files and tables or all versions of the data?

Answer to question 23: The fully-processed and enhanced RI APCD data will be stored and hosted by the RI State Data Center. The raw data, as

received from data submitters, should be stored by the Vendor and will be transferred to the State upon contract termination.

Question 24: p. 19 – “Unless otherwise noted, all methodologies proposed must be transparent/’open-source’/cannot be withheld due to proprietary restriction.” Does this requirement also include the actual code or is it referring to the logic used to develop the methodologies?

Answer to question 24: The requirement on page 19 refers to the logic used to develop the methodologies, not the actual code used.

Question 25: Can the State confirm the number of data submitters that are currently participating in the APCD?

Answer to question 25: There are currently 11 data submitters, who submit a total of 16 separate submissions (since some data submitters have multiple lines of business/business platforms).

Question 26: How many lives are currently in the database?

Answer to question 26: See Section 3: Background, page 10. As of June 2016, the APCD contains approximately 1.03M unique covered lives.

Question 27: The RFP notes in "Section 1: Introduction," Item 10 (p.5), that "...all materials submitted to the State for consideration in response to this RFP will be considered to be Public Records as defined in Title 38, Chapter 2 of the General Laws of Rhode Island, without exception, and will be released for inspection immediately upon request once an award has been made." If intellectual property or protected material is included in the RFP response, is there a provision for releasing a redacted version?

Answer to question 27: Submit all highly confidential information (i.e. financial statements or intellectual property) – in a separately sealed envelope clearly marked. Vendors may also include a redacted copy; however the state is ultimate decision-maker as to what should or should not be disclosed.

Question 28: Exhibit A and Appendix 2 both appear to be truncated. Would the State be amenable to releasing either a Word version or adjusted PDF to include the full content of those tables?

Answer to question 28: This issue should now be resolved in the version of the RFP that is provided.

Question 29: Regarding Task 3(C)(a) in support of the Common Provider Database (CPDB), which requires the vendor to "send a copy of the RI APCD Master Provider Index to RIQI," could the State provide additional detail on the desired method of transferring the data (e.g., SFTP, hard drive, etc.)?

Answer to question 29: The Vendor should propose a method to securely transmit the data, as part of their proposal response.

Question 30: The required RIVIP form mandates that the bidder agree "to comply with its [the RFP's] terms and conditions," which presumably includes Appendix 1 ("EOHHS BASE CONTRACT"). The base contract's Par. 15 ("Copyrights") includes a provision that "any and all data, technical information, information systems, materials ... used ... by the Contractor in performance of the Agreement used to create and/or maintain work performed by the Contractor, including but not limited to, all hardware, software computer programs, data files, application programs, intellectual property, source code, documentation and manuals, regardless of state of completion shall be deemed to be owned and remain owned by the State." If the contractor's services will be delivered as Software as a Service (SaaS), with application source code, proprietary documentation, and software, etc., remaining the intellectual property of the Contractor, not the State, how would the State prefer this be addressed?

Answer to question 30: EOHHS may choose at its discretion to work with the selected vendor to modify the terms and conditions of the base contract (Appendix 1 of the RFP) on a selective basis.

Question 31: Task 3C(3) includes the following requirement: "Integrate CPDB provider data into the fully-processed extract sent forth to the State Data Center on a quarterly basis. The CPDB extract will include data elements not otherwise collected by the RI APCD – linked by a common key (e.g. NPI)." Could the State confirm whether this RIQI-provided data should be included as a separate table or if it instead needs to be processed/clustered with the standard APCD data?

Answer to question 31: Vendor should propose the method they will use to integrate the CPDB data into the rest of the fully-processed RI APCD data.

Question 32: Regarding Domain 4, could the state provide an estimate of the number of dashboards that will need to be implemented as part of the BI solution?

Answer to question 32: Vendor should demonstrate in the RFP response the capability to build dashboards as part of the selected BI solution. The Vendor will be directed to implement dashboards by the ISW, as part of work executed under Domain 5: Special Projects/Enhancements. Any Domain Five work will be agreed to in writing, by both the State and the vendor, before any enhancement work begins.

Question 33: Regarding Domain 4, could the State also confirm whether all dashboards will require ongoing quarterly refreshes and QA?

Answer to question 33: Yes, as outlined in the RFP, Vendor will be responsible for ensuring that all content available via the Business Intelligence tool(s) are refreshed quarterly, including existing reports and dashboards, using the updated RI APCD data available in the State Data Center. Vendor is also responsible for performing checks to ensure data continues to map properly after content is refreshed with each quarterly update of the RI APCD data.

Question 34: Regarding Domain 4, could the State provide an estimate of the number of users that are anticipated to require concurrent access to the BI tool?

Answer to question 34: The State anticipates approximately 15-25 concurrent users. The State has already purchased the necessary Business Intelligence software license(s) and will define user's roles and permissions. Vendor will be responsible for providing training and technical assistance to all users as needed.

Question 35: Regarding Domain 4, could the State provide an estimate of the number of users that will be registered (licensed) to use the BI tool?

Answer to question 35: The State anticipates approximately 25-50 users that will be registered and trained to use the BI tool. The State has already purchased the necessary Business Intelligence software license(s) and will define user's roles and permissions. Vendor will be responsible for providing training and technical assistance to all users as needed.

Question 36: Regarding Domain 4, could the State provide an estimate of the number of RI staff that will have permissions to create reports, dashboards, and visualizations?

Answer to question 36: The State anticipates approximately 10-15 super users with permissions to create reports, dashboards, etc. The State has already purchased the necessary Business Intelligence software license(s) and will define user's roles and permissions. Vendor will be responsible for providing training and technical assistance to all users as needed.

Question 37: Regarding Domain 4, could the State provide guidance on whether all registered users and RI staff will require training for using the BI tool?

Answer to question 37: As outlined in Task 4B, the Vendor will be responsible for providing training for state analysts, including an overview of claims data and the RI APCD, key data concepts to understand how to

analyze claims data using the BI tool, and functionality and navigation of the BI tool.

Question 38: Regarding Domain 4, could the State clarify which software components of the BI solution will need to be covered in the anticipated training sessions?

Answer to question 38: Please see answer to Question 37.

Question 39: Will any part of this contract include federal funding and if so, can you please provide the CFDA number?

Answer to question 39: The RI APCD is currently funded by the State Innovation Model (SIM) federal grant (CFDA #93.624). The State anticipates that other federal funds will continue to support the APCD in the future.

Question 40: What, if any, constraints does RI EOHHS have to the implementation of the scope of services?

Answer to question 40: The RI APCD must be implemented in accordance with Chapter 23-17.17-9, *Health Care Quality and Value Database*, and the Rules and Regulations Pertaining to the Rhode Island All-Payer Claims Database [R23-17.17-RIAPCD]. As with all RI EOHHS contracts, issuance of the contract is contingent upon availability of funds.

Question 41: What will RI EOHHS's dedicated staff be to this project?

Answer to question 41: The RI APCD implementation is managed by a state Interagency Staff Workgroup (ISW); a governing body with representatives from RIDOH, EOHHS, OHIC, and HealthSource RI. These four agencies have committed staff to the project.

Question 42: What is your proposed budget for this project?

Answer to question 42: Budget information is not available.

Question 43: Is there an incumbent on any of the work that precedes this procurement?

Answer to question 43: Yes. As outlined in Section 3 of the RFP, the various tasks associated with implementing the RI APCD have historically been performed by three vendors: Arcadia Healthcare Solutions; Onpoint

Health Data; and 3M. A description of the work historically performed by each of these vendors can be found on page 13 of the RFP.

Question 44: Will your evaluation team consist of persons who will be directly involved in this project? If not, who will serve on the evaluation committee?

Answer to question 44: That information is not available at this time.

Question 45: Does your state have any existing cooperative agreements with other states that would be utilized in the award of this project?

Answer to question 45: No.

Question 46: Does your state offer incentives or additional evaluation points for in-state bidders?

Answer to question 46: No.

Question 47: Do you anticipate the deadline being extended?

Answer to question 47: No.

Question 48: Submission Deadline: October 21, 2016 at 10:00 (Eastern Time)  
Can you please confirm if this is 10:00 AM or 10:00 PM?

Answer to question 48: The submission deadline for RFP 7550978 is October 21, 2016 at 10:00 AM.