



**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**

ADDENDUM # 2

RFP# 7551433

TITLE: Enterprise Fraud, Waste and Abuse Analytics and Platform

Submission Deadline: APRIL 25, 2017 at 02:00 PM ET

ADDENDUM DESCRIPTION:

A. Extension of Submission Deadline and

B. Responses to Questions received by March 9, 2017 at 05:00 PM ET.

A. Submission Deadline Extension:

The submission deadline has been changed:

From: APRIL 20, 2017 at 02:00 PM ET

To: APRIL 25, 2017 at 02:00 PM ET

B. Responses to Questions received by March 9, 2017 at 05:00 PM ET.

1. **Question:** Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)

Answer: Yes however companies outside of the USA may be subject to additional security requirements. Also the State shall not conduct business with any foreign countries prohibited by State and/or Federal law. Cloud data centers must be located in the contiguous United States.

2. **Question:** Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

Answer: Yes, the State expects any acceptable foreign companies to be able to meet at our office in Rhode Island if selected for an interview (all expenses will be the Vendor's). Also the State expects the awarded vendor to provide an onsite team for the implementation and training as well as customer service/technical support available during the State's business hours in the Eastern Time Zone. Some meetings can be done with as a conference call during the State's business hours and some meetings the State

will expect onsite participation; these requirements will be mutually agreed upon as the meetings arise.

3. **Question:** Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)

Answer: No. There are federal and state restrictions to moving data offshore as per. R.I. Gen. Laws § 11-49.3-, The State requires that any and all State information and/or software code for this project shall be located within the United States at all times and all personnel supporting this project be located in the United States. Further, if applicable, any and all data storage shall be on servers located within the United States.

4. **Question:** Can we submit the proposals via email?

Answer: No. Please see the RFP's Section 10, page 43. Response package must be mailed or hand-delivered in a sealed envelope marked "RFP# 7551433" to:

RI Department of Administration
Division of Purchases, 2nd floor
One Capitol Hill
Providence, RI 02908-5855

Please see the RFP for additional information on the contents of responses in Section 11, pages 43-44.

5. **Question:** Has a budget been allocated already for this project? May I know an estimated contract value?

Answer: Funds are allocated for this project. Details on funding are not available to vendors.

6. **Question:** Who is the incumbent vendor in contract for this project? May I know the contract expiry date?

Answer: This is a contract for a new fraud analytic system there is no incumbent vendor.

7. **Question:** There is general guidance that the response should not be longer than 100 pages (excluding required sample submissions). There are specific page limit suggestions (25 pages for Section 3.5; 7 pages for Section 3.7.1.3.3; 4 pages per resume and 3 pages for additional resources per Section 3.7.2; and, 5 pages per subcontractor or partner noted in Section 3.7.3). Will the State provide any additional section page limit suggestions, e.g. Technical Proposal, Section 7?

Answer: The suggested page limit for Section 7 is 25 pages.

8. **Question:** Page 2, Introduction - Can OIA provide an estimated start date for the contract?

Answer: We anticipate a start date of July 1, 2017

9. **Question:** Page 3, 1.1 Instructions and Notifications - Item 14 states that the MBE goal is 10% in all procurements. Where does this goal factor into the evaluation criteria listed on page 42?

Answer: Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) vendor status and/or state goals are not part of the evaluation criteria. After the evaluation is completed and a vendor is selected, the selected vendor will be required to submit an MBE plan for consideration of their tentative award. For further information visit the website www.mbe.ri.gov.

10. **Question:** Page 5, 2.2.3. Anticipated Results; For the 3 identified agencies to be the initial implementation (DOR, DLT and DHS), how many systems and payment types are expected to require integration to the solution?

Answer: The Initial implementation would include using data from 3 Departments 5 systems and 8 Payment types. There is no integration or front end detection of payments in the scope of work. It is strictly analytics over existing data.

11. **Question:** Page 5, 2.2.3. Anticipated Results - The last sentence states that “other agencies will be added sequentially.” Are the other agencies considered part of the scope for this fixed price contract? If yes, how many anticipated agencies and payment types would be expected? If no, would these other agencies be addressed through a change order process?

Answer: The possibility of utilizing data from other agencies (more than the 3 defined in this RFP) should be considered as part of the respondent’s proposal for developing fraud analytics that yield productive targets. The pricing should not be based on the number of agencies but on the development of productive analytics.

12. **Question:** Page 6, 3.1 Scope of Work – General Instructions - The requirement reads, “The Vendor shall include in its written narrative a detailed description of how it will address each of the lettered or bulleted requirements specified in Section 5.5.4.” Section 5.5.4 (page 39) refers to Data Breach Disclosure and does not have lettered or bulleted requirements. Please clarify which section(s) in the Scope of Work should be responded to.

Answer: There is an error in the General Instructions. Reference for Section 5.5.4 should respond in a narrative paragraph there is no bulleted requirements.

13. **Question:** Page 9, 3.3.2.1.6 System Access and Navigation - This requirement states: "Generate an audit trail of actions taken on a claim, including incorporation of external documents with date and time stamps." These actions are typically made in a case management system, which is stated already being in the RSI system. Please clarify what actions are desired in the detection system versus the case management system, as these would seem to be duplicative.

Answer: This is an error and should be disregarded; it is not a requirement for this RFP response.

14. **Question:** Page 13, 3.4.4.1 Agile Training - This section states that “DoIT and State project team may require initial orientation training on the Agile Development process.” How many people are anticipated to be trained in the methodology and process?

Answer: Between 5 and 15.

15. **Question:** Page 13, 3.4.4.1 Agile Training - This section states that the “vendor will provide orientation training to State members of the project team and stakeholders ...

on the tools the vendor will use to track the Agile process.” How many people from the State are expected to need access / seats or licenses for access to the Agile tool?

Answer: Between 5 and 15.

16. **Question:** Page 15, 3.4.6.2.5 Administrative - This states that there is to be a web-based collaborative issue and project tracking tool made available to State team members. How many State team members would need direct access to the tool?

Answer: 5

17. **Question:** Page 17, 3.4.9 Milestones and Deliverables - For the 3 identified agencies for initial implementation identified in 2.2.3, does the milestone and deliverable matrix (3.4.9.1) expect delivery of all 3 of the specified agencies and integration to their payment systems to define the deliverable complete in order to receive payment?

Answer: The system is expected to be delivered only to the Office of Internal Audit and there is no integration expected with the agencies payment systems.

18. **Question:** Page 17, 3.4.9.1 Milestones and Deliverables - The Predictive Modeling Initiative Milestone and Deliverables Matrix indicates a Solution Deployment (Go-Live) at Month 12. Can a vendor propose an expedited go-live and, if so, would that be viewed favorably by the State, as it would shorten the time to savings?

Answer: An expedited go-live may be proposed. The technical evaluation team would decide favorability based upon the quality and feasibility of date presented.

19. **Question:** Page 17, 3.4.9.1. Milestones and Deliverables Matrix - The matrix shows payment for Monthly Status and Performance reports as 10% of the Total Fixed Price on completion and approval of deliverables. Does that mean payment will be on a monthly basis? Will that be calculated by paying 1/24th of the 10% monthly? Please clarify.

Answer: No, payment of the 10% will be made at the end of the period.

20. **Question:** Page 24, 3.6.4.2. Agile Methodology and Project Plan - he RFP requires that “the Vendor must submit with its response a high-level Project Plan enumerating major project phases and milestones. The Project Plan must commence with Purchase Order and end no later than eighteen (18) months later.” The contract is for 24 months, including deliverables through month 24. Please clarify.

Answer: Assume a Purchase Order issue date of June 25th with a start of July 1 and roll project plan forward from the start date.

21. **Question:** Page 24, 3.8 Codes of Conduct - Can OIA provide a copy of the Code of Conduct and Confidentiality Agreement that the awarded bidder would be required to execute?

Answer: Yes, see attachments accompanying this addendum on the Division of Purchases website. The file is named “CONFIDENTIALITY – Code of Conduct”.

22. **Question:** Page 41, 7. Technical Proposal - This section describes 7.1 Understanding of the Requirements of the Project and 7.2 Interface Strategy. These two response sections are also described as pass/fail sections on page 41 (Evaluation and Scoring). Please clarify as to how bidders should respond to these two sections. Are we to

provide distinct responses to these, or will the scores be derived from our responses to the Statement of Work?

Answer: Please provide distinct responses.

23. Question: Page 42, 9. Evaluation and Selection - The scoring matrix in Section 9 aligns with the Technical Proposal elements identified in Section 7. However, those elements are not consistent with the responses required for Sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 for which narrative responses are also required (Scope of Work, Hosting and Security Requirements, Maintenance and Support, and Breach of PII). Will the State please provide direction as to whether the responses for Sections 3-6 are intended to be part of the Technical Proposal as outlined in Section 7, and, if so, into which area(s) as outlined by Section 7, those Section 3-6 responses should be integrated. If the responses to Section 3-6 are not part of the Technical Proposal, how will they be evaluated and scored?

Answer: Yes, these should be part of the Technical Proposal elements and will be scored as noted.

24. Question: Page 43, 10. Questions and Proposal Submission - Given that no date was provided for the posting of answers to submitted questions, would OIA consider extending the due date to allow bidders time to incorporate answers into their responses?

Answer: Please see section A of this addendum as the submission deadline has been extended to April 25, 2017 at 02:00 PM ET

25. Question: Has OIA met with any vendor(s) regarding this project? If so, which vendor(s)?

Answer: OIA has not met with any vendors for this RFP.

26. Question: On page 6 of the RFP, it states "The Vendor shall include in its written narrative a detailed description of how it will address each of the lettered or bulleted requirements specified in Section 5.5.4." However, 5.5.4 Data Breach Disclosure on page 39 does not have a bulleted requirements list. Please confirm is this is the correct section number.

Answer: See answer to question 12.

27. Question: Are responses to each individual bulleted requirement in Section 3.3, Section 3.4, Section 4 (Hosting), Section 5 (Maintenance), and Section 6(PII Breach) to be included in the technical response? If so, do they count toward the 100 page count limitation?

Answer: See response to question 23. Yes this counts towards the 100 page limitation.

28. Question: In our experience working alongside RSI's Portfolio Warehouse solution at another state, we have learned that any data aggregated into PW winds up being classified as "FTI" (because it is co-mingled) and therefore subject to IRS 1075 requirements. If true FTI (tax data) is not properly partitioned off within TSPW, it could

lead to non-tax data (e.g. Medicaid) becoming classified as FTI thereby raising the overall cost to deliver the project. Our questions are therefore:

- a) Does the state envision that TSPW will serve as the central database of record for ALL government data used to support fraud detection efforts (to include data from DOR, DLT, DHS, etc.) and
- b) If so, can the vendor assume the tax data will be partitioned off from the non-tax data to preclude extensive 1075 remediation efforts for the non-tax data?

Answer:

(a) Yes, the TSPW will serve as the central database of record.

(b) Yes, partitioning is in effect and complies with 1075.

29. **Question:** The RFP states that “any suspected fraudulent action would be shared across all participating departments, and the perpetrator would be investigated on all department fronts (DHS, BR, DLT, DOR).” In our experience with cross-agency fraud detection projects, a single agency typically takes the lead and ownership of the investigation, even if the fraud (and the supporting data) crosses agency boundaries (e.g. taxpayer claiming both EITC and Medicaid). How will the state determine which agency will lead the investigation?

Answer: OIA is the lead agency and will refer to other agencies via existing case management software.

30. **Question:** In consideration of the state’s goal of \$5M in recovery or cost avoidance, is the agency open to alternative delivery models, for example, "software as a service" (SaaS)?

Answer: We will explore all methods presented.

31. **Question:** What is the agency's long term preference with respect to using advanced predictive modeling tools - (a) to have the solution provider provide these capabilities, or, (b) for the agency staff to learn to use these tools internally?

Answer: Our goal is for agency staff to learn to use the tools.

32. **Question:** Does the state expect \$5M, or near \$5M, in recovery or cost avoidance in year one of the contract?

Answer: There is a target for net recovery/cost avoidance. We would expect at least \$5M in first year.

33. **Question:** On page 5 of the RFP, it states "Data from several RI state agencies is already and will continue to be assembled and aggregated..." Can the state please provide a full list of these data sets to ensure duplication is prevented in a vendor's response?

Answer: The vendor should propose any sources that they would like to utilize for their analytic solution. Upon contract award we will provide a list of all existing data to avoid duplication. To date the following is readily available: Department of Motor Vehicles; Registration and License, Department of Health; Licenses, Department of Labor and Training; Data related to taxation transactions.

34. **Question:** Since the chosen vendor will not be the source of record for this data and a hot/warm Disaster Recovery setup is very costly, would the State consider loosening some of the Disaster Recovery requirements? Would a 99% uptime SLA with daily backups and a full Continuity of Business Plan meet the State's needs?

Answer: Yes.

35. **Question:** Can the state provide a more detailed vision for the user interface to manage fraudulent alerts prior to them being sent to the TPSW for case management and investigation purposes?

Answer: We would expect a view of the alerts that allows sorting and grouping and some explanation of the origin of the alert. The state should be able to prevent items from being sent to TPSW on a single item or group basis and be able to provide feedback to the analytics vendor.

36. **Question:** The scope of fraud within the Department of Revenue (DOR), Department of Human Services (DHS), and the Department of Labor and Training (DLT) are vastly different. In an effort to help vendors properly scope and price this effort, can the State provide direction on how they envision vendors attack these different types of fraud? For example, is the State looking for the vendor to use a pre-defined data model and pre-defined business fraud rules to address the potential fraud, waste and abuse or is the State looking for the vendor to customize the solution to meet the specific and unique use cases within Rhode Island?

Answer: The state is looking for the vendor to use predefined models as well as cases that may be unique to Rhode Island to provide fraud alerts that have the greatest probability for successful identification of actual fraud.

37. **Question:** Page 1, Proposal Submission Deadline is currently MARCH 30, 2017 at 02:00 PM ET. Because a bid of this size and complexity, with significant differences from the first bid, requires more time to prepare than the 4 weeks originally provided, could the State please extend the proposal Submission Deadline to **April 28, 2017 at 02:00 PM ET** and also provide an extension to submit questions to **March 24, 2017?**

Answer: See answer to question 24.

38. **Question:** Page 6, 3.1 General Instructions - The RFP states that, "*The Vendor shall include in its written narrative a detailed description of how it will address each of the lettered or bulleted requirements specified in Section 5.5.4.*" However Section 5.4.4 is a requirement regarding Data Breach Disclosure. Could the State please clarify this reference?

Answer: Refer to response to question 12.

39. **Question:** Page 17, 3.5 Required Technical Response Supporting Documentation - The RFP states that, "*The Vendor must submit the following material in their response. In response to the requirements in Sections 3.2.1 through 3.2.4, Vendors must submit the following information (suggested page limit 25 pages. Note! Specifically identified and requested sample pages do not count against the suggested page limit):*" However, Sections 3.2.1 through 3.2.4 are part of a list General Requirements 3.2.1 through 3.2.6.

Could the State please clarify this reference and the sections that the page limit applies to?

Answer: Refer to answers to questions 10 and 12; page limits per section are 25 pages.

40. **Question:** Please provide a list of transaction types, systems, databases and business areas.

Answer: Labor and Training: TDI, UI
Human Services SNAP, Medicaid, RIWorks, GPA, Childcare
Revenue: Taxation
Secretary of State Corporations Database
Department of Administration Financial Database (RIFANS)

41. **Question:** Approximately how many transactions are processed annually by the State?

Answer: Unknown, we do not track this metric enterprise wide.

42. **Question:** What areas does the State believe are most rife with fraud?

Answer: We believe there exists waste and abuse that needs to be monitored and recovered.

43. **Question:** Is the Division of Taxation case management system a COTS product or was it developed by the State?

Answer: COTS product

44. **Question:** Does the State want the applications to run directly on top of the State's data warehouse (Section 2.2.2) or in a separate cloud-based environment (4.2)?

Answer: Vendor to provide solution. We expect this to "snap in" and can reside where vendor proposes.

45. **Question:** What Business Intelligence tools and data mining tools does the State already license for this purpose?

Answer: None

46. **Question:** Are MMIS transactions stored in TSPW?

Answer: No. MMIS transactions are not part of this RFP.

47. **Question:** Which transactions are stored in TSPW and which are stored in other databases?

Answer: Data within each business area is stored within their own systems. TSPW stores tax transactions only.

48. **Question:** Does the State desire a rules-based fraud detection system?

Answer: Blend of rules and scheme

49. **Question:** Does the State desire a scheme-based fraud detection system?

Answer: Blend of rules and scheme

50. **Question:** Is this a new initiative or will there be a transition from an existing vendor?

Answer: New Initiative

51. **Question:** If this is a transition from an existing vendor, what shortcomings would the state like to address?

Answer: Not Transitioning

52. **Question:** How many end users are anticipated?

Answer: 10-40

53. **Question:** Does the State desire a vendor with experience in the banking/financial services industry (2.2.3.1)?

Answer: Not necessarily, we will explore all responses regardless of experience.

54. **Question:** Will Rhode Island consider an extension of the RFP? This is a complex request with a very short time to respond and without a timeframe for questions to be addressed.

Answer: See answer to question 24.

55. **Question:** Would you please clarify which systems should utilize prepayment of post payment screening?

Answer: Prepayment and post payment screening is handled within the agency systems. If the selected vendor develops fraud leads prior to payment OIA will coordinate the screening with the agency. The focus of this project is to develop behavioral analysis and fraud analytics post payment.

56. **Question:** Please specify the number of claims systems to integrate into the payment process.

Answer: This RFP does not call for the development of a payment process.

57. **Question:** Would you define the timeline of when each department's platform is expected to be brought live?

Answer: There is one platform for this solution. We would expect the bidder's response to include the ability to be flexible to meet the needs of the OIA during this agile build of the analytics.

58. **Question:** Would you provide more detail on the data from each system that is to be integrated?

Answer: Data from each system contains sufficient demographic information that would normally be needed to properly administer the program. Due to the sensitivity of the data record layout, we will not provide this in a public document. It will be discussed with the vendors at presentations.

59. **Question:** What history is available to be loaded for each system to use for model training/

Answer: There is no history available, test data will need to be developed.

60. **Question:** In reference to Section 3.2.4, are the analysts who receive the fraud leads state employees or vendor employees? If state employees, can the state define the number of investigators, by department, available to work the fraud leads?
Answer: State employees. There are a total of approximately 10 employees identified at OIA to work leads at project initiation. We would expect to add other agency staff as the project matures.
61. **Question:** In reference to Section 3.2.4, If the analysts are vendor employees, how many fraud leads does the state anticipate each year?
Answer: N/A
62. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, is the Solution expected to 1) risk score claimants (those submitting claims, providing benefit services or enrolling in benefit programs) and 2) the submitted claims in each state department?
Answer: 1) yes
2) yes
63. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, does the state anticipate the Solution to be the fraud detection system for Medicaid fee-for-service claims?
Answer: No
64. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, does the state anticipate the Solution to identify fraudulent Medicaid managed care organization fraud?
Answer: No
65. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, does the state anticipate the Solution to identify fraudulent claims submitted to Medicaid managed care organizations?
Answer: No
66. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, can the state prioritize the Human Services organizations to be rolled into the Solution, including Medicaid, Food Stamps, Welfare, Foster Care, and other human social programs?
Answer: Not at this time. This will be discussed with the selected respondent during contract negotiations. Refer to the answer to question 57.
67. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, what is the vendor's responsibility in creating standard operating procedures and memorandum of understanding between various state departments?
Answer: The vendor will assist the state to accomplish these tasks.
68. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, does the state have any external vendors that currently identify potential fraud and conduct fraud investigations? If so, how will this solution interact with those vendors?
Answer: Yes. We expect the chosen solution to support integration to an unlimited number of third party fraud services, however we do not expect this to be an initial phase deliverable.

69. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, is the vendor responsible to identify any weaknesses or conflicts in state policies so that they can be improved?

Answer: Yes

70. **Question:** Please explain how the moratorium on technical procurements that Governor Raimondo put in place on February 15, 2017 affects this RFP? See this reference regarding Rhode Island's announced freeze on technical procurements: <http://www.govtech.com/policy/Rhode-Island-Governor-Freezes-New-State-Government-IT-Projects-.html>.

Answer: Please refer to Attachment 1. This RFP will proceed according to its terms.

71. **Question:** As you may be aware, our company is a specialist in the area of Fraud, Waste and Abuse analytics, and we sought the opportunity to participate in the last RFP (#7550779) which was a procurement for a waste and fraud system by the State of Rhode Island in 2016. Our company discovered the fact that RFP#7550779 was copied verbatim from a State of California sole-source procurement to a vendor listed as participating in procurement #7550779. RFP #7550779 was ultimately canceled. Given this recent background, will the State of Rhode Island provide clear and unqualified assurance that:

a) This RFP #7551433 is an original work product of the State of Rhode Island and is not copied in full or in part from the marketing materials, technical specifications or other documentation that specifically describes a solution offered by a specific vendor of waste and fraud solutions?

Answer: See answer to question 71 (b) below.

b) RFP #7551433 was written without any assistance from any third-parties who would have a material interest in the outcome of this procurement?

Answer: This RFP was written by state resources, no 3rd party vendor participated in the development of this RFP.

72. **Question:** In Section 2.2 on page 5 of RFP #7551433, it is stated as a requirement that "Results of fraud identification and case selection processes will be passed into the existing Case Management systems via an Application Programming Interface (API) to allow audit staff to structure and manage case tracking...". The system identified as housing this Case Management system is identified as "TSPW".

a) The RFP does not include a detailed description as to what functionality is currently provided by the TSPW system. Can you provide this in as detailed a manner as possible? It is very difficult to estimate the costs of meeting the State's expectations without understanding this important piece of integration.

Answer: The TSPW system provides Case Management, Outbound Correspondence, Workflow Management and Case Management Performance Metric Reporting. The State envisions Case Management API integration to

consist of a relatively simple data payload feeding the case management system with details regarding the target identified by the fraud analytics.

- b) If the functionality “...to allow audit staff to structure and manage case tracking” is to be provided by modifying the TSPW system, please explain the details of how a 3rd party supplier would modify the TSPW system which is likely the protected intellectual property of another vendor.

Answer: 3rd party supplier would not modify the TSPW system. See answer to question 72(a) above.

- c) If the functionality “...to allow audit staff to structure and manage case tracking” is to be provided outside of the TSPW system as part of the specified software to be procured, please provide more details as to the current TSPW specifications including, but not limited to file structures, APIs, workflow, etc.

Answer: TSPW can work with a broad range of APIs, SOA based calls, SFTP and one off file exchanges. Refer to question 72 (a) above.

- d) Please provide full technical details of the API to be used to send data from the new waste, fraud and abuse analytics platform required by this RFP to the existing TSPW system, so that bidders other than the operator of the TSPW system can thoroughly understand the technical requirements of that API, and therefore properly estimate the cost to implement this requirement. Without this documentation, it is not possible to price this work accurately.

Answer: The operator of the TSPW is prepared to work with the chosen vendor to accept a broad range of APIs. See question 72 (a) above.

- e) Is Requirement 3.3.1.14 on page 8 related to the above described requirement (Section 2.2 on page 5)? Is this functionality to be delivered outside of the current TSPW? If this is the case, would this case tracking functionality interface with the current TSPW Case Management system as an external application, replace the TSPW Case Management system, or is the proposing vendor expected to make changes to the TSPW system itself?

Answer: We expect the flag/risk assessment of the leads or targets to happen outside of TSPW We expect the fraud analytic solution to interface with the existing case management system. We do not expect to make significant changes to the case management system. .

- f) Is requirement 3.3.1.15 on page 8 related to the above described requirement (Section 2.2 on page 5)? Is this functionality to be provided within the TSPW Case Management System, or external to it?

Answer: See answer above.

73. Question: Throughout RFP #7551433, references are made to “machine learning” and requirements are listed for “machine learning”, along with a requirement for the system to operate with as little human intervention as possible.

a) Will the State share the publically available facts, information and other details it is relying on as the foundation for these requirements to the exclusion of other proven, valid methods of waste and fraud detection?

Answer: Information about machine learning is publically and widely available to all respondents. However, we do not expect the solution to rely solely on machine learning to the exclusion of other methods.

b) Will the State consider alternative solutions that are proven to deliver actionable findings of fraud, waste and abuse that do not utilize “machine learning”?

Answer: Yes, with the understanding that human capital is at a premium and our preference is for a solution that incorporates machine learning techniques as set forth in the RFP.

c) Will a responding vendor be penalized for proposing a system that utilizes a vendor’s skilled data investigators to produce leads rather than an automated solution? If so, why?

Answer: Since the RFP requests machine learning, we would not expect a vendor to receive maximum points allowed if this is not incorporated into the respondents proposed solution. This solution is intended to be “next generational” in thinking. The State has skilled data investigators at its disposal.

d) If “machine learning” is made optional instead of mandatory, how will the proposal evaluation process be changed to fairly score proposals that do not utilize “machine learning”? We are looking for a clear and fair roadmap for evaluators to follow for scoring purposes if existing requirements in the RFP are no longer required.

Answer: We are not making this optional, it must be incorporated into the respondents proposed solution.

73. Question: The RFP mandates a specific, fixed price contract with a milestone payment schedule. As the public record makes clear, Rhode Island is struggling with problematic technical/system implementations with substantial cost and performance implications. Based on these recent and ongoing issues, would the State consider a pricing model that provides a greater assurance of vendor performance and quantifiable results (e.g. the identification of actionable fraud, waste and abuse) to help to protect the state’s interests?

Answer: All proposals regarding pricing will be considered.

a) Will the State of Rhode Island consider alternative pricing models for this procurement, such as a pricing structure that combines a fixed fee component along with a performance-based contingency fee component? By the State

accepting such a performance-oriented pricing proposal, the State limits its cost risk and places a performance incentive on the winning vendor to actually produce results that lead to waste and fraud findings for the state, not simply install and operate a system that may or may not find waste and fraud.

Answer: See above answer.

74. **Question:** Will the State specifically detail the evaluation scoring methodology for the proposals submitted in response to this RFP? Both vendors and state evaluators need a clear roadmap for how the state will score proposals, particularly if elements of the proposal that are currently requirements become optional instead.

Answer: We are not making any technical requirements optional so scoring matrix as noted in the RFP remains.

75. **Question:** A successful waste, fraud and abuse analytics engagement is completely dependent on having access to reasonably accurate (or at least non-corrupted) data on which to perform the analytics. The well-documented problems that Rhode Island is having with the State's UHIP computer system raise the concern that the quality of the state's Medicaid data is highly suspect. We draw that conclusion based on the State's inability to pay Medicaid providers; such provider data being essential to successful Medicaid waste and fraud analytics.

a) What is the timeframe for the State's vendors to clean up the UHIP data and the associated problems that are causing the data issues?

Answer: See answer to question 75 (b).

b) Will the State guarantee the quality, accuracy and integrity of its UHIP data?

Answer: The State will not hold the analytics vendor liable for data quality issues in other systems.

c) What portion of the expected \$5 million in first year recoveries listed in Section 2.2.3.4 is anticipated to come from Medicaid?

Answer: None. Medicaid fraud is not part of this RFP. Such fraud is addressed by the State's Program Integrity Office.

76. **Question:** The RFP indicates that significant and relevant data is already warehoused in the TSPW system, which is operated and maintained by an existing technology vendor. Section 3.3.1.2 on page 8 requires the awarded waste and fraud vendor to "Utilize and expand upon existing technical infrastructure which houses the data as necessary". Since the TSPW vendor has a detailed knowledge of the TSPW system functionality (and we assume proprietary control of the code for that system), data structures and code, how can the State assure other proposing vendors that the TSPW vendor will not have several distinct advantages, including a major pricing advantage, over every other vendor in this procurement?

Answer: The TSPW data will be fully accessible to the successful bidder. The TSPW vendor does not currently provide analytics so there is no advantage. We anticipate the selected respondent to use the TSPW data to perform analytics outside of the TSPW. Please also see answer to question 72 (a).

- a) Does this requirement mean the awarded fraud, waste and abuse analytics platform vendor must modify the existing TSPW technical infrastructure? If so, can the State provide the details of the TSPW technical infrastructure so that vendors other than the TSPW vendor can determine if such required modifications can be done in a cost effective way? Will the TSPW source code be made available for examination by proposing vendors to evaluate the cost and difficulty of modifying the TSPW system?

Answer: No. Not applicable. Please also see answer to question 72 (a).

- b) If the State selects a vendor as a result of this RFP/Procurement other than the incumbent provider of the current TSPW system, will this vendor be responsible for utilizing and expanding upon the TSPW system? Will the State confirm that such work by a 3rd party on the TSPW system is allowed under the TSPW agreements with the State (e.g. software license agreement(s), support and maintenance agreement(s), statement(s) of work, warranties, etc.) and that the 3rd party will not be responsible for any issues with the TSPW system?

Answer: Bidders are not responsible for expanding upon TSPW but we would expect the bidder to want to utilize this data in the proposed solution. Any changes to the TSPW would be performed by the TSPW vendor. We expect both the awarded bidder and the TSPW vendor to collaborate when addressing concerns regarding TSPW data. Third party is not responsible for any issues with TSPW.

- c) Since the TSPW system is integral to this RFP, if the TSPW vendor is a participant in this procurement, how will the State ensure that all other vendors will be provided an equal and fair opportunity to compete?

Answer: Everyone will have the same access. We are leveraging the existing infrastructure and case management software (TSPW) which was acquired through competitive bid. The ability to provide an analytics solution using available data will win this bid.

- d) Since the TSPW system is integral to this RFP, if the TSPW vendor is a participant in this procurement, how will the State ensure that all other vendors will be evaluated on a level playing field?

Answer: All responses will be evaluated in accordance with the scoring matrix noted in the RFP. Refer to the answer to question 76(c) above. Again, everyone will have the same access.

77. Question: In section 3.3.1.1, Rhode Island requires that the awarded vendor “fully integrate” the solution into the TSPW as well as “other such systems that the state may designate”.

a) Is this integration the implementation of the TSPW API, or is it something else? If it is something else, please describe fully what is meant by the phrase “fully integrate the solution into the TSPW”. We interpret the word “integrate” to mean an integrated software solution, where there is close coordination between two disparate computer systems. Is the state using the word “integrate” in this circumstance to define a data extract as opposed to a system integration?

Answer: A large amount of relevant data is stored within TSPW. Additional relevant data is stored in other state systems (e.g. Secretary of State Corporations Database). By ‘Integrate’, we mean it is expected that the selected vendor would synthesis data in TSPW or other state systems and feed the TSPW case management system with the resulting targets.

b) As the State may appreciate, there is cost associated with every integration with an external system such as described in this RFP. Will the State provide more details regarding each new system integration, in detailed form, so appropriate estimating and pricing can be achieved by vendors responding to this RFP?

Answer: Refer to (a) above.

c) If this requirement means the requirement to work with the data that currently resides in the TSPW system, is it required that the awarded solution work inside the TSPW system, or is it acceptable to extract the TSPW data into a separate system for analysis?

Answer: See (a) above.

d) Can the State explain why the requirement for a vendor other than the vendor of the TSPW system to work with the TSPW data inside the TSPW hardware and software framework would not provide an unfair advantage to the TSPW vendor and highly disadvantage all others?

Answer Refer to answer to question 77 (a) above and question 76(c).

e) Can the State explain how, if the incumbent TSPW vendor is allowed to leverage the TSPW platform to provide enterprise-wide waste and fraud analytics from within the TSPW that would not create an unfair pricing advantage for the TSPW vendor?

Answer: See previous answer.

78. **Question:** Section 3.3.1.9 requires vendors to “Utilize integrated real-time, or near real time, transaction risk scoring and referral strategic capabilities...”

a) Can the State provide details and information as to the specific use of such automated scoring systems to reliably uncover actionable waste, fraud and abuse findings as a mandatory and exclusionary requirement? What specifically is meant by “strategic capabilities”?

Answer: The scoring referenced is to rate the identified targets/leads which result from the analytics so that we address the leads in a cost effective manner.

b) Why is the State excluding solutions that do reliably uncover actionable waste, fraud and abuse findings without such capabilities?

Answer: We are open to all solutions.

c) Will Rhode Island remove this requirement? If so, how will evaluators be instructed to handle proposals that do not implement this specific method of waste and fraud detection but provide effective waste and fraud detection using other means?

Answer: We do not understand the “requirement” referenced in this question and are therefore unable to answer.

79. **Question:** Page 3, Point 7 in Section 1.1 says “It is intended that an award pursuant to this RFP will be made to a prime vendor, or prime vendors in the various categories, who will assume responsibility for all aspects of the work.” Is the state planning to make multiple awards?

Answer: We will consider splitting the work among multiple vendors based upon responses.

80. **Question:** Page 6-17, beginning in RFP Section 3.6 “Required Technical Response Materials” the State explicitly outlines the required sections and content of a vendor’s response. Does the State expect the vendor to include additional sections corresponding to the RFP Sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 regarding the SOW.

Answer: Reference answer to question 23.

81. **Question:** Pages 14-15, Does the State or do the Departments currently have access to public record, third party data, and national licensure and sanctions list?

Answer: Respondents should include this in their solution and assume that the State does not have access to the noted elements.

82. **Question:** Pages 17-18, Does the State expect vendors to respond to the SOW requirements (Sections 3.1 - 3.4) through the “Overall Approach” document described in Section 3.5.1?

Answer: Refer to question 23.

83. **Question:** Pages 17-18, Is the “Overall Approach” document, described in Section 3.5.1, intended to contain all technical response materials, including those outlined in Section 3.6: Required Technical Response Materials, or should the “Overall Approach” be included as a section of the technical response?

Answer: Overall approach should be an executive summary of the technical response. Refer to question 23.

84. **Question:** Page 21, What is the state’s expectation for on-site verse remote work by the Vendor project team?

Answer: The State expects the vendor to present a proposal for the most economical and effective division of work between onsite and offsite.

85. **Question:** Page 22, Is the vendor’s response to Sections 3.7 – 3.9 of the “Business Response” intended to be a separate document from the Technical Response or simply a separate section of the same document?

Answer: See questions 23 and 83.

86. **Question:** Page 28, Can the State elaborate on the make-up of the Technical Review Committee? Will the committee consist of IT personnel, end-users, department leadership?

Answer: The Committee will include IT, end user, audit and department personnel.

87. **Question:** We have produced the following response outline based on our understanding of the State’s response requirements. Can the State verify this outline meet its expectations and the suggested page limitations are correct?

1. Technical Response (~25 pages)
 - a. Executive Summary
 - b. Overall Approach (will include item by item response to SOW requirements)
 - c. Project Staffing
 - d. Staff-Loading and Organization Charts
 - e. Agile Methodology and Project Plan
2. Business Response (Not part of ~25-page limitation)
 - a. Government/Business References
 - b. Personnel References
 - c. Subcontractors and Teaming Partners
 - d. Codes of Conduct
 - e. Conflict of Interest
3. Supporting Documentation (Not part of ~25-page limitation)

Answer: Outline meets expectation.

88. **Question:** Do the Department(s) currently license any statistical software applications (e.g., SAS, IBM Modeler, Revolution Analytics, etc.)?

Answer: Respondents should not assume availability of existing statistical software licenses.

89. **Question:** What are the current levels of identified fraud for the various Departments?
Answer: We do not currently have enterprise wide fraud metrics.
90. **Question:** Will the State or Departments be able to provide the Contractor with historically fraudulent data?
Answer: When and if available, yes.
91. **Question:** Page 17, 3.5 of the RFP calls for supporting documentation. Is the material called for in this section intended to be referenced in other sections of the Technical and Business response with calls to attachments and appendices, or is this to be a section unto its own?
Answer: See question 23.
92. **Question:** Section 2.2.2, Can you provide more information on the TSPW system? How does input/output currently interact (real time, near real time, batch, hybrid, etc.)?
Answer: A combination of all of the above depending on the source system.
93. **Question:** Section 2.2.2, Can you provide more information on the Case Management system? How does input/output currently interact (real time, near real time, batch, hybrid, etc.)?
Answer: A combination of all of the above depending on the source system.
94. **Question:** Section 2.2.2, Can you provide more information on the existing reporting functionality? Is it SSRS and/or a combination of other BI tools (e.g. Cognos, Tableau, Qlik, etc.)?
Answer: The reporting functionality of the existing system is not germane to the analytics solution.
95. **Question:** Section 2.2.2, Can you provide more information on API that was referenced? Is it Java based, or C++, scripts, SDK used, etc.)?
Answer: A broad range of APIs is acceptable.
96. **Question:** Section 3.2.1., Does OIA currently utilize a predictive modeling solution? If yes, is this RFP to help them enhance current system or replace?
Answer: There is no predicative modeling solution in place.
97. **Question:** Section 3.2.2., Can you provide additional information of the current system processing performance levels (e.g. list of current SLAs, benchmarks, etc.)?
Answer: No, we expect to communicate performance levels with awarded bidder.
98. **Question:** Section 3.2.2., Can you provide additional information on the types of pre-determined thresholds that will be considered?
Answer: No, we have no predetermined thresholds. We expect to negotiate this with awarded bidder.

99. **Question:** Section 3.2.4., Should the solution automatically submit flagged leads to analysts via an interface to the TPSW or should its design allow for the submissions to be controlled by State staff?
Answer: Both, submit flagged leads to analyst via interface to the TSPW case management software and allow for submission to be controlled by staff.
100. **Question:** Section 3.2.5., Should the solution automatically capture and store feedbacks and final dispositions of leads from analysts or should its design allow for the posting of feedbacks on and the final dispositions of leads to be controlled by State staff? Will these feedbacks and dispositions flow from an interface to the TPSW as will the flagged leads in the opposite direction?
Answer: Yes, it should capture and store feedbacks. Yes, they will flow via interface in both directions.
101. **Question:** Section 3.2.6., Can you provide more information on inherent machine learning? How will increased performance and accuracy be measured? Are there examples that can be provided?
Answer: Refer to question 73.
102. **Question:** Section 3.1., There is a reference of lettered/bulleted requirements in Section 5.5.4 which is titled Data Breach Disclosure and contains no requirements. Could you please clarify?
Answer: Refer to question 12.
103. **Question:** Section 3.6.4.2., References a “Project Plan that must commence with Purchase Order and end no later than eighteen (18) months later.” However, RFP Section 3.4.9.1’s Milestone and Deliverables Matrix states the deliverable for the START UP milestone is a “Project Plan for entire initiative including project schedule, dependencies and resources” and Section 1 (Introduction) states “The Contract that results from this RFP will have an initial term that begins with Purchase Order issuance for twenty-four (24) months from the Purchase Order issuance date.” Could you please provide clarification on the apparent discrepancy?
Answer: All should be 24 months.
104. **Question:** Section 4.6.2., What will be the total number of users and the estimated number of concurrent users?
Answer: Between 5-15
105. **Question:** Section 3.2.2., To better understand the way that information (data) flows, can you provide a technology landscape of your current infrastructure? This will also help us better understand how data is sourced and distributed downstream by the TSPW system.
Answer: Refer to question 77(a).
106. **Question:** 1 Introduction - All transactional systems of record within the state contain at least minimal validation and fraud prevention measures built-in. These

systems, however, are largely siloed. Question – what are the forms of these validation and fraud prevention measures – rules/ models/ strategies/ a combination?

Answer: A combination of common self-referential validation tactics. Very few systems query across systems for validation.

107. **Question:** 1 Introduction - A valid looking transaction in one system may look suspect when paired with information from an entirely different system owned by a different agency. Question – has OIA done any exploratory work that suggests that cross-data-source benefits exist or is it based on anecdotal evidence?

Answer: Based on anecdotal evidence. Refer to question 106 above.

108. **Question:** 1 Introduction - OIA wishes to procure a predictive, real time, machine-intelligence-assisted analytics solution (“the Solution”) to help identify potential sources of fraud, abuse, and waste across multiple systems and diverse data sets. Question – is most of the data structured? Is there a desire/ need to be able to work with unstructured/ semi-structured text data?

Answer: Most data is structured, but there may be a need to include unstructured data or semi structured and text data.

109. **Question:** 2.2.2 Existing Infrastructure, Approximately how many transactions are processed annually by the State by transaction type?

Answer: We do not have this information.

110. **Question:** 2.2.2 Existing Infrastructure, Question: What is the overall volume of data (number of records and bytes) in TPSW?

Answer: Volume of data continues to grow and expand as required. As data will be queried from more than TSPW, we are unable to provide an answer without the bidders proposed solution of data need.

111. **Question:** 2.2.2 Existing Infrastructure, Question: Does the State want the ability to deploy existing rules/models in the new platform? If so, how many rules/models?

Answer: We do not currently have automated programmatic rules that can be imported into any system.

112. **Question:** 2.2.2 Existing Infrastructure, The State will rely on an existing licensed software solution for some foundational functions of the new Enterprise-wide Fraud Detection and Prevention System. The existing solution includes a data warehouse, case management system and reporting functionality.

a. Question: What reporting functionality is available? Is it a COTS product? If so, what is the name and version of the product?

Answer: No reporting functionality currently exists for data analytics.

b. Question: Does the State desire the vendor to write reports in the existing reporting functionality or bring new reporting functionality?

Answer: New reporting functionality for analytics.

113. **Question:** 2.2.2 Existing Infrastructure, “Results of fraud identification and case selection processes will be passed into the existing Case Management system via an Application Programming Interface (API) to allow audit staff to structure and manage case tracking and resolution activities in a centralized secure system, monitor case actions and outcomes, and provide opportunities for case sharing/collaboration across agencies.” However, in the following sections, the Vendor is asked for features related to case management

- 3.3.2.1.5 Enter actions taken on a claim;
- 3.3.2.1.6 Generate an audit trail of actions taken on a claim, including incorporation of external documents with date and time stamps;
- 3.3.2.1.8 Navigate intuitively. Users should be able to easily figure out where in a given workflow they are. The platform should give visual representation of their progress throughout. If information in a given workflow is incomplete, the platform should highlight the exact fields that are incomplete or incorrect, with clear instructions for resolving any problems
- 3.3.2.1.9 Save their progress in a given workflow and return to it later.

a. Question: Does the State desire that the Vendor modify the existing Case Management system to add these features?

Answer: No, This is an error and should be disregarded. Refer to question 77 (a).

b. Question: Does the State desire workflow/transaction review/document management/decisioning capability outside of the existing Case Management system?

Answer: N/A Refer to question 77(a).

c. Question: Is the existing Case Management system a COTS product? If so, what product? If not, what technology is the existing Case Management system written in?

Answer: This is a COTS product known as Revenue Premier.

d. Question: What is the integration protocol for the Case Management system (e.g. webservice/SOAP, specialized API, database mediation, etc.)?

Answer: API, SOAP and other protocols are acceptable.

114. **Question:** 3.2.1 The predictive modeling solution system (“the Solution”) is fully integrated into the TSPW and other such databases that the State may specify; Question – how many other databases does the State anticipate integrating with outside of the TSPW?

Answer: Refer to 77 (a). Data may be made available from several additional state databases as identified by the selected respondent and subject to their availability.

115. **Question:** 3.3.1.3 Integrate into multiple points in the claim processing flow from submission through adjudication for the identification of high-risk and suspect claims. Question – are multiple points in the claim processing flow represented in

TSPW or does the state anticipate the need to integrate directly with claim adjudication systems? If so, how many claim adjudication systems will be involved?

Answer: We will not be incorporating provider claims into this initiative at this time.

116. Question: 3.3.1.7 Link to third-party systems and data sources, such as the MFCU Investigation Database, State Compromised Numbers Database, List of Excluded Individuals/Entities (LEIE), vital statistics, land records and criminal history data as well as datasets managed by other state agencies.

a. Question – how many third party systems, data sources and other databases does the State anticipate integrating with outside of the TSPW?

Answer: As many as the selected respondent proposes subject their availability.

b. Question: Will direct access to those data sources be provided? Or will it be data exports? A combination?

Answer: State will provide access to our data sources only. The vendor will have to provide access to third party sources.

c. Question: Are all of the named data sources required for inclusion or are they just examples of data sources that could be included if analysis determines they are predictive?

Answer: They are examples of what we envision for enterprise wide fraud solutions.

117. Question: 3.3.1.8 Optimize itself genetically for improved performance, maximization of its accuracy and minimization of incidences of false positives and false negatives through continuous validation and recalibration of scoring models and allow for regular updates through a feedback loop. Ideally, the solution should also offer the ability to see different modeled outcomes based on potential changes in calibration. Question: Please explain what the State requires by “genetic” optimization. Does this imply a requirement for the use of specific genetic algorithms in the continuous validation process? Are other methods acceptable?

Answer: Refer to question 73.

118. Question: 3.3.1.13 Integrate with TSPW workflow management that has the ability to systematically present scores, reason codes, and treatment actions for high risk scored transactions, as well as create cases for investigative follow up.

3.3.1.14 Mark each flagged claim with a reason code or model rule explaining to the analyst the reason the lead has been scored high risk or suspect and providing a recommended action. Question – are there restrictions on the format and number of reason codes required?

Answer: These will be determined during design phase of project.

118. Question: Are there any particular data-at-rest, data-in-motion security requirements to adhere to?

Answer: Yes. Data at rest secured via rule based need to know security. Data in motion must be encrypted.

119. **Question:** Are all internal data sources stored in relational data stores? If not, what other formats are used (i.e. csv, fix format, NoSQL, unstructured)?
Answer: Combination of the above.
120. **Question:** Are external data sources “ingestible” or does external data need to continue to reside externally accessible via API?
Answer: External data needs to reside externally when possible, some data sources are ingestible.
121. **Question:** Are certain data stores accessible to only certain classes of users or is all data available to all users equally?
Answer: Certain data sources accessible to only certain classes of users, with role based security.
122. **Question:** Are there any regulatory or policy requirements regarding data purging or can we assume all data made available to the solution will continue to be available in perpetuity?
Answer: Each agency has its own record retention policy which must be followed.
123. **Question:** Is production quality/volume data available in lower (DEV,QA,PREPROD) environments?
Answer: Yes, It can be made available but must remain secured.
124. **Question:** Since there is no public bid opening, will OIA release the names of the bidders? (Page 2, Section 1 – Introduction)
Answer: There is no pre-bid/proposal conference. To clarify Section 1 *“there will be no public opening and reading of responses received by the Division of Purchases pursuant to this Request, other than to name those offerors who have submitted proposals.”* – this refers to any actual proposal contents beyond the name of the bidder. There will be a public bid opening on the submission deadline at the Division of Purchases of which any interested party is welcome to attend. The Division of Purchases shall only read the name of the bidders and shall not provide any additional proposal information/content to the public. For those in attendance, you shall be required to sign in and no questions shall be permitted. The resulting list of bidders shall be posted to the Division of Purchases’ website soon after the opening has concluded.
125. **Question:** In general and specifically complying with requirement: “utilize and expand upon existing technical infrastructure which houses the data as necessary”, can bidders assume that, if data is needed for their analytics, OIA will:
a) broker the necessary Memo(s) of Understanding with the required agencies;
b) load the data in the TSPW (optional, but preferred for many reason); and
c) provide the data to the vendor in the format mutually agreed?
For example, if provider payments are necessary, who is loading that data to the warehouse and providing to the bidder? Certainly vendor will participate in any

design discussions about data format and integrity. (Page 5, Section 2.2.2 Existing Infrastructure; Page 8, 3.3.1.2 Predictive Modeling Solution Functionalities)

Answer: Yes, OIA will work to gain access to new data sets when needed.

126. Question: In general and specially complying with requirement: “integrate into multiple points in the claim processing flow from submission through adjudication for the identification of high-risk and suspect claims”, can bidders assume that the bidder will provide resulting sets of data (possible leads, scores, etc.) to OIA and/or the source agency in a mutually agreed format (or API), and that OIA will load the data into the Case Management system or the source agency will integrate the data into their legacy case management or transaction systems? (Page 5, Section 2.2.2 Existing Infrastructure; Page 8, 3.3.1.3 Predictive Modeling Solution Functionalities)

Answer: Selected respondent loads to case management. Refer to question 77.

127. Question: Could OIA please provide a detailed hardware and software inventory of the current TSPW so bidders can determine what in that environment can be leveraged as part of the solution and what additional hardware and software may be required? (Page 5, Section 2.2.2 Existing Infrastructure)

Answer: A majority of infrastructure, includes SQL 2012 database, which is virtualized using VMWare. The virtualization hardware is provided by HP. Outside of that environment, there are four physical servers, each pair hosting a clustered Microsoft SQL 2012 database. Most of the servers are running Windows Server 2008, with the remainder running Windows Server 2012. Database drives and VMWare servers are all stored on a Hitachi SAN device. IIS is leveraged for web-application.

128. Question: Could OIA please provide a current inventory of the data sources (years) in the TSPW? Please indicate which data sources are refreshed and how often (e.g., is Tax data updated/refreshed nightly?). (Page 5, Section 2.2.2 Existing Infrastructure)

Answer: The length of time data sources are retained and refreshed is dependent on the source and needs of the current TSPW. Some of the current data sources are: Department of Motor Vehicles; Registration and License, Department of Health; Licenses, Department of Labor and Training; Data related to taxation transactions. Other State agency files and data may become available. Refer to question 144.

129. Question: Please confirm that an SAS-70 audit report is acceptable for meeting this requirement. (Page 10, Section 3.3.3.3 Systems Documentation)

Answer: Yes, acceptable.

130. Question: If a bidder leverages and extends the TSPW, is it safe to assume that certain requirements are not then applicable (for example, SAS-70/SOC-2 report, Disaster Recovery Plan or Hosting), except for new components? Will OIA maintain the necessary environments (Development-Production)? (Page 10, Sections 3.3.3.3

and 3.3.3.5 Systems Documentation; Pages 25-26, Sections 4.5 Hosting Environment(s) – 4.9 Network, Server, and Application Security)

Answer: SAS-70/SOC-2 reports are required for this project. A Disaster Recovery plan is required for the components of this project even if the bidder is leveraging existing architecture. The bidder is required to have their own Development, Testing and Production environments that would interact with the current TSPW environments.

131. **Question:** Could OIA please clarify the requirement as described in Section 3.3.3.10? (Page 11, Section 3.3.3.10 Systems Documentation)

Answer: Bidder to supply information as stated.

132. **Question:** There is no reference to accessing IRS data directly. Does this requirement apply? Is there IRS data in the TPSW, that implies this requirement applies? (Page 24, Section 4.3 IRS Security Requirements)

Answer: We will use only state tax data which resides in TPSW.

133. **Question:** If a bidder leverages and extends the TSPW, can OIA please clarify the bidder's responsibilities for 1st and 2nd level support? (Page 26, Section 5. Maintenance and Support)

Answer: First and second level support will be only for the component that is developed in response to this RFP.

134. **Question:** When will Appendix A be available for review? (Page 44, Section 13. Appendix A – Services Agreement – Draft)

Answer: Yes, see attachments accompanying this addendum on the Division of Purchases website. The file is named "Appendix A SLA".

135. **Question:** Is the Vendor Expected to query TSPW SQL Server warehouse directly or will the State provide extracts of data deemed necessary for the Enterprise Fraud solution?

Answer: Query or interface TSPW directly.

136. **Question:** The RFP initially suggests the Taxation Department Data Warehouse will be referred to as "The data warehouse", however most of the RFP uses TSPW. We assume these are the same, but can you please confirm this?

Answer: They are the same.

137. **Question:** The RFP states the data warehouse contains data from multiple divisions within the Department of Taxation, it also states it contains data from multiple agencies. Is it therefore reasonable to assume that all State provided data to be used for the initial 24 month implementation and operation will be sourced from the TSPW? If not, what other forms of data does the State expect to provide?

Answer: Other data could be accessed via API from sources like DLT and DHS. Refer to question 77(a).

138. **Question:** By extension, would the State add data identified for the solution, which is not yet present to TSPW to the Data warehouse prior to its inclusion?
Answer: Expect vendor to extract necessary components for analytics from all available sources. Refer to 77(a).
139. **Question:** Section 2.2.3.4 states an expected first year net of \$5 million. Is this for the 12 month period following implementation that includes the stabilization phase?
Answer: Refer to question 32.
140. **Question:** Can the State expand on the services provided with RSI and how the vendor is expected to collaborate with RSI?
Answer: To be negotiated with the selected respondent.
141. **Question:** Is the case management system part of the data warehouse SQL Server solution?
Answer: Yes
142. **Question:** Can the State provide some further information on the Case Management System and API for integration?
Answer: A broad range of APIs can be accepted for use with the existing case management system. Refer to question 77 (a).
143. **Question:** Can the State confirm whether the case management system provides any lightweight functionality for alerting only, or the ability to create new workflows? Alternatively can the State confirm a case is expected for all behavior identified by the Enterprise Fraud Solution, including for example a simple data mismatch for one individual between different sources of data?
Answer: The case management system will not provide the ability to create new workflows for analytics. We expect the selected respondent to eliminate simple data mismatches that they feel would provide little chance for successful identification of possible fraud. Refer to 77(a).
144. **Question:** Is the TSPW updated in real-time or near-real time? If not, what is the typically latency of data in the data warehouse?
Answer: TSPW is updated in real time for taxation and depending on data source near-real time or according to scheduled updates.
145. **Question:** If the TSPW is not updated in real-time, are real-time (claims) sourced from elsewhere?
Answer: See above.
146. **Question:** The RFP states the system should be developed for an increasing volume of claims. Does the State have current data volumes? If not, is there a growth forecast?
Answer: We do not have current metrics about claims data volumes or growth forecasts. Please refer to question 55.

147. **Question:** Section 3.4.9.1 Solution Design and Development has a deliverable "MMIS integration test results." Is this an additional integration that is required?
Answer: This is an error in the RFP document. MMIS integration is not part of this analytic solution. Therefore, no MMIS integration is expected.
148. **Question:** In regards to Section 4.4 - Agencies should fully report Hardware and Software. The RFP states "The vendor shall provide the hardware, software, communications, and other infrastructure necessary to meet the requirements of this RFP at *no additional cost to the State, including any licenses that must be procured and maintained.*" To ensure we are on the same page, does the reference to 'no additional cost' relate to costs beyond what will be quoted in the Cost Proposal we submit in this RFP response?
Answer: Yes
149. **Question:** My question/request is that the State consider extending /pushing back the RFP due date. Although this RFP is similar to a prior RFP issued by the State, more time is important to ensure we can do our due diligence in assessing this RFP on its own.
Answer: See answer to question 24.
150. **Question:** Please specify the transaction systems to be integrated with the analytics platform. Please include reference (such as eligibility and/or provider) systems.
Answer: Refer to question 40.
151. **Question:** Please specify the number of data sources the solution will access and include in the analysis.
Answer: Refer to question 40.
152. **Question:** Please specific the number of transactions, \$ processed annually , and number of "recipients" for each transaction system.
Answer: Refer to question 146.
153. **Question:** Would you please clarify which systems should utilize prepayment and/or post payment screening?
Answer: Refer to question 55.
154. **Question:** Would you define the timeline of when each department's platform is expected to brought live?
Answer: This is dependent on the vendor approach. We have no preconceived timeline by department.

155. **Question:** Would you provide more detail on the data from each system that is to be integrated?
Answer: Data from each system contains sufficient demographic information that would normally be needed to properly administer the program.
156. **Question:** What history is available to be loaded for each system to use for model training?
Answer: Refer to question 59.
157. **Question:** Section 1.1.9 refers to availability of funds. What amount has been budgeted for the implementation and maintenance of the solution?
Answer: Funds are allocated for this project. Details on funding are not available to vendors.
158. **Question:** Section 2.2.3.4 refers to anticipated results in the first year – is that the first year in production?
Answer: Yes. Refer to question 32.
159. **Question:** Section 3.2.1 refers to other databases? Please identify.
Answer: The Vendor will work with the OIA to determine the data sources needed.
160. **Question:** Section 3.3.1.3 refers to integration at multiple points within transactions systems. Can you identify how many points in each system?
Answer: Refer to question 77(a).
161. **Question:** Section 3.3.1.7 refers to third party systems...does the state currently subscribe to/access these third party data sources?
Answer: Respondents should not assume this is available to them for the fraud analytic solution.
162. **Question:** How many users, broken down by role, are expected to utilize the solution?
Answer: Refer to question 60.
163. **Question:** In reference to Section 3.2.4, are the analysts who receive the fraud leads state employees or vendor employees? If state employees, can the state define the number of investigators, by department, available to work the fraud leads?
Answer: Refer to question 60.
164. **Question:** In reference to Section 3.2.4, If the analysts are vendor employees, how many fraud leads does the state anticipate each year?
Answer: N/A

165. **Question:** Section 3.3.1.15 Are there existing tracking/reporting requirements? If so, please provide.
Answer: No, to be determined.
166. **Question:** Sections 3.3.2.1.5 and 3.3.2.1.8 Which workflows steps does the state envision are tracked by the solution vs. the existing case management system. In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, is the Solution expected to 1) risk score claimants (those submitting claims, providing benefit services or enrolling in benefit programs) and 2) the submitted claims in each state department?
Answer: Refer to 77(a).
167. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, does the state anticipate the Solution to be the fraud detection system for Medicaid fee-for-service claims?
Answer: No.
168. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, does the state anticipate the Solution to identify fraudulent Medicaid managed care organization fraud?
Answer: No.
169. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, does the state anticipate the Solution to identify fraudulent claims submitted to Medicaid managed care organizations?
Answer: No.
170. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, can the state prioritize the Human Services organizations to be rolled into the Solution, including Medicaid, Food Stamps, Welfare, Foster Care, and other human social programs?
Answer: All Human service programs except for Medicaid.
171. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, what is the vendor's responsibility in creating standard operating procedures and memorandum of understanding between various state departments?
Answer: Vendor will assist state to develop MOU's and SOP's. State retains responsibility for executing.
172. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, does the state have any external vendors that currently identify potential fraud and conduct fraud investigations? If so, how will this solution interact with those vendors?
Answer: Yes, they are in Medicaid and no interaction is anticipated in the first phase of this solution.
173. **Question:** In reference to Section 2.2.1, 3.3.3.6, is the vendor responsible to identify any weaknesses or conflicts in state policies so that they can be improved?
Answer: Yes, if the vendor identifies these they should be communicated to state staff assigned to this project.

174. **Question:** Section 4.2 - Does the state expect / prefer the solution to be hosted in a cloud environment vs. Installed within the state's IT environment?
Answer: A cloud solution is permitted.
175. **Question:** Is the current TSPW database hosted in the cloud or installed in the state's IT environment?
Answer: State IT environment.
176. **Question:** Section 4.4 - Can the state provide a list of hardware/software/communication and infrastructure currently available to the state?
Answer: For Security purposes this information will be made available in detail to the winning bidder. See answer to questions 105 and 127 for an overview of the current system architecture and hardware software.
177. **Question:** What is the anticipated process / timetable for selecting a vendor solution?
Answer: We anticipate having a vendor selected and a PO/contract executed prior to July 1st.
178. **Question:** How many alerts are generated today per month? How many fraud cases are launched, investigated, and confirmed as evidence of fraud?
Answer: We do not have enterprise wide metrics available.
179. **Question:** Our implementation approach is collaborative. Will the State of Rhode Island supply technical resources to assist with the implementation including any system integration and data integration efforts?
Answer: Yes. We expect collaboration between state staff, TSPW vendor and winning bidder.

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS WILL BE ENTERTAINED AS OF THIS ADDENDUM.

Meredith Skelly
Interdepartmental Project Manager