

RFP#: MHCC 22-001

Data Management for the Maryland Medical Care Data Base (MCDB)

Q&A

The MHCC is making available questions and answers to prospective Offerors known by the Issuing Office to have received the above-referenced RFP. Updates will follow as we receive additional questions from potential Offerors.

1. Question: Key Information Summary Sheet, pg. 3

Will the State consider responding to questions in a rolling fashion for the questions submitted prior to questions due date (June 4, 2021)? Because the Q&A period is more than 30 days after the release of this RFP, will the State consider extending the proposal submission date?

Answer: Questions will be received and answered from the day of release of the RFP up to June 4, 2021. The proposal due date has been extended to July 7, 2021, refer to Addendum #1.

2. Question: Does the State intend to provide licenses for any of the software components (i.e., Tableau Desktop, SQL Server, SSIS, SAS) for the vendor or end users during the life of the Contract?

Answer: The State will provide the SAS licenses only, refer to Addendum #1 amendment to RFP Section 2.2.6 "Other State Responsibilities".

3. Question: Figure 3 Data Enclave Historical Data, pg. 16

Would you confirm that all submitters' data (including Medicare and Medicaid) are currently integrated into the MCDB's MS SQL server environment?

Answer: The Figure is now revised, issued May 28, 2021, as Addendum #1, as Figure 4. All data submitted by private (commercial) reporting entities are fully integrated into the MCDB's MS SQL database. For Medicare and Medicaid, only the Medicaid MCO data is fully integrated into the MCDB's MS SQL database.

4. Question: Figure 3 Data Enclave Historical Data, pg. 16

Is any data available beyond 2018 in the current environment? If so, what is the volume and database size for this additional data?

Answer: The Figure is now revised, issued May 28, 2021, as Addendum #1, as Figure 4. Data from 2019, 2020 (paid in 2020 only, run-off data due 5/31/2021 from reporting entities) is available. The volume and database are similar per year as past years.

5. Question: Section 2.4.4 Deliverable Description, pg. 38

Please confirm that the State is requesting a "Lift and drop" or "migration" of all the current vendor components of the MCDB MS SQL Server data base and SAS code?

Answer: Yes. That is the State's expectation as a minimum requirement for business to continue smoothly.

6. **Question:** Would the State share a proposed budget range to help vendors align their response with funding? There are several requirements and SLAs that will be costly and understanding the budget will allow vendors to propose alternate approaches.

Answer: The State will allocate the budget based on the awardee's total proposed cost.

7. **Question: Section 2.5.4 Modification Option – MD State Cloud Solution, pg. 49**
What is the expected timeline for the Cloud-Based Environment listed under "Optional Features or Services, Future Work"?

Answer: Implementation is expected in Contract Year 3.

8. **Question: Section 2.5.4 Modification Option – MD State Cloud Solution, pg. 49**
Is the intent of the MD State Cloud solution (under Optional Features or Services, Future work) to replace the hosting environment proposed by the Vendor or will it exist in parallel?

Answer: The intent of the MD State Cloud solution is to replace the Contractors hosting environment.

9. **Question: Section 2.2.3 Current Environment, pg. 13**
Would the State provide hardware configuration for all the existing infrastructure?

Answer: There is adequate information provided in this section regarding the configuration of the current environment.

10. **Question: Section 2.6.7 Service Level Agreements. 11. Disaster Recovery - Normal, pg. 53**
Would the State confirm that the recovery point objective (RPO) is one hour? Since the ETL frequency is only once a quarter, we expect the data will not change between the two ETL refreshes and would like to understand the goal of an RPO of 1 hour.

Answer: This section relates to the entire system that MHCC interacts with. It does not pertain to the ETL. If any part of the system fails, recovery must be from the backup system within one hour of the failure.

11. **Question: Section 1 Minimum Qualifications, pg. 8**
Can we use the same three (3) references to satisfy all three requirements?

Answer: Yes, the Offeror may use the same references to satisfy all the requirements.

12. **Question: Section 2.2.2 Project Background**
Can MHCC provide a list of the current thirty-seven (37) data submitters?

Answer: List of reporting entities found at:

https://mhcc.maryland.gov/mhcc/pages/apcd/apcd_mcdb/apcd_mcdb_data_submission.aspx

13. Question: Section 2.2.3.2 Existing Automated ETL, pg. 15

If we are proposing our own Portal and leveraging our own ETL process, would our data submission Portal and ETL likewise become the property of the MHCC?

Answer: See RFP Attachment M Contract, Section 7 “Patents, Copyrights, and Intellectual Property,” for this detail.

14. Question: Section 2.2.3.3 Member Identity Resolution Process, pg. 15

The last line of the paragraph indicates that the member identification resolution process with the MD State HIE is portrayed in Figure 3, but Figure 3 is a table summarizing the data enclave historical data. Where can a schematic of the member identification resolution process be found?

Answer: The Figure was omitted in error; an amendment was issued May 28, 2021, as Addendum #1, which corrects the error.

15. Question: Section 2.2.3.4 Figure 3 Data Enclave Historical Data, pg. 16

How many years of historical data will be required to be initially loaded into new platform?

Answer: Years 2010 – 2020.

16. Question: Section 2.2.3.4.B Data Enclave, last paragraph, pg. 17

- 1) Who is/are the current external analytic vendor(s) calculating episode and quality metrics?
- 2) Would the MHCC allow bidder to calculate episode and quality metrics in lieu of using an external analytic vendor?

Answer: (1) Signify Health is the current analytics Contractor.

(2) This is currently not a required deliverable in the RFP. We encourage the Offeror to demonstrate in its proposal its capabilities related to episode and quality metrics.

17. Question: Section 2.3.1.B.1.k and l, pg. 21

- 1) Do these requirements mean that the DSM will essentially stay the same even if the data processing efficiency and quality may be improved through structural changes to the submission format?
- 2) Would MHCC consider adopting the APCD- CDL as standard format for the MCDB DSM in the near future?

Answer: (1) The DSM is updated annually. For example, MHCC is in the process of updating COMAR 10.25.06, the regulations that govern the MCDB and its data collection process to increase the frequency (to more than quarterly) of collecting data from reporting entities. Such a change will be noted in the DSM, after the regulations are promulgated.

(2) MHCC will adopt the APCD-CDL as a standard format if this standard guarantees that Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) data will be included. It will be challenging to convince State legislators of the change if ERISA data were not included since that is the primary reason for the creation of the APCD-CDL. Maryland, along with other APCD states, participated in the creation of the APCD-CDL.

18. Question: Section 2.3.1.B.4 Medicaid MCO and FFS Data, pg. 22

Will the Medicaid MCO and FFS files be submitted in the MHCC DSM format or will they need to be mapped to the MHCC DSM format?

Answer: The Medicaid (MCO & FFS) data is received from Maryland Medicaid in the DSM format. Hence, no mapping is necessary.

19. Question: Section 2.3.6.H Contractor-Supplied Hardware, Software, and Materials, pg. 33

What does the phrase “provide all documentation for the software” encompass?

Answer: It includes specifications for all software, provided by the Contractor, used to support MCDB operations.

20. Question: Section 2.3.9.1 Technical Support

Can a 24/7 online ticketing system satisfy the requirements for 24/7 technical support?

Answer: All proposed solutions will be considered during proposal review.

21. Question: Section 2.5 Optional Features or Services, Future Work, pg.’s 46-49

- 1) If an "optional" feature and/or service is a standard feature in bidder's solution, can bidder's line item cost in the Financial Proposal be entered as \$0?
- 2) Can bidder propose an equivalent but alternative feature and/or service?

Answer: 1) Yes, the Offeror may propose zero cost for any portion of the RFP.
2) Yes, the Offeror may propose an equivalent but alternate solution.

22. Question: Sections 2.5.2.10 and 2.5.2.11, pg. 48

What does "MIA" stand for?

Answer: Maryland Insurance Administration (MIA)

23. Question: Sections 2.5.3 Optional Tasks Related to Task Three, pg. 48 - 49

Does MHCC have a preferred Episode grouper for deriving Episodes of Care (i.e., MEGs v ETGs)?

Answer: MHCC currently uses the Prometheus Grouper.

24. Question: Sections 2.5.4 Optional: MD State Cloud Solution, pg. 49

What Cloud Platform does the State currently leverage?

Answer: Amazon Web Services (AWS)

25. Question: Sections 3.2.7.K.4, pg. 59

What is meant by “...transfer source code for minimum data validation checks, including current operating procedures”?

Answer: At the end of the Contract, it is important that the data vendor provide the source code used to check data submitted by reporting entities for errors, consistency, and reasonability. This data validation is usually done through the ETL. The source codes used for data validation checks must be approved by MHCC. Therefore, MHCC is requesting that a copy of the source codes be transferred to the new vendor at the end of the contract.

26. Question: Sections 3.9 SOC 2 Type 2 Audit, pg. 71

Would the State consider a HITRUST certification in lieu of a SOC 2 Type 2?

Answer: The SOC 2 Type 2 audit is a requirement of the State and cannot be substituted.

27. Question: Sections 4.33 Nonvisual Access, pg. 96

Does the current vendor support Nonvisual Access?

Answer: Yes. The current vendor supports Nonvisual Access.

28. Question: Sections 5.2.6. Two Part (Double Envelope) Submission, pg. 98

Should this be interpreted to mean that, at minimum, we need to submit two versions of our Technical Proposal, in WORD and PDF, as well as two versions of our Financial Proposal, in EXCEL and PDF?

Answer: Yes, also provide a PIA version of both proposals in PDF, refer to Section 4.8.

29. Question: Sections 3.1 Contract Initiation Requirements, pg. 55

In reference to Section, 3.1, would MHCC isolate transition-in costs from the price evaluation in an effort to reduce an incumbent advantage or alternatively, set aside a cap amount that would not be weighted towards the price evaluation?

Answer: Refer to Addendum #1 amendment to RFP Section 6.3 “Financial Proposal Evaluation Criteria”.

30. Question: Sections 5.4 Volume II – Financial Proposal, pg. 112

Would MHCC create a cost category for transition & takeover expenses that would be eliminated from the price evaluation? This would allow non-incumbent vendors an opportunity to compete

equally on price without having the disadvantage of transition & takeover expenses factored into their overall bid price (for evaluation purposes).

Answer: Refer to Addendum #1 amendment to RFP Section 6.3 “Financial Proposal Evaluation Criteria”.

31. Question: Sections 1.1 Minimal Qualifications, pg. 8

In order not to limit vendor participation, would DHS allow subcontractor qualifications to count towards the Offeror Minimal Qualifications?

Answer: As mentioned in Section 2.1.4 an Offeror, directly or through its subcontractor, can meet all of the requirements requested.

32. Question: Sections 3.10.2 Personnel Experience, pg. 73

Since MHCC is allowing subcontractor participation in addition to minority participation, would MHCC allow subcontracts to provide staffing for the key personnel positions? There are certain positions (e.g., Program Manager) in which the Offeror should provide the resource for the position; however, for other key positions allowing subcontractors to fill key personnel positions will ensure that DHS receives the strongest possible team for the project.

Answer: Refer to Addendum #1 amendment to RFP Section 3.10.2 “Personnel Experience.”