



RICK SCOTT  
GOVERNOR

ELIZABETH DUDEK  
SECRETARY

March 30, 2015

Prospective Vendor(s):

Subject: Solicitation Number: AHCA RFP 003-14/15

Title: Independent Validation and Verification (IV and V) Consulting Services for the Medicaid Management Information System, Decision Support System, and Fiscal Agent Procurement

Addendum No. 3

The enclosed information has been provided for consideration in the preparation of your response to the above mentioned RFP.

All other terms and conditions of the RFP remain in effect.

**To the extent this Addendum gives rise to a protest, failure to file a notice of intent to protest and formal protest within the time prescribed in Section 120.57(3), Florida Statutes, shall constitute a waiver of proceedings under Chapter 120, Florida Statutes.**

Sincerely,

*Jennifer Barrett*

Jennifer Barrett, Chief  
Bureau of Support Services

Enclosures: Addendum No. 3 (1 Page)  
Questions and Answers (7 Pages)  
Questions and Answers Attachment I (3 Pages)



**AHCA RFP 003-14/15  
ADDENDUM NO. 3**

**Item #1**

Attachment C, Special Conditions, Section C.39, General Instructions for Response Preparation and Submission, Item C., Financial Information, the following sentence is hereby included as follows:

Respondents may submit Financial Information as required on CD-ROM in lieu of paper format.

**REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

**AHCA RFP 003-14/15**  
**IV AND V CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE MMIS, DSS AND FISCAL AGENT PROCUREMENT**  
**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Agency Reference No.	Vendor Name	Date Received	Vendor Question No.	Question	Answer
1	Coders Online	February 25, 2015	1	I am in the early stages of review the above RFP issued yesterday for our company, Coders Online. But in my review, I found a couple of things related to the budget that are confusing for us that I thought I would bring to your attention prior to submitting all of my questions. In reviewing your annual budget for the project compared to the deliverables expected to be completed each year, there seems to be a discrepancy between what is being delivered each year and what is stated as the budget for each year. I have validated by numbers two different ways and they add up different than what is stated in the RFP. These estimates are based upon when the RFP indicates that deliverables are due. But the amounts add up differently by year than what the RFP states. I will appreciate the State reviewing the numbers and clarifying the correct annual budgets. Also, the \$312,000 indicated by the State for Year one seems to only account for the initial plan and does not appear to account for the Report on MMIS/ DDD /Discal.... Or for the Comprehensive Monthly Report. Please also not, that the percentage allocation in the RFP is 99.99% of the budget and is missing .0001 of the budget. I added this difference to the monthly report budget. I will appreciate clarity on this issue.	Please see Questions and Answers Attachment I.
2	Science Applications International Corp. (SAIC)	March 1, 2015	1	SAIC, is interested to respond to the FL Medicaid IVV activity, rfp AHCA RFP 003-14/15. However, we would respectfully request an extension, of three weeks, from the currently issued due date of April 10, 2015  Could you kindly publish, or inform if that is possible, as it is pertinent to our bid/no bid internal decision, solution development and partnering activities. Any information provided before March 23, 2015 would be highly appreciated.	Please see Addendum No. 1 to AHCA RFP 003-14/15.
3	Electronic Health Resources, LLC	March 3, 2015	1	The RFP does not specifically state whether the vendor selected to perform this work will be validating one or two solutions (MMIS/DSS). Will the State consider a two week extension to the schedule to allow potential bidders time to evaluate the States answers to the questions that may have a substantial impact on the statement of work outlined in this RFP?	Please see Addendum No. 1 to AHCA RFP 003-14/15.
4	Electronic Health Resources, LLC	March 3, 2015	2	Will the selected vendor for this RFP be validating one combined MMIS/DSS or does the agency anticipate separate RFP's for MMIS and DSS?	There will separate solicitations for the MMIS/Fiscal Agent and for the DSS.
5	Electronic Health Resources, LLC	March 3, 2015	3	Are the "To-Be" conditions outlined in the recently completed SS-A the basis for the upcoming RFP(s) for MMIS/DSS? In other words, are the goals stated in the SS-A the basis for the MMIS/DSS modernization plans?	The recently updated MITA SS-A as well as other information is being used to develop the MMIS and DSS solicitations.
6	Electronic Health Resources, LLC	March 3, 2015	4	Will the MMIS and DSS be evaluated (validated) using the Federal MECT requirements? If so, will the State consider publishing the MECT and State Specific requirements to be used for validation?	The Agency has not received final information on this from CMS. The CMS MECT information can be found at <a href="http://www.cms.gov/Research-Statistics-Data-and-Systems/Computer-Data-and-Systems/MMIS/MECT.html">http://www.cms.gov/Research-Statistics-Data-and-Systems/Computer-Data-and-Systems/MMIS/MECT.html</a>
7	Electronic Health Resources, LLC	March 3, 2015	5	Will the State require separate IV/V teams for the MMIS and DSS? If so, what are the staffing requirements?	No. However, appropriate team skill sets for validation and verification of an MMIS and a DSS are required.
8	Electronic Health Resources, LLC	March 3, 2015	6	If the State issues separate RFP's for MMIS and DSS, will the State amend the proposed budget outlined in this RFP?	Please see Addendum No. 2 to AHCA RFP 003-14/15.
9	Electronic Health Resources, LLC	March 3, 2015	7	Will all vendors responding to this RFP be barred from competing in the anticipated System Integration (SI) project referenced in the recently completed RFI for MMIS/DSS modernization?	All vendors will be expected to comply with Federal and State conflict of interest laws.
10	New Capitol IT	March 3, 2015	1	Please clarify the weighting of technical points and cost points, etc and how the total score is arrived.	The weighting of the technical response and cost proposal and scoring are described in Attachment E-1, Revised Evaluation Criteria.
11	New Capitol IT	March 3, 2015	2	Please clarify the basis on which the recommendation for final award is made.	In accordance with Section 287.057(b)(4) Florida Statutes, "The contract shall be awarded by written notice to the responsible and responsive vendor whose proposal is determined in writing to be the most advantageous to the state, taking into consideration the price and other criteria set forth in the request for proposals."

**AHCA RFP 003-14/15**  
**IV AND V CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE MMIS, DSS AND FISCAL AGENT PROCUREMENT**  
**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Agency Reference No.	Vendor Name	Date Received	Vendor Question No.	Question	Answer
12	KPMG LLP	March 9, 2015	1	<p>Publicly traded companies typically follow GAAP and privately held companies like the Big 4 accounting firms follow a different accounting framework. As a privately held company, we do not follow Generally Accepted Accounting Practices (GAAP) in our internal books and records. Our books and records are maintained on an alternative accounting framework that is in accordance with our partnership agreement. Would you be willing to accept the following update to enable privately held companies to compete for this work:</p> <p><b><u>RFP Attachment C – Special Conditions</u></b>  <b>Section C.24 Accounting:</b>  The successful vendor shall maintain an accounting system and employ accounting procedures and practices that conform to generally accepted accounting principles and standards <b>or other appropriate financial reporting framework</b>. All charges applicable to the resulting Contract shall be readily ascertainable from such records. The successful vendor is required to submit annual financial audits to the Agency within thirty (30) days of receipt.</p> <p><b><u>RFP Attachment H – AHCA Standard Contract</u></b>  <b>C. Audits and Records:</b>  To maintain books, records, and documents (including electronic storage media) pertinent to performance under this Contract in accordance with <b>generally accepted accounting procedures and practices or other appropriate financial reporting framework</b> which sufficiently and properly reflect all revenues and expenditures of funds provided by the Agency under this Contract.</p>	No.
13	Public Consulting Group, Inc. (PCG)	March 10, 2015	1	<p>Attachment D, Page 5  D.2.b: IV&amp;V Planning and Project Review Tasks  For the task listed, 'assess project risk and project change management', please define the use of 'project change management' here.</p>	Assess Project Change Management in this context is the assessment of the project's changes to date and the appropriateness of the project's formal scope change management plan to define, document, verify, manage, and control project scope.
14	Public Consulting Group, Inc. (PCG)	March 10, 2015	2	<p>Attachment D, Page 7  Figure 1: Project Oversight organizational Structure  Please clarify the State's expectations of vendors in association with providing this information.</p>	Figure 1: Project Oversight Organization Structure is an informational item only regarding the State's project team.
15	Public Consulting Group, Inc. (PCG)	March 10, 2015	3	<p>Attachment D, Pages 25-26  D.11: Method of Payment  The Agency shall pay the IV and V Vendor the remaining ten percent (10%) for all satisfactory completed deliverables upon Agency receipt and acceptance of the final invoice. Would the State consider having the 10% withholding payable upon acceptance of the final invoice per SFY?</p>	No.
16	Public Consulting Group, Inc. (PCG)	March 10, 2015	4	<p>Attachment D, Pages 27-29  D.12: Performance Standards and Liquidated Damages, Table 10  Much of the IV&amp;V vendor's schedule will be dependent upon that of the selected MMIS/DSS system integrator. The timing of the IV&amp;V vendor's independent reviews will be directly linked to the SI's implementation schedule and access to deliverables, which will directly impact the IV&amp;V team's ability to complete work in accordance with contractual due dates. Given that reality, would the State consider removing liquidated damages set forth in Table 10?</p>	No.
17	SLI Global Solutions	March 10, 2015	1	<p>C.15 Original Proposal Guarantee, Page 4 - The original response must be accompanied by an original proposal guarantee payable to the State of Florida in the amount of \$234,154.00; the respondent must be the guarantor. The Agency will not accept a copy of the proposal guarantee with the original response.</p> <p>Requiring an original proposal guarantee of \$234,154 discourages small but qualified firms from responding. It is in the best interest of the state to receive responses from multiple qualified IV&amp;V firms. This requirement will eliminate all but the largest firms from responding. We request that the state delete this requirement.</p>	No.
18	SLI Global Solutions	March 10, 2015	2	<p>D.11 Method of Payment, Page 25 - Upon receipt and Agency approval of each deliverable, the IV and V Vendor shall be paid ninety percent (90%) of the total amount due for the deliverable. The Agency shall pay the IV and V Vendor the remaining ten percent (10%) for all satisfactory completed deliverables upon Agency receipt and acceptance of the final invoice.</p> <p>Retaining 10% payment for approved deliverables until all deliverables have been approved and acceptance of the final invoice on a multi-year contract puts an unreasonable financial burden on the awarded IV&amp;V vendor. Would the state revise this narrative to allow for an annual release of the 10% holdback?</p>	No.

**AHCA RFP 003-14/15**  
**IV AND V CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE MMIS, DSS AND FISCAL AGENT PROCUREMENT**  
**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Agency Reference No.	Vendor Name	Date Received	Vendor Question No.	Question	Answer
19	SLI Global Solutions	March 10, 2015	3	D.12 Performance Standards and Liquidated Damages, Page 27 - The Agency may impose liquidated damages as identified in Table 10, Performance Standards and Liquidated Damages below, when the IV and V Vendor has failed to meet the deliverable requirements of the Contract resulting from this RFP.  It is highly unusual to include Liquidated Damages provisions in a professional services contract. The state has several remedies and protections including withholding deliverable approval and payment. Including Liquidated Damage raises the cost to the state without providing additional protection. We request that the state delete these provisions.	No.
20	SLI Global Solutions	March 10, 2015	4	D.13 Performance Bond, Page 30 - A performance bond in the amount of ten percent (10%) of the annual amount of the Contract resulting from this RFP shall be furnished to the Agency by the IV and V Vendor for the specified Contract term.  Similar to Liquidated Damages, it is highly unusual to require a Performance Bond on professional services contracts. The state has multiple protections against poor contractor performance including non- payment and contract termination. The Performance Bond requirement raises the cost to the state, decreases completion without providing additional protection. We request that the state delete the requirement for a Performance Bond.	No.
21	Berry Dunn	March 20, 2015	1	Attachment C, Page 5 of 26, Section C.21, and Attachment D, Page 31 of 35, Section D.13:  a. Is there a specific bond form we should use?  b. When would the bond get called in the event of a termination of the vendor?  c. What happens if the surety does not issue a subsequent bond? Does that constitute a loss under the prior bond?  d. What if the vendor decides to terminate the contract due to non-payment, project mismanagement by the State or MMIS vendor, or other conditions outside of its control? Can there be conditions where there is no assessment made against the bond?	a. No. The performance bond must be submitted in accordance with the requirement in Attachment C-1, Revised Special Conditions, Section C.21, Performance Bond.  b. At the time of termination by the Vendor.  c. The performance bond shall remain in effect for the full term of the resulting Contract, including any renewal period.  d. The Agency may call the bond for any termination by the vendor prior to full performance.
22	Berry Dunn	March 20, 2015	2	Attachment C, Page 19 of 26, Section C.39.E.6.a-b:  a. Please clarify the State's expectation for the vendor's response to 6a. Are you looking for us to provide our proposed IV&V Project Management approach, OR our approach for how we would conduct an initial evaluation of the MMIS/DSS/Fiscal Agent Vendor's IT Project Management?  b. Please clarify the State's expectation for the vendor's response to 6b. Are you looking for us to describe the authority of our proposed Project Manager OR our approach for how we would conduct an initial evaluation of the MMIS/DSS/Fiscal Agent Vendor's Project Manager?	a. The State expects the vendor response for Attachment C, Page 19 of 26, Section C.39.E.6.a to contain the vendor's proposed IV&V Project Management approach.  b. The state expects the vendor response for Attachment C, Page 19 of 26, Section C.39.E.6.b to contain the vendor's proposed description of the authority of the vendor's proposed Project Manager.
23	Berry Dunn	March 20, 2015	3	Attachment C, Page 20 of 26, Section C.39.E.9: At what point during the evaluation process will the IV&V Vendor review proposed technical solutions? For example, will IV&V's review be done in parallel with the State's Evaluation Team, or will IV&V be brought in to review only short-listed proposals based on the Evaluation Team's review? How many proposals should we plan to review?	The IV&V Vendor will review the proposals selected for negotiations for the MMIS contract and the DSS contract. The state cannot predict with accuracy how many proposals will be received.
24	Berry Dunn	March 20, 2015	4	Attachment D, Page 1 of 35, Section D.1.a:  a. The second paragraph refers to a "procurement of a new fiscal agent Contract and enhancements to or development of an MMIS and DDS by June 2018." Based on the RFI published by the Agency on January 23, 2015, we understand that the Agency is planning separate solicitations for a takeover of the current HPES with enhancements and for a Systems Integrator.  b. Is the Agency still planning for separate solicitations? If so, will the selected IV&V Vendor provide IV&V for the takeover of the current HPES with enhancements and the SI contract, or only for the SI contract?	The State is planning to release two Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) solicitations for this procurement cycle. One for the takeover of the current MMIS system operated by HPES with enhancements and another for a separate DSS that will be new to Florida Medicaid. The IV&V Vendor will provide IV&V for the takeover of the current HPES MMIS with enhancements and the DSS. The state has not made a final decision regarding the Systems Integrator procurement.

**AHCA RFP 003-14/15**  
**IV AND V CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE MMIS, DSS AND FISCAL AGENT PROCUREMENT**  
**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Agency Reference No.	Vendor Name	Date Received	Vendor Question No.	Question	Answer
25	Berry Dunn	March 20, 2015	5	Attachment D, Page 3 of 35, Section D.2.a: Please name the Research and PMO/DDI Support vendors and their subcontractors so that proposers can ensure there are no potential conflicts with existing vendors on the project.	The Research and Planning Vendor is CSG Government Solutions, sub contracts with Health Management Associates and CSpring. The PMO/DDI vendor is North Highland Company, sub-contracts with Cambria and Rack Space.
26	Berry Dunn	March 20, 2015	6	Attachment D, Page 5 of 35, Section D.2.c.1.b: Does AHCA anticipate selecting one or multiple vendors for the MMIS and DSS solutions?	The State anticipates selecting one MMIS vendor and one DSS vendor.
27	Berry Dunn	March 20, 2015	7	Attachment D, Page 5 of 35, Section D.2.c.1.b: In order to ensure an "apples to apples" approach to evaluating proposed IV&V costs, please provide an estimated number of deliverables the IV&V should plan to review. How many rounds should we plan to review for each deliverable?	The Agency cannot state with any certainty how many deliverables will be received. At this time it is anticipated that the MMIS and DSS requirements will be organized around MITA business areas, plus 3-4 "non-MITA" business areas, and 3-5 Major MMIS enhancements are anticipated. We do not typically have multiple "rounds" of review for deliverables. We typically limit the reviews to one review, with an exception of 2 review periods as warranted.
28	Berry Dunn	March 20, 2015	8	Attachment E, Page 1 of 14, Section E.3: Since Financial Stability comprises 16% of the evaluation criteria, please clarify how financial stability will be scored. Will financial stability be evaluated solely on the financial information presented in response to Attachment C, Section C.39.C, or will the evaluation also take into account factors such as company history, stability, years in business, and growth?	Financial Stability will be evaluated in accordance with Attachment C-1, Revised Special Conditions, Section C.39, General Instructions for Response Preparation and Submission, Subsection C, Financial Information.
29	Berry Dunn	March 20, 2015	1	We saw Amendment 2 posted and it appears there are changes to several sections. Are you able to provide a marked-up version that shows the changes from the original RFP (e.g., additions, deletions, modifications)? If that is not an option, would you please provide an unlocked version of the document so we can mark up the amended RFP to note changes from the original RFP?  The myflorida.com purchasing site shows that Addendum 2 was posted on March 13; however, we just received the email notification that it was posted yesterday. Would you consider extending the timeline for submitting questions by one day to allow time for our team to review the amended RFP?	No.
30	Science Applications International Corp. (SAIC)	March 20, 2015	1	p 1 - Will the selected vendor for this RFP be validating one combined MMIS/DSS or does AHCA anticipate a separate RFP for each MMIS and DSS? If yes, will separate teams be required?	The state anticipates separate solicitations for the MMIS and DSS. Separate teams will not be required, however, appropriate team skill sets for validation and verification of an MMIS and a DSS are required.
31	Science Applications International Corp. (SAIC)	March 20, 2015	2	p 31 - Will the MMIS/DSS be evaluated (validated) using the Federal MECT requirements? If so, will AHCA publish the MECT and State Specific requirements to be used for validation?	The Agency has not received final information on the certification that will be required from CMS. The CMS MECT information can be found at <a href="http://www.cms.gov/Research-Statistics-Data-and-Systems/Computer-Data-and-Systems/MMIS/MECT.html">http://www.cms.gov/Research-Statistics-Data-and-Systems/Computer-Data-and-Systems/MMIS/MECT.html</a>
32	Science Applications International Corp. (SAIC)	March 20, 2015	3	Att E, p 80 - Attachment C, Page 20, 10c relating to UAT indicates the IV&V vendor must coordinate with the DDI vendor to develop test scenarios, test cases, test data. Please clarify the responsibilities of the IV&V team in the development of these work products. Will the IV&V team have an operational level of test scenarios and cases, whereas the DDI vendor will have software test level test scenarios and cases?	As it relates to UAT, the IV&V vendor must provide an approach to UAT that encompasses all levels of user acceptance testing.
33	Science Applications International Corp. (SAIC)	March 20, 2015	4	p 45 - Attachment D, Page 7, Figure 1. Can you describe the MOD groupings and how they are meant to relate to the activities of the IV&V vendor?	Project Oversight Organization Structure is an informational item only regarding the State's project team.
34	Science Applications International Corp. (SAIC)	March 20, 2015	5	Att D, p 63 - Should the scope of the current RFP requirements change, post contract award, will AHCA be willing to amend the program requirements for the IV&V program, relating to current budget and current deliverables?	Yes, as necessary and within the Agency's budget limits.
35	Science Applications International Corp. (SAIC)	March 20, 2015	6	In Design, Development and Implementation (DDI) Evaluation, how often will JAD sessions occur? Please provide the estimated number and location of JAD sessions.	The Agency cannot state with any certainty how many DDI JAD sessions will be required or the timing of the DDI JAD sessions. The location of the JADs is undetermined at this point.
36	Science Applications International Corp. (SAIC)	March 20, 2015	7	p 47; 61 - The RFP contains conflicting statements for the place of performance; p 61 'located remotely and/or onsite in Tallahassee, Florida' whereas p 47 'located onsite in Tallahassee, Florida'. Please clarify if remote/offsite work is permitted for this effort.	Remote/offsite work is allowed for this contract work if approved by the Agency.
37	Science Applications International Corp. (SAIC)	March 20, 2015	8	Att D; Tbl 6, 7, 8 - Are the percentages outlined in Attachment D Tables 6, 7, 8 based on percentages of total funded value, or associated with estimates of the work effort required? How was the percent calculated for the IV&V Management Plan (6.40%) and the UAT Plan (1.02%)?	The Percentages on Tables 6, 7, and 8 are percentages of the total funded value.
38	North Highland	March 20, 2015	1	Please clarify the IV&V vendor responsibilities for monitoring itself in the provision of the Testing and OCM Services.	The IV&V Vendor will not be required to monitor the UAT testing or Organizational Change Management services required in the Contract resulting from this RFP.

**AHCA RFP 003-14/15**  
**IV AND V CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE MMIS, DSS AND FISCAL AGENT PROCUREMENT**  
**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Agency Reference No.	Vendor Name	Date Received	Vendor Question No.	Question	Answer
39	North Highland	March 20, 2015	2	<p>Attachment C: Page 5 of 25, C.18</p> <p>"The Agency anticipates the issuance of one (1) Contract as a result of this RFP. The Agency at its sole discretion, shall make this determination."</p> <p>This statement implies that at AHCA's discretion, more than one contract could also be awarded.</p> <p>Given that the RFP requests service for 3 distinct, specialty business areas: IV&amp;V Services, Testing Services and OCM Services, the Agency may be best served by entertaining partial proposals from vendors who are "best of breed" in a particular services area.</p> <p>Can the Agency modify the scoring of the RFP to enable the Agency to consider and select multiple vendors that propose to provide only one or two of the specialty service areas?</p> <p>Stated another way: Can a bidder propose to provide services for discrete components of the bid (not the entire scope of work) and still have the response be considered compliant?</p> <p>For example: Could the bidder propose to provide only the testing or OCM components of this bid with an understanding that another vendor could be selected to provide the remaining IV&amp;V scope of service?</p>	No.
40	North Highland	March 20, 2015	3	<p>Attachment D: Page 16 of 33, Task 10</p> <p>This item makes reference to both a "delivery schedule" and a "training schedule". Will you please clarify these terms? Is this a reference to a delivery schedule for the OCM Communication materials?</p>	Yes. The OCM Delivery Schedule will include a delivery schedule for the OCM communication material as well as a training schedule.
41	North Highland	March 20, 2015	4	Please clarify which vendor will be responsible for curriculum development and training for MMIS /DSS system end users?	Curriculum development and training for system end users will be the responsibility of the MMIS and DSS vendors.
42	North Highland	March 20, 2015	5	Please estimate how many State of Florida end users will be exposed to a change in operation processes as result of the MMIS/DSS/FA Implementation?	Approximately 340.
43	North Highland	March 20, 2015	6	Please identify (or estimate) all non-government stakeholders to be addressed by the OCM scope of services.	None known at this time. The State reserves the right to add other stakeholders during the development of the OCM plan.
44	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	1	As the standard contract included as Attachment H does not appear to incorporate PUR 1000, does Attachment H supersede PUR 1000 as allowed by Florida Administrative Code Rule 60A-1.002(7)? If not, please identify which sections of PUR 1000 will be incorporated into the resulting contract and which terms govern in the event of a conflict between the terms of Attachment H and PUR 1000.	Attachment H, Standard Contract supersedes PUR 1000, General Contract Conditions.
45	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	2	Would the agency consider modifying the indemnification language in Attachment H, section 1.F, exhibit IV to align with the standard indemnification language in PUR 1000?	No.
46	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	3	If attachment H supersedes PUR 1000, would the agency consider including a limitation of liability clause similar to that found in PUR 1000? Otherwise can the agency confirm that the standard limitation of liability provision of PUR 1000 will be incorporated into the resulting contract?	No. Attachment B, PUR 1000, General Contract Conditions will be incorporated into the Contract as part of the Invitation to Negotiate.
47	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	4	Regarding Attachment J-1, Revised Cost Proposal – Items #4 and #12 appear to be recurring deliverables for which there is a quantity greater than one. Should we enter the price per individual deliverable or for all anticipated deliverables in the space provided?	All entries in Attachment J-1, Revised Cost Proposal should be the total cost of the deliverable for the life of the Contract.
48	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	5	Attachment F Past Performance Client Reference Form – Page 5 of the form is not editable. Do references need to print the form and fill it out by hand along with their original signature?	Yes.
49	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	6	The need for a bid bond is uncommon in Florida state agency procurements for consulting services and specifically IVV services. Would AHCA reconsider the need for vendors to provide a bid bond?	No.
50	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	7	If AHCA is unwilling to waive the need for a bid bond: What risk is the agency trying to cover by requirement of the bid bond? Can the agency specify when the bid bond will expire?	The proposal guarantee is an assurance that the respondent shall, upon the Agency's acceptance of his or her proposal, execute such contractual documents as may be required within the time specified. The bid bond will be returned upon receipt of the performance bond.
51	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	8	The need for a performance bond is uncommon in Florida state agency procurements for consulting services and specifically IVV services. Would AHCA reconsider the need for vendors to provide a performance bond?	No.

**AHCA RFP 003-14/15**  
**IV AND V CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE MMIS, DSS AND FISCAL AGENT PROCUREMENT**  
**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Agency Reference No.	Vendor Name	Date Received	Vendor Question No.	Question	Answer
52	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	9	If AHCA is unwilling to waive the need for a performance bond: What risk is the agency trying to cover by requirement of the performance bond? Can the agency specify when the performance bond will expire?	If the successful vendor terminates the resulting Contract prior to the end of the resulting Contract period, an assessment against the bond will be made by the State to cover the costs of issuing a new solicitation and selecting a new vendor. The performance bond shall remain in effect for the full term of the resulting Contract, including any renewal period.
53	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	10	We are a large accounting firm structured as a limited liability partnership, and we do not distribute our financial statements to parties other than our partners, principals and lenders. We would be happy to provide public information such as our total revenue growth over the last three years, our Fitch credit ratings, details of our firm ownership structure, assets, and borrowings which will show we have adequate financial resources to perform the contract. Further, we would be happy to arrange for AHCA to speak to our firm's financial executives on the details of our finances and if needed, invite you to our offices in Tallahassee where one of our Partners could walk you through the specifics of our financial statements. Is this acceptable per the request in section C.39.C Financial information of the RFP?	No.
54	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	11	In section 10.b, you have requested "identification process for testing scenario(s)". Can you please provide details on what process you are looking for? (i.e. Naming convention for test scenario, approach for defining test scenarios, etc.)	The State is looking for the vendor's approach for defining test scenarios in this specific phrase.
55	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	12	In section 10.c, the agency has requested "coordinating with the Design, Development and Implementation vendor to develop..." Is the assumption that UAT test planning and execution will be conducted by the DDI vendor?	UAT test planning and execution will be conducted by the IV&V vendor. The DDI vendor will provide the needed infrastructure to conduct the tests.
56	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	13	Attachment D, Table 5, No. 10, mentions an OCM Plan deliverable. What are the components (Training, Knowledge Transfer, Change Management, Communications, to name a few) of the OCM Plan that the agency would like discussed in the RFP response?	Vendors should use their knowledge and experience in Organizational Change Management planning to describe the components needed for a comprehensive OCM plan.
57	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	14	Will the "OCM Plan" be treated as a single deliverable or will these possible sub-components be submitted separately?	As stated in Table 8, Implementation Evaluation, Organizational Change Management, and Project Closeout Deliverable Schedule, the OCM plan is a single deliverable.
58	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	15	Attachment D, Table 5, No. 12, describes a "Monthly Report," but the description makes mention of statewide training sessions. What are the various activities around training, OCM effectiveness assessments, and "Monthly reporting"? What are the agency expectations for each of these activities?	The monthly OCM report will contain an update on all aspects of the OCM plan, including the scheduled training.
59	Ernst & Young LLP	March 20, 2015	16	UAT is part of the scope of this RFP. For the other test phases, can you please provide test phase name, description, included types testing, and the responsibly party (State or vendor).	The MMIS and DSS vendors will conduct a variety of testing phases that have not been fully defined as of the release of the IV&V RFP. At a minimum, the testing will include system integration testing, interface testing, functional testing, end-to-end testing, provider testing and possibly conversion testing. The IV&V vendor is responsible for validation of all MMIS and DSS vendor testing.
60	Grant Thornton, LLP	March 20, 2015	1	What protection is in place to prevent the public disclosure of information requested in Section C.39?	Please refer to Section C.39, General Instructions for Response Preparation and Submission.
61	Grant Thornton, LLP	March 20, 2015	2	Does the limitation of liability apply to the liquidated damages stated in Section D.12? If not, is there a cap on liquidated damages?	No.
62	Grant Thornton, LLP	March 20, 2015	3	Does the "Certification Regarding Terminated Contracts" include contracts terminated for convenience?	Yes.
63	Grant Thornton, LLP	March 20, 2015	4	What is the intended order of precedence for award document?	1. The Contract resulting from AHCA RFP 003-14/15, including all Attachments; 2. Amendments to the Contract resulting from AHCA RFP 003-14/15; 3. AHCA RFP 003-14/15, including all Addenda; and 4. The Vendor's response to AHCA RFP 003-14/15.
64	Grant Thornton, LLP	March 20, 2015	5	In Attachment C, section E-5 Project Timeliness (page 30 of the Addendum 2 PDF file), bullet b reads, "The respondent's analysis of the Agency's proposed Deliverable Schedules, provided in Attachment D...." The expectation is that the deliverable schedule for the IV&V vendor will match the overall project activity schedule. Can AHCA clarify the desired goal of this part of the question? (We understand the purpose and intent of bullet a and c.)	Respondents should provide their analysis of the Agency's Deliverable Schedule in this RFP with regard to feasibility and completeness.
65	First Data Government Solutions, LP	March 20, 2015	1	Attachment C, pg 5, C.20 Subcontracting  Will vendors receive any preference in evaluations or awarding for the use of minority or MWBE companies?	Please refer to Attachment E-1, Revised Evaluation Criteria, Part II, Evaluation Criteria for the Detailed Evaluation Criteria Components.



**AHCA RFP 003-14/15**  
**IV AND V CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE MMIS, DSS AND FISCAL AGENT PROCUREMENT**  
**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Agency Reference No.	Vendor Name	Date Received	Vendor Question No.	Question	Answer
66	First Data Government Solutions, LP	March 20, 2015	2	Attachment C, pg 14, C.39 General Instructions for Response  Can the Agency please clarify the accurate number of copies to be submitted? Is the following list correct: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 original hard copy</li> <li>• 5 paper hard copies</li> <li>• 6 electronic copies (CDs)</li> <li>• 1 paper copy – marked as redacted</li> <li>• 1 electronic copy (CD) – marked as redacted</li> </ul>	Yes.
67	First Data Government Solutions, LP	March 20, 2015	3	Attachment C, pg 16, C. Financial Information  Due to the large volume of our financial statements, would the Agency permit these to be submitted on a CD instead of as hard copies?	Yes.
68	First Data Government Solutions, LP	March 20, 2015	4	Attachment C, pg 17, D. Cost Proposal  Will the Agency allow the cost proposal section to be excluded in our redacted copies?	Please see the requirements of Attachment C-1, Revised Special Conditions, Section C.39, General Instructions for Response Preparation and Submission.
69	First Data Government Solutions, LP	March 20, 2015	5	Attachment C, pg 18, E.3.b. Organizational Structure and History  Can the Agency please clarify who specifically should be included in the organizational chart? Is the Agency looking for only leadership and management of the organization?	In addition to the personnel proposed for the resulting Contract, the organizational chart should include leadership and management in the chain of command that impacts the resulting Contract.
70	First Data Government Solutions, LP	March 20, 2015	6	Attachment C, pg 19, 7.a IV&V Project Oversight  The RFP asks for the proposed approach to ongoing analysis of past project performance. Is this referring to how we analyze our own past performance?	The IV&V vendor will be required to analyze and report the MMIS and DSS reprourement project's past performance on an ongoing weekly basis using performance metrics developed by the IV&V vendor as part of Deliverable 1.
71	First Data Government Solutions, LP	March 20, 2015	7	Attachment C, pg 24, 17.a Hardware and Software Requirements  Since this RFP is for IV&V Services, there are no hardware or software requirements to be met by the Offeror (no automation, software development, nor data exchanges/interfaces). Will the Agency consider removing this response requirement?	No.
72	First Data Government Solutions, LP	March 20, 2015	8	Attachment C, pg 24, 17.b Disaster Recovery  Since this RFP is for IV&V Services, there are no disaster recovery requirements to be met by the Offeror (no data or applications to backup/restore). Will the Agency consider removing this response requirement?	No.
73	First Data Government Solutions, LP	March 20, 2015	9	Attachment C, pg 24, 17.c Data Transmission and Security  Since this RFP is for IV&V Services, there is no need for the Offeror to access nor transmit sensitive Medicaid data or PHI/PII. Will the Agency consider removing this response requirement?	No.
74	First Data Government Solutions, LP	March 20, 2015	10	Attachment D, pg 3, Table 1  There are several key project dates listed in Table 1. Have all prior events (Feb 2014 – Feb 2015) been completed? If not, which remain outstanding?  Who is the Planning/Research Vendor?  Who is the PMO/DDI Support Vendor?	Yes.  The Planning and Research Vendor is CSG Government solutions.  The PMO Support Vendor is North Highland Company.
75	First Data Government Solutions, LP	March 20, 2015	11	Attachment D, pg 23, D.8 Staffing  Does the Agency require all key staff to be onsite in Tallahassee on a full-time basis, or is this at the discretion of the Offeror?	The Agency must approve off-site work and hours outside of normal business hours for vendor staff.
76	First Data Government Solutions, LP	March 20, 2015	12	Attachment D, pg 25, D.10 Office Space  How many people can be accommodated in the proposed office space for the IV&V vendor's staff?	A maximum of 8.
77	First Data Government Solutions, LP	March 20, 2015	13	Attachment F, pg 1 Client Reference Form  If subcontractors are proposed, must the Offeror also include 3 client reference forms on their behalf?	No.

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ATTACHMENT I

Response is based upon Addendum No. 2 to AHCA RFP 003-14/15.

The differences in the calculations are due to two issues:

1. The RFP percentages in Tables 6, Planning and Project Review Deliverable Schedule; Table 7, DDI Evaluation and Monthly Reporting Deliverable Schedule; and Table 8, Implementation Evaluation, Organizational Change Management, and Project Closeout Deliverable Schedule were determined by spreadsheet formulas, dividing each deliverable cost by the total Contract amount. Percentages were calculated to four (4) decimal places but were rounded to two (2) decimal places for the RFP tables. Please see the chart below.
2. Attachment D, Scope of Services, Section D.11, Method of Payment, subsection b., describes the State Fiscal Year (SFY) as July 1<sup>st</sup> through June 30<sup>th</sup>. Please see the chart below for the alignment of deliverables to the SFY. Because funds for SFY 15/16 are estimated at a different amount per pending legislative funding request, the same percentage cannot be applied to all years. The RFP percentage was calculated from the sum of all years, divided by the Contract total.

State Fiscal Year	Deliverable Description	Due (Per RFP)	Budgets	Calculated Percent of Total*	REVISED Percent of Total (Per RFP)	REVISED Budget (Per RFP %)
			<b>Per Question Received</b>		<b>Per RFP Calculations</b>	
July 2014-June 2015	IV and V Management Plan	06/29/15	\$312,361.04	6.67%	6.4003%	\$312,539.00
	<b>TOTAL SFY 2014-15</b>					<b>\$312,539.00</b>
July 2015-June 2016	<b>Addendum No. 2: Report on the MMIS/DSS/Fiscal Agent Procurement Solicitation Document(s)</b>	<b>8/14/15</b>			<b>3.3250%</b>	<b>\$162,365.00</b>
	Comprehensive Monthly Report	12 months**	\$349,669.53	7.47%	***	\$974,191.00
	Report on MMIS/DSS/Fiscal Agency Vendors Proposed Technical Solutions	10/28/15	\$81,017.18	1.73%	1.6625%	\$81,183.00
	Solicitation Requirements Compliance and Traceability Monitoring Methodology	04/07/16	\$62,753.19	1.34%	1.3392%	\$62,714.00
	<b>TOTAL SFY 2015-16</b>					<b>\$1,217,739.00</b> <b>1,118,087.83</b>

State Fiscal Year	Deliverable Description	Due (Per RFP)	Budgets	Calculated Percent of Total*	REVISED Percent of Total (Per RFP)	REVISED Budget (Per RFP %)
			<b>Per Question Received</b>		<b>Per RFP Calculations</b>	
July 2016-June 2017	Solicitation Requirements Compliance and Traceability Monitoring Methodology	<b>Addendum No. 2: 8/15/16</b>			1.2842%	\$62,714.00
	Comprehensive Monthly Report	12 months**	\$839,206.86	17.92%	***	\$905,872.00
	OCM Plan	04/03/17	\$37,464.59	0.8%	0.9938% <del>1.0363%</del>	\$48,532.00
	OCM Delivery Schedule and Materials	06/16/17	\$48,703.97	1.04%	0.7682% <del>0.8011%</del>	\$37,514.00
	<b>TOTAL SFY 2016-17</b>					<b>\$1,054,632.00</b> <del>991,918.10</del>
July 2017-June 2018	Comprehensive Monthly Report	12 months**	\$839,206.86	17.92%	***	\$905,872.10
	Monthly Report: OCM Sessions and Assessment of OCM Effectiveness (August 2017 through March 2018)	8 months	\$302,058.27	6.45%	12.3673% <del>12.8957%</del>	\$603,915.00
	UAT Plan	12/04/17	\$50,108.89	1.07%	1.0242% <del>1.0681%</del>	\$50,018.00
	UAT Protocols and Training Manual	01/02/18	\$50,108.89	1.07%	1.0242% <del>1.0681%</del>	\$50,018.00
	UAT Results Report	05/07/18	\$244,924.77	5.23%	5.0180% <del>5.2324%</del>	\$245,039.00
	<del>OCM Plan</del>	-	<del>\$37,464.59</del>			
	<del>OCM Delivery Schedule and Materials</del>	-	<del>\$48,703.97</del>			
	System Test Validation Report	01/17/18	\$24,820.29	0.53%	1.2842% <del>0.534%</del>	\$62,714.00 <del>25,009.00</del>
	Implementation Planning Assessment	11/27/17	\$28,566.75	0.61%	0.5873% <del>0.6125%</del>	\$28,682.00
	Operational Readiness Recommendation	05/18/18	\$114,735.31	2.45%	2.3494% <del>2.4498%</del>	\$114,728.00
	<b>TOTAL SFY 2017-18</b>					<b>\$2,060,986.10</b> <del>2,023,281.10</del>

**REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

State Fiscal Year	Deliverable Description	Due (Per RFP)	Budgets	Calculated Percent of Total*	REVISED Percent of Total (Per RFP)	REVISED Budget (Per RFP %)
			<b>Per Question Received</b>		<b>Per RFP Calculations</b>	
July 2018-June 2019	System Test Validation Report	-	\$24,820.29			
	UAT Protocols and Training Manual	-	\$50,108.89			
	UAT Results Report	-	\$244,924.77			
	Operational Readiness Recommendation	-	\$114,735.34			
	Monthly Report: OCM Effectiveness	-	\$302,058.27			
	Lessons Learned Report	09/30/18	\$43,084.28	0.92%	0.8833% <del>0.9211%</del>	\$43,134.00
	Comprehensive Monthly Report	2 months**	\$839,206.86	17.92%	***	\$150,980.00
	IV and V Closeout Report	01/31/19	\$43,084.28	0.92%	0.8833% <del>0.9211%</del>	\$43,134.00
	<b>TOTAL SFY 2018-19</b>					<b>\$237,248.00</b>
2019	(There are no costs in FY 19/20)					
	IV and V Closeout Report	-	\$43,084.28			
	Comprehensive Monthly Report	-	\$69,933.94	1.49%		
	<b>TOTAL ALL</b>					<b>\$4,883,144.00</b> <del>4,683,074.03</del>
	Total Amount of RFP/Contract		<b>\$4,683,074.00</b>			

**NOTES:**

- \* Calculated based on total Contract cost of \$4,683,074.00 and deliverable cost contained in question received. Total Contract cost increased to **\$4,883,144.00** in accordance with Addendum No. 2 to AHCA RFP 003-14/15.
- \*\* Comprehensive Monthly Reports from June to July (12 months) for SFY 15/16, 16/17, and 17/18. Reports for July and August 2018 (2 months) for FY 18/19. Total is 38 months.
- \*\*\* Because funds for SFY 15/16 are estimated at a different amount per pending legislative funding request, the same percentage cannot be applied to all years. The RFP percentage was calculated from the sum of all years, divided by the Contract total.

**REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**