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Date: August 29, 2016

To: All RFP ETG0004 / ETG0006 Proposers

RE: **ADDENDUM No. 1**

**Request for Proposal (RFP) ETG0004 and ETG0006**

**Data Warehouse Solution and Visual Business Intelligence Solution**

**Acknowledgement of receipt of this Addendum No. 1:**

**Proposers must acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 1 by providing the required information in the box below and including this Page 1 in Tab 1 of Proposer’s Proposal.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| Proposer’s Company Name: |  |
|  |  |
| Authorized Printed Name: |  |
|  |  |
| Authorized Signature: |  |
|  | Date |

**Please note the following updates to RFP ETG0004 / ETG0006:**

1. **REMOVE** Appendix 3 – Data Specifications – Wellness (Proposed) from the RFP. **ADD** new Appendix 3 – StayWell Standard Export File Layouts, which is attached to this Addendum No. 1 (and posted on VendorNet and ETF’s Extranet).
2. **CHANGE** all references within the RFP to Appendix 3 – Data Specification – Wellness (Proposed) to Appendix 3 – StayWell Standard Export File Layouts.
3. **REMOVE** Table 4 – Calendar of Events from Page 15 of the RFP. **ADD** the following, revised Table 4 – Calendar of Events to Page 15 to the RFP:

***Table 4 – Calendar of Events***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date\* | Event |
| August 5, 2016 | ETF Issues RFP |
| August 17, 2016 | Proposer Questions Due |
| August 29, 2016 | ETF Posts Answers to Proposer Questions on ETF Extranet |
| **September 13, 2016** | **PROPOSAL DUE DATE: Proposals Due by 2:00 p.m. CDT** |
| Q1 2017 | Contract Start Date |

\*All dates are estimated with the exception of the due dates for Proposer Questions and the Proposal.

1. **REMOVE** Section 1.11 Letter of Intent on Page 15 of the RFP. **ADD** the following, revised Section 1.11 to Page 15 of the RFP:

##### Letter of Intent

**A letter of intent indicating that a Proposer intends to submit a response to this RFP is requested by August 17, 2016.** In the letter, identify the Proposer's company and give the name, location, telephone number, and e-mail address of one or more persons authorized to act on the Proposer's behalf. Submit the letter of intent via email to the address listed in Section 1.4. The RFP number and title must be referenced in the subject line of the email. The letter of intent does not obligate the Proposer to submit a Proposal.

1. **CHANGE** the first sentence on Page 18 of the RFP, in Section 2.3 under **Specific Instructions for Submitting FORM I – Cost Proposal**, to:

“One (1) original (marked as such) and (1) copy (both on 8.5 x 14” paper) of FORM I – Cost Proposal must be sealed in a separate envelope and submitted to ETF with Proposer’s shipment of Proposals.”

1. **ADD** the following bullet to Page 18 of the RFP, Section 2.4 to the right of TAB 1 directly proceeding “Provide the following in the following order:”

Page 1 of ADDENDUM No. 1: Sign Page 1 of Addendum No. 1, complete, and sign.

1. **CHANGE** the first bullet to the right of TAB 4 on Page 21 of the RFP directly proceeding “Provide a hard copy of the following documents,” to:

* Proposer’s audited financial statements for the two (2) most recent fiscal years including the audit opinion, balance sheet, statement of operations, and notes to the financial statements.

1. **CHANGE** the first sentence of the third paragraph of Section 8.2, Additional Services, on Page 31 of the RFP, to:

“Proposers shall list the cost of all proposed Additional Services in the section titled “Additional Services” in FORM I – Cost Proposal.”

1. **REMOVE** the second sentence of VBI Requirement 5.9.8 in Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements that reads: “See Data Query Requirements regarding integration of Reporting Requirements capabilities.”
2. **REMOVE** the third sentence of VBI Requirement 5.9.11 in Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements that reads: “See Data Query Requirements regarding integration of Reporting Requirements capabilities.”
3. **REMOVE** Escrow Requirement 5.11.20 from Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements in its entirety.
4. **ADD** the following answers from ETF to questions submitted by Proposers:

| No. | RFP Section | RFP Page | Question/Answer |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Q1 | RFP | Page 4 - 1.2.1 | Will ETF want to integrate state administered plan (IYC Access Health Plan and State Maintenance Plan) that are administered through a single administrator? Please validate. |
| A1 |  |  | To confirm, ETF expects the Contractor to integrate state administered (e.g. self-insured) plan data (e.g. eligibility/membership, claims, etc.) with all DSE source data into the DW/VBI system. |
| Q2 | 1.2.1 | 4 | Will prescription drug data be supplied only from the PBM? |
| A2 |  |  | In addition to prescription drug claim data submitted from ETF's PBM, the medical portion of prescription drug claims will be supplied through the health plan or TPA DSEs (e.g. J-codes). |
| Q3 | RFP | 1.2.1 | 1. Please confirm ETF will provide a monthly eligibility and demographic data file or ALL eligible employees and lives for EFT? 2. Will the eligibility feed include the COBRA and Retiree population? 3. Will the eligibility provide the different coverages for all the data feeds integrated now and in the future? For example, will they provide who and what plans ETF employees/members have for Short Term Disability, Dental, Vision, etc. coverage? |
| A3 |  |  | To confirm, ETF will provide a monthly eligibility and membership file to the Contractor. This eligibility and membership file will provide member benefit data, yet will neither provide disability nor vision benefit data. See current membership information in Table 1 - 2016 Enrollment Data, Page 5 of the RFP. |
| Q4 | 1.2 | 4 | Section 1.2 says there are over 570,000 state and local government employees and annuitants, but Section 1.2.1, Table 1, shows grand total of only 357,000 (110,448 subscribers + 246,981 participants). Would you please clarify the total number of employees/annuitants who are covered by health insurance and the number of their dependents? |
| A4 |  |  | 570,000 represents the total number of employees and annuitants participating in the five (retirement, health, life, disability, and long-term care) ETF-administered programs listed in Section 1.2. Per Table 1, in Section 1.2.1, 110,448 employees, annuitants, continuants and graduate assistants are participating in GHIP/WPE programs and the total number of covered lives in GHIP/WPE programs is 246,981. |
| Q5 | 1.2.1 | 6 | Has the Board selected its new Wellness and Disease Management contractor yet? Can you provide any of the following information: the contractor’s name, the estimated date the contract is likely to start, and the approximate time the contractor will start generating data for the DW contractor? If ETF is not at liberty to share the name of the new contractor, can you tell us if it will be a national firm that does this work in multiple states today or will it be a regional firm? |
| A5 |  |  | StayWell has been selected to be ETF's new Wellness and Disease Management contractor. The contract start date was 08/18/2016, and StayWell will start generating data in Q1 of 2017. |
| Q6 | 1.3 | 7 | Web-portal is loosely described throughout the documents. Are we expected to analyze needs and specifications as part of project plan? |
| A6 |  |  | The expectation is for ETF and the Contractor(s) to work collaboratively to analyze business and technical needs and requirements, and the results of this analysis shall be included in the project and implementation plans. |
| Q7 | 1.3 | 7 | Is the biometric data and the Health Risk Assessment (HRA) data one and the same data feed or separate feeds?  Is it coming only from the new Wellness and Disease Management contractor or from another contractor/s? |
| A7 |  |  | The biometric and HRA data will be submitted to the DW by ETF's new Wellness and Disease Management contractor. See the attached, new Appendix 3 – StayWell Standard Export File Layouts data file specifications for Disease Management (DM), Lifestyle Management (LM), Biometrics, and Health Risk Assessments (HRA). |
| Q8 | 1.3 Future state | 7 | Is there a solution in place for VBI – or this is a new requirement? |
| A8 |  |  | ETF does not currently have a VBI solution in place. See the VBI Requirements section 5.9 (Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements Tab A - Technical Requirements) for additional details and for reference. |
| Q9 | 1.3 Future state | 7 | For VBI, will the vendor be required to create access control/security features? |
| A9 |  |  | Yes, the VBI Contractor shall be required to create access and security controls. The RFP asks for a thorough description of the Proposer’s approach to security, including how security administration operations will be structured and supported. See the Functional Requirements 5.4.9 through 5.4.14, and the Security Requirements 5.5.1 through 5.5.6 (Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements Tab A - Technical Requirements) for further details. |
| Q10 | 1.3 Future state | 7 | Is there staged/sample data available to start VBI development? If yes, what is the size of the datasets? |
| A10 |  |  | The only data ETF currently has available is member eligibility and enrollment related, and there is not currently other data (e.g. claims) available to begin VBI development. |
| Q11 | 1.3 Future state | 7 | What platform is the data currently residing on? |
| A11 |  |  | ETF only possesses eligibility/membership data, and the remainder of other expected data / data sets and future submissions resides with each DSE, residing on each of their respective platforms. Thus, each DSE will have their own platform where their data resides. |
| Q12 | 1.3 Future state | 7 | For VBI refresh/support, is ETF open to working with Global shore delivery timings or regular US working hour support is required? |
| A12 |  |  | See Q&A 52 regarding a Global Shore Delivery model. |
| Q13 | RFP 1.1 Future State: Project Scope and Objectives | Page 8 | What type of Provider Profiling is ETF interesting in? How is EFT currently using this data? |
| A13 |  |  | The provider segmentations and profiling include the following: by Health Plan or TPA, individual physician, physician specialty, provider clinic, facility or hospital, in-network, out-of-network, and network leakage. See the Analytic and Dashboard Reporting Requirements (Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements Tab B - Reporting Requirements) for details. |
| Q14 | 1.3.1 | 8 | As per this section, ETF has vision to blend clinical and administrative data, whereas phase section 1.3.2 doesn’t have any clinical data sources listed. Is it long term vision to integrate clinical data in DW? If integrating clinical data is part of current scope of work, please share the list of clinical data sources. |
| A14 |  |  | See Q&A 16. |
| Q15 | 1.3.1 | 8 | "Evaluate providers by utilization, cost, and quality of care."  We assume that that Providers will be only captured from the Provider data extracted from contracted health plans only. Please confirm. |
| A15 |  |  | See Table 1 in the Technical Requirements, and Functional Requirement 5.4.42 (Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements Tab A - Technical Requirements) for details. |
| Q16 | RFP 1.1 Future State: Project Scope and Objectives | Page 9 | What type of EMR/EHT reporting's ETF interested in? How is EFT currently using this data? |
| A16 |  |  | As noted in the RFP and in Phase 3 of the implementation of the DW/VBI system, ETF is interested in exploring the implementation and integration of Electronic Medical Records (EMR)/Electronic Health Records (EHR) clinical data/values into the data warehouse for enhanced population health management analysis. ETF does not currently receive EMR/EHR data, and is therefore not currently using this data. |
| Q17 | Section 1.3.2 | Page 9 | Page 9 of the RFP (Section 1.3.2) has as the last bullet of Phase 1 “Develop a web-portal for ETF program administrators and other DSEs”. What is the general functionality of this web portal?  (Since Phase 2 is clearly the VBI user interface). |
| A17 |  |  | The web portal requirements are detailed in the Functional Requirements 5.4.85 through 5.4.90 (Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements Tab A - Technical Requirements), as well as noted in several other sections. |
| Q18 | RFP | 1.3.2 | Explore the implementation and integration of select Electronic Medical Records (EMR)/Electronic Health Records (EHR) clinical data/values into the data warehouse for enhanced population health management analysis.  EMR / EHR data is not a standard data type and will be priced accordingly based on discussions with ETF and Contractor regarding analytic and reporting requirements |
| A18 |  |  | This is not phrased as a question as required. If this is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions of your Proposal. See RFP Section 2.4, Proposal Organization and Format, Tab 3. |
| Q19 | RFP | 1.3.2 Project Phases. Page 9 | Has ETF been successful in obtaining the fully insured identified claims data from the DSEs with complete adjudication, including discount amounts, and diagnostic data? |
| A19 |  |  | As noted in the RFP, in the first quarter of 2017, the DW shall be able to receive a minimum of twenty-two (22) data submission feeds. A list of ETF Data Submitting Entities (DSEs) can be found in Appendix 9. The Contractor DW system shall systematically collect, integrate and make available medical claims, pharmacy claims, dental claims, wellness, eligibility and provider files from health plans, Third Party Administrators (TPAs), ETF's Pharmacy Benefit Manager (PBM), and wellness and dental contractors. |
| Q20 | RFP | 1.3.2 Project Phases. Page 9 -- Appendix 9, Appendix 10 | Please validate the feeds to include in the pricing model? See Data Feeds tab for list. Appendix 9 refers to 21 DSE submitting data and Appendix 10 indicates requirements for acceptance of data from 22 DSEs. Please confirm. |
| A20 |  |  | The RFP Functional Requirements (see 5.4.31 through 5.4.50, Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements Tab A - Technical Requirements) detail the data submission requirements for the DSEs. |
| Q21 | 1.3.2 | 9 | Phase 2 mentions about “performance and quality measures”. Are quality measures identified those need to be delivered to end users? |
| A21 |  |  | The RFP Analytic and Dashboard (VBI) Reporting Requirements, Health Care Performance Metrics Reporting (Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements Tab B - Reporting Requirements), and new Appendix 8 - Sample Healthcare Performance Metrics, contain sample healthcare performance metrics that are based on HEDIS measures that shall be available to authorized DSE's end users. The final metrics/measures shall be determined by ETF. See also Q&A 99 for further details. |
| Q22 | 1.3.2 | 9 | We assume that the Membership, Enrollment, Medical claims and Pharmacy claims will be extracted for past 3 calendar years only. Please confirm |
| A22 |  |  | As noted in the RFP in Section 1.3.2 Project Phases, Phase 1, three (3) calendar years of baseline Membership, Enrollment, Medical claims, Pharmacy claims and other data will be submitted to the DW by DSEs. Thereafter, Membership, Enrollment, Medical claims, Pharmacy claims and other data will be submitted on a monthly basis by the DSEs to the DW, accumulated and aggregated in the DW with the baselines data, and maintained throughout the duration of the Contract. See also Q&A 30 and Q&A 31 for further details. |
| Q23 | 1.3.2 | 9 | Please share the tenure of data to be captured for Biometric and HRA data. What types of biometric data need to be captured? |
| A23 |  |  | One to two (1 to 2) calendar years of baseline biometric and wellness data will be provided to the DW. Thereafter, ETF's Wellness Contractor will submit monthly file(s) to the DW, accumulated and aggregated in the DW with the baselines data, and retained throughout the duration of the Contract. See the attached, new Appendix 3 – StayWell Standard Export File Layouts data file specifications for Disease Management (DM), Lifestyle Management (LM), Biometrics, and Health Risk Assessments (HRA). See also Q&As 30 and Q&A 31 for further details. |
| Q24 | 1.3.2 | 9 | What is the tenure of data to be captured for Provider data from the contracted health plans? |
| A24 |  |  | Three (3) calendar years of baseline Provider data will be submitted to the DW by the DSEs. Thereafter, DSEs will submit monthly Provider data file(s) to the DW, accumulated and aggregated in the DW with the baselines data, and retained throughout the duration of the Contract. See also Q&A 30 and Q&A 31 for further details. |
| Q25 | 1.3.2 | 9 | We assume that Dental claims data from the dental benefit administrator will be extracted for the past calendar year only. Please confirm. |
| A25 |  |  | As noted in RFP Section 1.3.2 Project Phases, Phase 1, one (1) calendar year of baseline Dental claims will be submitted to the DW by the Dental TPA. Thereafter, the Dental TPA will submit monthly file(s) to the DW, and such data will be accumulated and aggregated in the DW with the baseline data, and retained throughout the duration of the Contract. See also Q&A's 30 and 31 for further details. |
| Q26 | 1.3.2 | 9 | What systems the Web portal needs to be integrate for ETF program administrators and other DSEs? |
| A26 |  |  | Proposer’s question seems to imply that the portal should be capable of system integration across all DSEs, and this is not intended to be the case. The portal, or other ETF agreed upon method, shall be capable of meeting the Functional Requirements 5.4.85 through 5.4.108 (Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements Tab A - Technical Requirements). |
| Q27 | 1.3.2 | 9 | We assume that Dental claims data from the dental benefit administrator will be extracted for the past calendar year only. Please confirm. |
| A27 |  |  | See Q&A 25. |
| Q28 | 1.3.2 | 9 | “Dashboards for ETF program administrators and select end-users”  We assume that the Dashboard will be a part of web portal. Please confirm. |
| A28 |  |  | The dashboard(s) noted in the RFP Reporting Requirements (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab B Reporting Requirements) could be embedded within a portal or web portal and accessed via a website. However, ETF expects Proposers to propose a complete solution, including VBI and dashboard functionality that meets ETF's business needs within the context of the RFP Requirements. |
| Q29 | 1.3.2 | 9 | "Assess and improve treatment compliance and health outcomes via benefit design modifications"  We assume that the benefit design information will come via enrollment files. Please confirm. |
| A29 |  |  | Select member benefit design data will be included in ETF's monthly eligibility/membership file submissions to the DW. |
| Q30 | 1.3.2 | 9 | The requirement is to hold data for last 3 years. Is it expected to create an archival solution for the data older than 3 years during the monthly refresh process before incremental data is loaded? If yes, what’s the maximum retention period of the archived data?  Would there be any reporting requirements out of archived data? |
| A30 |  |  | In addition to all baseline data submitted by DSEs, for the duration of the Contract, monthly claims will continue to be submitted and integrated into the DW, and archived data is not an expected part of the scope of this project. See also Q&As 22, 23, 24, 25 and 31 for further details. |
| Q31 | 1.3.2 | 9 | The RFP indicates that the data warehouse is to be built using 3 years of historical data.  Is it the Department’s intent to have the contractor keep 3 years of current data online as the contract progresses by rolling off the oldest data each month? Or would ETF prefer to have the contractor keep all the initial historical data on line and grow the size of the database over time? |
| A31 |  |  | ETF requires the Contractor to retain all initial historical baseline data, and grow the size of the database over time, throughout the duration of the Contract. See also Q&A's 22, 23, 24, and 25 for further details. |
| Q32 | 1.3.2 | 9 | The State has not specified an expected Implementation time frame for each of the phases, but the initial contract is limited to two years. Does the State expect the proposer to provide an initial estimated timeframe for costing purposes? |
| A32 |  |  | The RFP specifies a detailed Project and Implementation Plan and timeline to be developed by the Contractor in consultation with ETF. |
| Q33 | 1.3.2 Project phases – Phase 1 | 9 | In case a vendor is only responding for VBI contract, will they need to wait for the DW development in Phase 1 to complete? |
| A33 |  |  | In the event that a Proposer is responding to or bidding on only the VBI solution, development of the VBI solution will occur per the project and implementation plans, as agreed upon by ETF and the Contractor. See 5.1 Project Management (PM) Requirements and 5.2 Implementation Requirements (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements. See also Q&A 133 regarding a Proof of Concept (POC), since a POC may impact the implementation of a DW and VBI solution for ETF. |
| Q34 | 1.3.2 Project phases – Phase 1 | 9 | Besides the existing data sources, is ETF open to additional new data sources? |
| A34 |  |  | ETF is open to new data sources in future development phases of the DW/VBI system or solution, and this can be proposed in Tab 5. |
| Q35 | 1.3.2 Project phases – Phase 2 | 9 | Will the vendor be required to assist in selection of metrics for VBI, or the performance and quality metrics will be solely identified by ETF? |
| A35 |  |  | ETF and the Contractor shall be collaborative partners, and as such, the Contractor may be required to assist ETF in the development and implementation of performance and quality metrics. |
| Q36 | 1.3.2 Project phases – Phase 2 | 9 | Is there a tool/platform of choice for VBI? Or the vendor is required to perform a tool assessment? |
| A36 |  |  | No. The platform for the VBI system will depend on the inherent capabilities of the DW/VBI system(s) contracted for as well as the overall Technical and VBI Requirements outlined in the RFP. |
| Q37 | 1.3.2 Project phases – Phase 1 | 9 | What platform with the DW be developed on (eg: Teradata) |
| A37 |  |  | The platform for the DW will depend on the inherent capabilities of the DW/VBI system(s) contracted for as well as the overall Technical and DW Requirements outlined in the RFP. |
| Q38 | 1.3.2 Project phases – Phase 2 | 9 | Are there separate staging and production servers available? |
| A38 |  |  | See Q&A 88. As stated in the Technical Requirements overview (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements), it is ETF's expectation that the Contractor(s) shall provide a complete DW/VBI solution to meet ETF's business needs. |
| Q39 | 1.3.2 Project phases – Phase 2 | 9 | Will the vendor be required to procure licenses to BI tools such as SAS, Oracle, Tableau, Spotfire or Qlikview? |
| A39 |  |  | The Contractor shall provide a robust solution for ETF to fulfill all RFP requirements, including but not limited to procuring licenses. |
| Q40 | 1.3.2 Project phases – Phase 3 | 9 | For VBI phase 3 – is the list of solutions/predictive models indicative and needs to be scoped out? |
| A40 |  |  | The Contractor shall have a robust predictive modeling solution, and the detailed list of developed solutions and predictive models shall be agreed upon by ETF and the Contractor, and shall also partially depend on identified trends and patterns, pending analysis of the data. |
| Q41 | 1.1 | 15 | Page 15 of the RFP (Section 1.10) cites the term as running through December 31, 2019.  Is this for the hosting of the solution?  If so, does ETF have a desired date for the first rollout of the DW and the subsequent VBI? |
| A41 |  |  | The terms of the Contract encompass the entire DW/VBI solution, and is not isolated to just the Hosting aspect of the solution/system. Implementation of the solution from planning to production is expected to take from 9 to 12 (nine to twelve) months. However, ETF also expects a rapid return on value, and implementation from an agile perspective is also a Requirement (see VBI Overview) and shall be incorporated into the planning and implementation phases, and overall project. |
| Q42 | 1.10 Contract term | 15 | Given VBI development will need agile development due to loosely defined scope, will the cost be on Time and Material basis? |
| A42 |  |  | No. |
| Q43 | Security 5.5.7 | 17 | FedRAMP as applicable.  Is this a firm requirement? |
| A43 |  |  | As noted in the Requirement, FedRAMP is a requirement, if applicable. |
| Q44 | Security 5.5.7 | 17 | For the third party assessment, will the Hosting Partner’s SOC2 meet the requirement? |
| A44 |  |  | No. SOC2 will not be able to satisfy this requirement since it is not a security risk assessment. See the Security Requirements 5.5.7 and 5.5.8 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements). |
| Q45 | 2.3 Submitting Proposal | 18 | Form I: Cost Proposal is formatted for 8.5 x 14 (legal-sized paper) but the instructions ask for paper copy to be 11X14 paper. Please verify what size paper is required for submission. |
| A45 |  |  | The paper copy of Form I – Cost Proposal should be on 8.5 x 14” (legal size) paper. The instructions should read: “One (1) original (marked as such) and one (1) copy (both on 8.5 x 14” paper) of FORM I – Cost Proposal….” |
| Q46 | 2.4 | 18 | With the exception of Tab 4, all of the tabs have a label. May proposers label Tab 4 “Financial Statements and Samples”? |
| A46 |  |  | Yes. |
| Q47 | 2.4 | 19 | How many vendors have been selected to respond to this RFP? |
| A47 |  |  | Vendors have not been selected to respond to the RFP. The RFP is posted and vendors choose to respond. |
| Q48 | 2.4 | 19 | Can we subcontract to a company with headquarters outside the US? We will only use their employees who are physically present in the US. |
| A48 |  |  | Wis. Stat. s. 16.705 (1r) allows ETF to “purchase contractual services only if those services are performed within the United States.” If the employees from that subcontractor are performing the contractual services within the United States, ETF believes your company can subcontract with a company whose headquarters are outside of the United States. |
| Q49 | 2.4 | 21 | Would the State permit proposers to submit financial statements in electronic format only and eliminate the requirement to provide hard copies? |
| A49 |  |  | Yes. Proposers may submit financial statements in electronic format only, eliminating the requirement to provide hard copies. If Proposer desires to submit electronic financial statements, Proposer must include the electronic file within Proposer's USB flash drive containing Proposer's Proposal, as per Section 2.3, Submitting the Proposal. |
| Q50 | Hosting: 5.6.8 | 21 | What is the anticipated bandwidth? |
| A50 |  |  | The Contractor bandwidth shall be sufficient to meet ETF and DSE business requirements. As noted in the Functional Performance Standards (C.1) (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab C Performance Standards), the Contractor(s) shall provide quarterly reports on functionality and associated issues described in the Query/Navigation Speed and Performance standards. ETF and the Contractor(s) shall enter into a collaborative relationship; and as such, opportunities and methods to meet or exceed the Performance Standards Requirements shall be pursued. See Q&A 127. |
| Q51 | 5.7 Maintenance & Support: Overview | 23 | How many users of the system are to be supported?  Is there an anticipated call volume or you would like vendor to assume based on user base? |
| A51 |  |  | Given there are 22 DSEs, with up to four (4) users per DSE, ETF expects to have approximately 60-90 system users with minimal growth throughout the duration of the Contract, and the Contractor shall appropriately plan and staff for call volume based on the final number of system users and reasonable estimates, pending agreement by ETF and the Contractor. |
| Q52 | 6. General questionnaire | 26 | Is ETF open to a global-shore delivery model? |
| A52 |  |  | Wis. Stat. s. 16.705 (1r) allows ETF to “purchase contractual services only if those services are performed within the United States.” If by global-shore delivery model, the proposer is referring to using a hybrid service delivery system involving a combination of onshore (within the United States) and offshore resources, ETF believes that model would be contrary to the statute. If the proposer has a different plan in mind that the proposer believes is consistent with that statute, the Proposer may present such plan in its Proposal. |
| Q53 | Appendix 1 |  | It appears that ETF plans to have the DSEs submit enrollment data in an ANSI 834 format.  Unfortunately, this format is expensive for the DW/VBI vendors to process.  The design of databases for population-based health reporting requires eligibility tables based on one record per person per month.  This is the format we would prefer to have from the DSEs, and most of the national insurers and TPAs are familiar with that form of data submission.  Would ETF consider changing from the 834 to a single record per member per month format? |
| A53 |  |  | After the Department procures a DW/VBI vendor, the specific file format for the 834 file will be determined. |
| Q54 | Appendix 10 - TAB A |  | We understand from RFP documents that the source data submitted by DSE’s will be in standard format for all the DSE’s those are participating initially. Will EFT work with future DSE’s to make them adopt to the standard formats or ETF expects Vendor to co-ordinate with DSE’s for revised format adoptions in future? |
| A54 |  |  | ETF expects all DSEs to adopt the standardized data file formats that are agreed upon by the Contractor and ETF, including revisions and upgrades. In addition, it is ETF's expectation that the Contractor shall collaborate and provide training for end-users external to ETF (e.g. key DSEs at ETF's discretion). See also the Training Requirements in 5.10 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements). |
| Q55 | Technical Requirements (#5) | Page 2 | Page 2 of the Technical Requirements (#5): Is it a requirement that all analytics be “in database”?  Or is a hybrid model, where some is “in the warehouse” and some is modeled outside of it as part of the service, acceptable? |
| A55 |  |  | While it is not a requirement that all analytics are in-database, ETF expects the Contractor will architect the system to be performant such that it is able to handle rapidly increasing scalability requirements, and the best combination of approaches for achieving high performance at an optimal cost. See the Functional Requirement 5.4.8 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements) for further details. Note: the question references the "Technical Requirements (#5)", however, it is the Technical Questionnaire (#5) that addresses "in-database". |
| Q56 | Appendix 10 - TAB A | 2 | Is there any possibility of getting unstructured data (like multimedia files, blogs etc.) from any of the sources listed in the RFP? |
| A56 |  |  | The submission of unstructured data to the DW is not currently a planned aspect of this project. |
| Q57 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements Row 9 | RFP: Overview | Does EFT's DSEs need access to identified data via the portal or via the DW / VBI application? Typically the DSE will submit data to a FTP site and Contactor will process data accordingly with follow up questions provided directly to the DSE for investigation and resolution. |
| A57 |  |  | The Proposer is expected to propose the best solution that meets ETF business needs within the context of the RFP Requirements. See also Q&A 17, 26 and 77. |
| Q58 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | PM: 5.1.20 | "The Contractor shall cooperate with any successor ETF contractor and with ETF staff to provide all required transition services, including to ensure that all existing data are supplied and that any code and documentation needed to provide continuity of the project is supplied to ETF and de-identification and consolidation methods are fully transferred. Transition Services shall include meeting with the successor Contractor and devising work schedules that are agreeable for both ETF and the successor Contractor."  Contractor can provide raw data files, with the appropriate documentation, to EFT with approval from Data Submitting Entities. Only raw data files will be returned. Is this acceptable? |
| A58 |  |  | Regarding Project Management Requirement 5.1.20 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements) and the above statement/question, if this statement/question is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q59 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements | PM: 5.1.21 | "The Contractor shall, as directed by ETF at the conclusion of the Contract, supply ETF with copies of all consolidated and unconsolidated data from Data Submitting Entities (DSEs) in a comprehensive and organized manner, including written documentation of the contents of the data files."  Provider files and EMR/EHR data are not a standard data type and will be priced accordingly based on discussions with ETF regarding analytic and reporting requirements. Contractor can provide a range of fees for any additional implementation and ongoing updates. Is this acceptable? |
| A59 |  |  | As noted in the RFP Requirements (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements), ETF's overarching goal of the project is to enter into a Contract with Contractor(s) who will collaborate and partner with ETF in the development of a robust DW and VBI tool set. In reference to this statement/question, see RFP Project Management Requirement 5.1.21. In addition, if this statement/question is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q60 | Mandatory Reqs – Tab A | PM: 5.1.21 | What is the duration for keeping the data files of DSEs? |
| A60 |  |  | Unless otherwise agreed upon by ETF and the Contractor, ETF expects that data files shall be kept for the duration of the Contract. |
| Q61 | Mandatory Reqs – Tab A | Implementation: 5.2.19 | Does ETF have licenses for data modeling, version control, performance testing, stress testing, security etc ? Should we propose tools and their costs as optional? |
| A61 |  |  | ETF does not currently hold licenses for data modeling, version control, performance testing, stress testing, security, etc. and license costs should be included as part of the RFP Cost Proposal. See the Hosting Requirement 5.6, and the Maintenance Requirement 5.7.1 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements). |
| Q62 | Mandatory Reqs – Tab A | Functional: 5.4.100 | Who is going to do UATs? Will ETF of all DSEs provide analyst support for UATs? |
| A62 |  |  | UAT is expected to be performed by both the Contractor and ETF staff, yet test scripts, scenarios, use cases, training and a test environment shall all be performed and provided primarily by the Contractor. |
| Q63 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Functional: 5.4.115 | “The Contractor shall establish a support center and dedicated point(s) of contact to provide communication and technical assistance to ETF, DSEs' information management and other key staff. Requirements for operation of the support center including hours of staffing for the help desk, response time criteria, etc. shall be agreed upon by the Contractor and ETF.”  Contractor does not utilize a support center and will provide a dedicated support team to provide communication and technical assistance to ETF, DSEs and key staff. Additional account support can be managed through the Client Manager assigned to ETF. IS there a reason the DW and VBI team at ETF need a support center? own many users does ETF anticipate? |
| A63 |  |  | Given that there are 22 DSEs, with up to four (4) users per DSE, ETF expects to have approximately 60-90 users with minimal growth throughout the duration of the contract. Regarding the support center requirement and vendor question, if this question is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q64 | Mandatory Reqs – Tab A | Functional: 5.4.12 | What kind of SSO system (LDAP/ Active Directory etc.) is currently implemented by ETF and DSEs? |
| A64 |  |  | Given that there will be a minimum of twenty-two (22) data submission feeds and 22 DSEs, while it is understandable that the Contractor will want to leverage the SSO (or secure authentication with Single Sign-On) system each DSE has in place, a full assessment of SSO as part of IAM (identify and access management) will need to be conducted as part of the project planning and implementation by the Contractor. |
| Q65 | Appendix 10A: Functional: 5.4.14 | Page 9 | Can ETF provide more details on what type of documents/reports require version control (i.e., enabling documents to be locked and checked out)? |
| A65 |  |  | Project and implementation plans, data dictionaries, DW/VBI requirements and static reports are some examples of documents where ETF expects a tight change and version control policy and procedure in place by the Contractor. |
| Q66 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Functional: 5.4.15 | "If two Contracts are awarded pursuant to this RFP, the DW and VBI Contractors shall closely collaborate and cooperate with one another to get the cleaned, validated and enhanced data in the required format to perform VBI and analytics."  Contractor request to be the single source vendor for both DW and VBI tools. |
| A66 |  |  | This is not phrased as a question as required. As stated in the RFP, the Proposer may provide a Proposal that reflects a desire to provide both a DW solution and a VBI solution. |
| Q67 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Functional: 5.4.39 | The changes and updates shall be reflected in the data maintained on the secure website, which will act as a reference throughout the term of Contract. The data, once provided to Contractor via a secure FTP server, is maintained on Contractor owned and operated secure server. Contractor does not have a portal established for DSE's examination of data. Is it acceptable to ETF to work with Contractor to develop a portal that meets the needs of both ETF and DSEs in the future? |
| A67 |  |  | In reference to this question, see the RFP Functional and other Requirements as stated in the RFP, especially 5.4.85 through 5.4.90. If this question is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q68 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Functional: 5.4.42 - 5.4.50 | “The following Claims data specifications shall be followed:  Claims data shall be submitted to the DW in the ANSI ASC X12 837 Post Adjudicated Claims Data Reporting (PACDR) format:  1) Post-Adjudicated Claims Data Reporting: Professional (837P); 2) Post-Adjudicated Claims Data Reporting: Institutional (837I); and (See Appendix 4 - Data Specifications - Medical and Appendix 5 - Data Specifications - Dental).”  Based on more than 30 years of experience, Contractor will want to receive data in the DSE format that Contractor has experience working with. In the instance where Contractor is not familiar with the data from a DSE, Contractor and DSE should come to terms on a mutually acceptable format that will meet the needs of ETF. Is this acceptable to ETF? |
| A68 |  |  | As noted in the RFP Requirements, ETF's overarching goal of the project is to enter into a Contract with Contractor(s) who will collaborate and partner with ETF in the development of a robust data warehouse and visual business intelligence tool set. However, in reference to this question, see the RFP Functional Requirements as stated in the RFP, especially 5.4.85 through 5.4.90 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements). If this statement/question is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q69 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements and RFP | Row 9 - RFP Overview AND Functional: 5.4.43 --- RFP 1.3.2 | "In the first quarter of 2017, the DW shall be able to receive a minimum of twenty-two (22) data submission feeds. A list of ETF Data Submitting Entities (DSEs) can be found in Appendix 9. The Contractor DW system shall systematically collect, integrate and make available medical claims, pharmacy claims, dental claims, wellness, eligibility and provider files from health plans, Third Party Administrators (TPAs), ETF's Pharmacy Benefit Manager (PBM), and wellness and dental contractors."  Provider data and EMR/EHR data are not a standard data type and will be priced accordingly based on discussions with ETF regarding analytic and reporting requirements. Contractor can provide a range of fees for any additional implementation and ongoing updates. In addition, Contractor shall collaborate on and agree upon the creation of said Provider file specifications for submission to the DW by select DSEs. Contractor can also account for custom fields to the file format requirements as outlined in 5.4.43. Is this acceptable? |
| A69 |  |  | As noted in the RFP Requirements, ETF's overarching goal of the project is to enter into a Contract with Contractor(s) who will collaborate and partner with ETF in the development of a robust data warehouse and visual business intelligence tool set. In reference to these statements/this question, see the RFP Functional Requirement 5.4.43 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements). If this statement/question is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. All requirements of the RFP must be included in Proposer’s Cost Proposal. |
| Q70 | Appendix 10 - TAB A | 11 | Based on our understanding so far, ETF has not made any technology selection for platform implementation. Are there any preferences on technology platform or ETF is open for recommendations from Vendor? Is ETF open for open source technologies? |
| A70 |  |  | While ETF does not hold significant preferences regarding a technology, the RFP Technical and Reporting Requirements detail ETF's expectations regarding the system, platform and tool capabilities. In addition, and as noted in the VBI Requirement 5.9.37, ETF requires that the VBI Contractor system is able to integrate with FOSS (Free and Open-Source Software) where there are gaps in the out-of-the-box Contractor VBI tool capabilities that can be enhanced via the FOSS. |
| Q71 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Functional: 5.4.49 | “Denied Claims. Denied claims shall be included with all medical, dental and pharmacy claims file submissions. Denied Reason Code data fields shall be a required field and accurately populated in all denied claims.”  Contractor does not typically integrate denied claims and recommends integrating paid data for the purpose of analytic reporting. Can ETF provide reasoning on why denied claims should be included in the data warehouse? |
| A71 |  |  | For quality of care and other performance measures, it is standard practice to include denied claims in order to accurately capture all service utilization provided to members for performance measurement purposes, whether or not an organization paid for the services. For example, reporting services for which payment was denied because they were not properly authorized, yet the service was performed to a member. |
| Q72 | Mandatory Reqs – Tab A | Functional: 5.4.51 | Are DSEs going to provide sample data sets prior or to planning and analysis phases? Complexity of existing data models, and existing data quality issues will significantly impact implementation effort and be a major source of risk. |
| A72 |  |  | No. ETF does not currently have plans for DSEs to submit data files to the Contractor prior to planning and analysis phases of the project. See the Project Management, planning and Implementation Requirements for additional requirements and ETF expectations that relate to this question. |
| Q73 | Appendix 10 - TAB A | 26 | “Manage the inventory of rejected files and records and communicate with DSE information management staff regarding data validation issues.”  What will be the mode and frequency of communication with DSE information management staff regarding data validation issues? What will be the frequency and content of the 'validation report' that needs to be sent to ETF? |
| A73 |  |  | As noted in the Operational Reporting Requirements, Data Validation reporting shall be provided on a (minimum of a) monthly basis or upon DSE data submission. In the event that a DSE is resubmitting a data file as a result of a failed submission, the Data Validation reports will need to be re-run for the same DSE, pending a file resubmission. The method and mode utilized to exchange Data Validation Reports with DSEs shall be agreed upon by ETF and the Contractor. |
| Q74 | Appendix 10 - TAB A | 11 | As the success of DW and Analytics programs lies in the quality of data provided by data submitters, we believe that data quality validation has to happen while bringing data onto platform.  As part of data quality validation, data that doesn’t meet minimum data quality requirements is often rejected and sent back to data submitter for their validation and correction. Will ETF own the coordination with the data submitters for getting data corrected of it is expected from vendor to coordinate and get the corrected data from submitters? |
| A74 |  |  | As noted in the Functional Requirements 5.4.31 through 5.4.40, the Contractor shall work with DSE information management and other staff to ensure timely compliance and data file submissions. In addition, the Contractor shall identify problems related to extracts, data conversions, formatting, etc. and work with DSE information management and other staff to develop remedies. See also the PEP Requirements 5.3.1 through 5.3.4 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements), and Operational Reporting Requirements for Data Validation (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab B Reporting Requirements) for further details. |
| Q75 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Functional: 5.4.66 | “The Contractor(s) shall provide the ability to track data lineage throughout the entire solution, for both the DW and VBI solutions. This shall include ETL (data importing and quality cleansing, and relational transformations), data warehouse (query access and dimensional modeling), and reporting (report data access per application and data source users; see also the Reporting Requirements).”  Can ETF provide an example of a data lineage document to make sure Contractor is interpreting question correctly? |
| A75 |  |  | ETF will provide the awarded Contractor with complete and accurate data lineage reports and other documents for ETF's eligibility/membership data. |
| Q76 | Mandatory Reqs – Tab A | Functional: 5.4.8 | Users, concurrent users, and data volume and ingestion rate are different dimensions of scaling. Should we demonstrate usage scalability assuming that the data volume is static and no other applications (e.g., ETL overflow runs, in database analytics, report updates, rare long running queries etc.) are running? |
| A76 |  |  | Contractor(s) shall demonstrate the flexibility to quickly scale performance based on a fluctuating workload, and the flexibility to scale levels up or down to accommodate usage peaks and low points. Observed and actual performance shall be measured and monitored, shall support changing throughput, and the number of active and passive users, as noted in the Requirements. See also Q&A 55. |
| Q77 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements and RFP 1.3.2 | 5.A, line 6 | Please define the Portal? Does EFT expect DSE to have access to the portal to examine data or to obtain a status of data feeds? Does ETF or DSE's expect to view identified claims data via the Portal? |
| A77 |  |  | See the Functional Requirement 5.4.85 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements). Authorized end user DSEs shall minimally have access to the portal to submit monthly data files, obtain the status of data submissions (see Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab B Reporting Requirements) for details, and access supporting materials and documentation (e.g. data dictionaries and training documents). As noted in the Requirements, ETF shall only have access to de-identified data, yet DSEs shall have access to identified data for members or program participants who are enrolled in their health plan or TPA. |
| Q78 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Functional: 5.4.85 - 5.4.90 | “The Contractor shall manage and host a secure portal, or other secure method agreed upon by ETF and Contractor, for access by ETF, ETF designated users, all DSEs and their designated users, and the Contractor. The Contractor shall facilitate access to the portal. The highest industry standard authentication protocols shall be used by the Contractor.”  The Contractor does NOT support a portal or any method for which a ETF or DSE can access as outlined in 5.4.87. Questions and issues regarding DSE's data files will be managed real time by Contractor via email or telephone on a daily basis with updates tracked through project plans and weekly meetings. Is it acceptable to ETF to work with Contractor to develop a portal that meets the needs of both ETF and DSEs in the future? |
| A78 |  |  | As noted in the RFP Requirements, ETF's overarching goal of the project is to enter into a Contract with Contractor(s) who will collaborate and partner with ETF in the development of a robust data warehouse and visual business intelligence tool set. However, in reference to this question, see the RFP Functional Requirements as stated in the RFP, especially 5.4.85 through 5.4.90 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements). If this question is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q79 | Appendix 10 - TAB A | 13 | For DSE portal access there is need to make data de-identified. Does ETF has any preference towards data masking/ obfuscation algorithms or ETF is open to vendor recommendations? |
| A79 |  |  | The Contractor shall supply data element-level de-identification software or other methodology as required by ETF. In addition, the de-identification software or method shall be agreed upon by ETF and the Contractor, and reviewed and approved for use by ETF prior to implementation. See the data de-identification Functional Requirements 5.4.73 through 5.4.85 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements) for additional details. |
| Q80 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Functional: 5.4.86 | "The portal, or other ETF agreed upon method, shall encrypt all data in accordance with the HIPAA and the HITECH Act, including but not limited to the following:  1) Contractor shall have a secured FTP (set) site that DSEs can use to transmit (post) data; 2) The Portal shall meet best practice industry security encryption standards for data in motion; 3) The Portal shall meet best practice industry security encryption standards for data at rest; 4) A process shall be created by which DSEs can contact and receive technical assistance from the Contractor (at no charge to the DSEs) to resolve data encryption or other issues; and 5) The Contractor shall periodically assess and, in consultation with ETF, update encryption methods to ensure that they meet the highest industry standards (see also the Security Requirements section for additional security details)."  The Contractor does routinely support a portal or any method for which a ETF or DSE can access for reporting as outlined. Technical issues will be managed real time by Contractor via email or telephone on a daily basis with updates tracked through project plans and weekly meetings. |
| A80 |  |  | This is not phrased as a question as required. If this statement is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q81 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Functional: 5.4.87 | "The portal, or other ETF agreed upon method, shall be a web-based mechanism by which DSEs securely transmit data to the DW. The portal will be used by ETF and the Contractor to track the progress of DSE data submissions. The portal or other agreed upon method shall allow DSEs to minimally perform the following:1) Practice the data submission process in a “test environment,” and receive approval from ETF to ensure that the change is tested and working correctly, prior to promotion to production;2) Upload properly formatted data files, encrypt files in motion for transfer, and transmit those files securely to the DW;3) View all data quality and validation reports (e.g. see also "DW Value Added" section);4) Apply for, and check the status of, waiver, format, or extension requests received from DSEs;5) Access supporting documentation and training materials (e.g. data dictionary, data submission information and methods, and data submission training and related video materials) shall be made available to DSEs via the portal;6) View their data submission progress;7) Resubmit data as necessary; and8) Manage DSE-specific user access to the Portal." Is it acceptable to ETF to work with Contractor to develop a portal, or another agreed upon method, that meets the needs of both ETF and DSEs in the future? |
| A81 |  |  | As noted in the RFP Requirements, ETF's overarching goal of the project is to enter into a Contract with Contractor(s) who will collaborate and partner with ETF in the development of a robust data warehouse and visual business intelligence tool set. However, in reference to this question, see the RFP Functional Requirements as stated in the RFP, especially 5.4.85 through 5.4.90 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements). If this question is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q82 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; PM: 5.1.20 | Functional: 5.4.9 | "The Contractor hosted DW shall: 1) Provide a select group of ETF staff with direct query access to all DW de-identified data, including the physical tables and crosswalk (yet not the crosswalk or lookup table containing identified data) or lookup tables located in the DW (not just views); 2) Allow ETF users direct access to the DW; 3) Monitor and track all system usage by users for auditing purposes; 4) Track and store run times for all queries; 5) Allow identified ETF users to run, modify and schedule queries directly against the DW; 6) Allow ETF users to save work; and 7) Allow ETF users to create data views and tables."  Specific to #1, Contractor will not provide direct access to DW de-identified data, including physical tables and crosswalk. Contractor can work with ETF to determine requirements of identified data and determine an acceptable solution. Is this acceptable? |
| A82 |  |  | No. If this question is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q83 | Appendix 10A | 5.4.9 | What is the estimated number of ETF staff with requested direct query access? Please verify if said queries will be written in SQL language. Is it possible to place limitations on the number of records queried? |
| A83 |  |  | ETF expects that less than ten (10) ETF staff will have direct query access. In addition, query language and any query limitations will be agreed upon by both ETF and the Contractor. |
| Q84 | Appendix 10 - TAB A | 14 | Kindly provide the expected data volume from each DSE or any other data source that would be loaded into the DW. |
| A84 |  |  | Currently, ETF does not receive data files from any DSE, and as a result, the expected data volume by DSE and data file submission would be speculative (e.g. based on the ETF population per DSE, and state or national claims per member averages). |
| Q85 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Functional: 5.4.98 | “The Contractor shall accept iterative rounds of testing until extractions conform to the intended format and content.”  Contractor typically allows a round of testing on test files and a second review of production data. Is it ETF expectations that DSE can submit data numerous times for review? Will ETF direct clients to submit data that has been reviewed internally by the DSE? |
| A85 |  |  | ETF expects clean, validated data. ETF will encourage cooperation from the DSEs with ETF and the Contractor. |
| Q86 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Functional: 5.4.99 | “The Contractor shall perform an extensive data testing process during the initial rounds of data submissions, utilizing an ETF agreed upon method.”  Can ETF provide a sample or outline of their data testing process? |
| A86 |  |  | The Operational Reporting Requirements (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab B Reporting Requirements) regarding "Data Validation" and "UAT, Development & Production" provide details on Contractor-expected data testing and data validation. |
| Q87 | Functional:  5.4.99 | Functional:  5.4.99 | Please provide clarification on the ETF agreed upon method for data testing. As per, ‘The Contractor shall perform an extensive data testing process during the initial rounds of data submissions, utilizing an ETF agreed upon method |
| A87 |  |  | See Q&A 86. |
| Q88 | Mandatory Reqs – Tab A | 5.6 Hosting: Overview | Assuming four environments 1. Development Environment 2. Testing 3. Production Environment 4. Disaster Recovery Environment/s. Please confirm if we require any other environment, i.e System Integration, any additional development instances are required. |
| A88 |  |  | ETF expects the Contractor to provide, host, manage and maintain an adequate number and type of environments to meet the requirements of the RFP. |
| Q89 | Appendix 10 - TAB A | 21 | Although production environment requirements are clearly laid out, it is not clear how the Development (DEV), System Integration Testing (SIT) and User Acceptance Testing (UAT) environments should be configured and maintained. Does ETF expect vendor to size and define the needs of non-Production environments? Please confirm. It is assumed that vendor will host and manage non-Production environment as well, please confirm. |
| A89 |  |  | See Q88. |
| Q90 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Value Added: 5.8.15 | “Contractor shall document all methodologies noted in this requirement. Such documentation must:1) Be fully transparent as to the methodology used by the Contractor;2) Allow for reproduction of the method;3) Support DW users (e.g. data dictionaries with plain English and technical definitions of each element); and4) Be updated as revisions are deployed.”  Contractor may not be able to allow for reproduction of methodologies as requested in 2) due to the complex assignment of fields and data logic. Contractor can reveiw logic with ETF or Consultant in detail if requited. |
| A90 |  |  | This is not phrased as a question as required. If this is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q91 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Value Added: 5.8.16 | “AHRQ's HCUP CCS:  Contractor's system shall support the use of Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ's) free HCUP Clinical Classification Software (CCS) single level grouper (website: http://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/tools\_software.jsp), and shall create and populate CCS grouper fields based on its application to the data warehouse claims data.”  Contractor does not support the use of AHRQ's and uses the Symmetry suite of clinically-based analytic methodologies built into the VBI application to support analyses relating to the overall health of the population. Does ETF expect Contractor to provide the data for AHRQ or to process data using AHRQ methodology? |
| A91 |  |  | Regarding the Value Added Requirements 5.8.16 through 5.8.18, ETF expects the Contractor to enhance or process the claims data submitted by DSEs utilizing AHRQ's methodology, rather than provide data to/for AHRQ. Given the statement that the "Contractor does not support the use of AHRQ's...", if this is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q92 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Value Added: 5.8.16, 5.8.17; 5.8.18 | Regarding the 3 AHRQ requirements, does ETF have certain requirements to use AHRQ? Does EFT need data to process data for AHRQ's methodology themselves or is it expected for Contractor to process the data using AHRQ methodology? |
| A92 |  |  | Per the Value Added Requirements overview, the Contractor shall employ industry standard tools and methodologies to enhance the claims and other data loaded into the DW by implementing several value-added component Requirements. Thus, ETF expects the Contractor to process and enhance the claims data received using the AHRQ algorithms. These components must be integrated into the DW in such a way as to allow ETF staff to access them and include them in data queries and analysis, and shall also be made available to the VBI Contractor or tool in a format required for data visualizations, dashboards and analytics. |
| Q93 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Value Added: 5.8.17 | “AHRQ's HCUP CCI: Contractor's system shall support the use of Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ's) free HCUP Chronic Condition Indicator (CCI) (website: http://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/tools\_software.jsp), and shall create and populate CCI indicator fields based on its application to the data warehouse claims data.”  Contractor does not support the use of AHRQ's in the DW and uses the Symmetry suite of clinically-based analytic methodologies built into the application to support analyses relating to the overall health of the population. Is this acceptable? Is AHRQ a requirment? Does ETF expect Contractor to provide the data for AHRQ or to process data using AHRQ methodology? Is this acceptable? |
| A93 |  |  | See Q&A 91 and Q&A 92. |
| Q94 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Value Added: 5.8.18 | AHRQ's HCUP CCS-Services and Procedures: Contractor's system shall support the use of Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ's) free HCUP Clinical Classification Software (CCS) for Services and Procedures (website: https://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/toolssoftware/ccs\_svcsproc/ccssvcproc.jsp), and shall create and populate CCS-Service and Procedures grouper fields based on its application to the DW claims data.  Contractor does not support the use of AHRQ's and uses the Symmetry suite of clinically-based analytic methodologies built into the VBI application to support analyses relating to the overall health of the population. Is this acceptable? Does ETF expect Contractor to provide the data for AHRQ or to process data using AHRQ methodology |
| A94 |  |  | See Q&A 91 and Q&A 92. |
| Q95 | Appendix 10 - TAB A | 32 | "Compliance with State and Federal requirements as it relates to data contained in the DW". We assume that ETF SME will be available for clarification on the State or Federal requirements? |
| A95 |  |  | Yes. See Requirement 5.8.2 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements). |
| Q96 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Value Added: 5.8.21 | Preventable Analytics: Contractor's system shall create claims indicators, code and description fields, and clinical segmentations/groupings for the following:1) potentially preventable admissions (e.g. ACSC's or PPIA's);2) all-cause and potentially preventable readmissions;3) potentially preventable emergency department visits; and4) potentially preventable complications. Contractor does not support the standard grouping defined and can work with EFT to create specific reporting templates specific to Preventable Analytics. |
| A96 |  |  | This is not phrased as a question as required. If this is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q97 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Value Added: 5.8.22 | “Ambulatory Patient Grouper: Contractor's system shall assign Ambulatory Patient Group logic to claims (e.g. 3M's EAPG's).”  Contractor does not support the use of APGs and uses the Symmetry suite of clinically-based analytic methodologies built into the VBI application to support analyses relating to the overall health of the population. Is this acceptable? Does ETF require Contractor to provide the data for AHRQ or to process data using AHRQ methodology? |
| A97 |  |  | If this statement is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. Further, the above question references AHRQ, yet the Requirement specified is regarding enhancement of claims utilizing an APG methodology. |
| Q98 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Value Added: 5.8.24 | Health Care Performance Metrics: Contractor's system shall support the user ability to generate the list of quality of care and related measures noted in the Reporting Requirements. Numerator and denominator detail data for each measure shall be available at the following segmentations: member level, with member demographic details such as age and gender, hospital/facility, health plan, product, line of business, provider medical group/clinic, and individual provider and provider specialty). The list of measures, rates, numerators and denominator results (including detail data for each measure) shall be run and refreshed quarterly.  Can ETF provide a sample report package for review? |
| A98 |  |  | See Appendix 8 – Sample Healthcare Performance Metrics for a sample set of measures. |
| Q99 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Value Added: 5.8.25 | “Health Care Performance Metrics Provider Ranking: Contractor's system shall support the user ability to rank individual providers (and by provider segmentations) based on Appendix 8 – Sample Health Care Performance Metrics and actual/observed rate, expected rate, difference, variance rates, and standard deviations above and below the expected rate.  Can ETF provide a sample report of the Provider ranking? Does the results in the Appendix need to produced by a HEDIS certified engine? |
| A99 |  |  | The provider report noted in this question does not yet exist, and as a result, a sample report cannot be included in this response. In addition, while NCQA certified HEDIS measure reporting is preferred by ETF, HEDIS-like measures are acceptable. The Proposer is expected to describe its health care measurement reporting capabilities in its proposal. |
| Q100 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Value Added: 5.8.26 | “Fee Schedule: Contractor's system shall support the use of physician and provider fee schedule costs for distinct service procedures, and the fee schedule shall be made available for analysis within the VBI system.”  Contractor will provide post adjusted claims in DW for reporting and analytics. Contractor does not provide a Fee Schedule in the VBI system and this is considered above and beyond what is generally required of a DW and VBI solution. How does ETF want to use a fee scheduled is the context of a DW or VBI? Contractor does have a deep bench of Consulting experience to support analytics around fee schedules. |
| A100 |  |  | If this statement is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. In addition, the Contractor should describe its capabilities in detail in its Proposal to ETF, including those related to the specified Requirement. |
| Q101 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Value Added: 5.8.5 | “Unique Physician Identifier: Creation, insertion, attributes file: The Contractor shall attribute patients to primary care providers and maintain a master provider directory. This involves creating unique healthcare provider and healthcare facility identifiers that will enable accurate member and claims record links to unduplicated healthcare organizations and practitioners across Payers. Contractor shall classify healthcare providers by taxonomy code using the National Plan and Provider Enumeration System (NPPES). Specifications include, but are not limited to, the following: 1) Create/adopt unique physician identifier to denote a given physician throughout the DW. 2) Create new fields in the dataset with physician name/ID (e.g. NPI) on claim with unique physician identifier. 3) Develop an attributes file that records: a) unique physician identifier, b) name, c) specialty, d) other attributes provided to Contractor by ETF and/or health plan. Unique physician identifier shall be capable of being cross walked to other attribute files. The Contractor shall unify the physicians history and determine the most current information, including unifying physicians with name changes, variants and differences in spelling, where possible. The process for creating a unique physician identifier shall be approved by ETF prior to final implementation.”  Contractor does not use a separate provider file to assign a unique Physician Identifier. Contractor uses the information from the claim provided from processing and will work with the DSE for any data issues including blank or invalid physician identifier. Is this acceptable to ETF? Does ETF currently encounter issues with Physician Identifiers? |
| A101 |  |  | Regarding the Value Added Requirement 5.8.5 specified and the statement that the "Contractor does not use a separate provider file to assign a unique Physician Identifier", if this statement is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. In addition, the Proposer should describe its capabilities in detail in its Proposal to ETF, including those related to this Requirement. |
| Q102 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Value Added: 5.8.7 | “Unique Entity Identifier: Creation, insertion, attributes file: Contractor's system shall include: 1) Create / adopt unique entity identifier to denote a given entity throughout the DW. 2) Create a new field in the dataset with other entity name/ID (e.g. TIN) on claim with unique entity identifier. 3) Develop an attributes file that records: a) unique entity identifier, b) name, c) other attributes provided to Contractor by ETF and/or health plan. The unique entity identifier shall be capable of being cross walked to other attribute files. The Contractor shall unify the entity history and determine the most current information, including unifying entities with name changes, variants and differences in spelling, where possible. The process for creating a unique entity identifier shall be approved by ETF prior to final implementation.”  Contractor does not use a separate provider file to assign a unique Entity Identifier. Contractor will use the information from the claim and will work with the DSE on any data issues including blank or invalid entity identifier. Is this acceptable to ETF? Does ETF currently encounter issues with Entity Identifiers? |
| A102 |  |  | If this question is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. Entity reporting with integrated data (e.g. claims, membership, wellness, biometric, etc.) does not exist at ETF, and as a result, this portion of the question cannot be fully addressed. |
| Q103 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Value Added: 5.8.8 | “Attribute health practioners practicing under a physician's license to the physician: Where a claim is void of physician name due to services being rendered by a health practitioner practicing under the physician's license, the Contractor shall accurately denote the unique physician identifier on the claim.”  Contractor does not attribute a health practioner under a physician. Is this critical to ETF? How is this used for reortng currently? |
| A103 |  |  | Regarding the Value Added Requirement 5.8.8 specified above and the statement that the "Contractor does not attribute a health practitioner under a physician", if this statement is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. This reporting does not currently exist at ETF, and as a result, this Requirement is not being used currently. |
| Q104 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | VBI: 5.9.14 | “Exception Reporting: Contractor's system shall have the ability to generate reporting alerts to end-users as a result of critical business events, as custom defined by business end-users.”  Can ETF define what a critical business event is? Contractor's tool does have alerts built in based on analytic measures when compared to normative information and across time periods. |
| A104 |  |  | As noted in the VBI Requirements Overview (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements), analytic and visual agility is the ability for business intelligence and analytics to be fast, responsive, flexible and adaptable, and improved analytic agility supports a flexible model that allows end users to define critical events and corresponding alerts based on current business needs and criteria. |
| Q105 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | VBI: 5.9.15 | “Web-based Authoring: Contractor's system shall include a secure web-based tool that can build reports using Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP) enabling web sharing and display.”  Contractor provides Web-based analytic reporting application is an interactive and visually robust reporting system consisting of dashboard, templates and custom "ad hoc, build your reports". VBI tool does not allow for building of reporting using HTTP. Does ETF need this for specific reports? Would ETF need a solution developed? |
| A105 |  |  | While VBI Requirement 5.9.15 notes HTTP, the primary focus of the Requirement is the functionality and performance centered on web-based authoring, report building, sharing, display and end user customization. The web portal requirements are detailed in the Functional Requirements 5.4.85 through 5.4.90 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements), as well as noted in several other sections. See also Q&A 17, 26, 77 and 79. |
| Q106 | Mandatory Reqs – Tab A | VBI: 5.9.28 | Is the discovery process related to providing assisted search capabilities or generating prescriptive insights? |
| A106 |  |  | The data discovery and exploration capabilities include among others both the ability to search for predictive and prescriptive modeling, patterns and insights as well as specific items or data in a data set. |
| Q107 | VBI:  5.9.28 | VBI:  5.9.28 | Please clarify ETF’s definition of “relevant information” as per ‘Data Exploration and Discovery: Contractor's system shall facilitate the discovery of relevant information.’ |
| A107 |  |  | See Q&A 106. |
| Q108 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | VBI: 5.9.29 | “Geolocation Analysis and Visualizations: Contractor's system shall provide the ability to handle maps, drill down to information based on a specific region, county, zip code, or use data that is automatically refreshed according to a specific location (e.g. location intelligence). Contractor's system shall also have the capability to associate geographical coordinates (latitude and longitude) with address information to be referenced on a map and to obtain derivative geographic data relationships including, but not limited to proximity calculations, standard and custom boundary-based analysis, and historical review.”  Contractor does not have the capability to associate geographic coordinates with address information for reporting. Contractor does have capability to report and drill down on Maps specific to zip code related data. Will ETF need to include address and geographic coordinates as part of the DW solution? Typically this is not included in the DW due to privacy concerns. |
| A108 |  |  | Yes. Regarding the VBI Requirement 5.9.29 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements) and the statement that the "Contractor does not have the capability to associate geographic coordinates with address information ...", if this statement is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. See Q&A 79. |
| Q109 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | VBI: 5.9.37 | “Integration with free and open-source software (FOSS) and/or integrated development environment (IDE) programming: Contractor's system shall allow key end-users to integrate FOSS with the VBI tool where there are gaps in the out-of-the-box Contractor VBI tool capabilities that can be enhanced via the FOSS and/or IDE (e.g. R-Studio, Apache, Hadoop, Apache Spark, Python, KNIME, RapidMiner). This capability shall allow for a more flexible environment and for lower cost outlays for core software, and avoid complex and costly customizations and workarounds required to meet key ETF business objectives.”  Contractors VBI's tool does not allow end users to integrate FOSS software. Special reporting or data requests can be managed via the Client Manager assigned to ETF. The VBI tool is a powerful combination of reporting including the integrated data warehouse with a personalized reporting structure and FOSS is typically not a requirements of the DW solution. Can ETF provide some examples of what key end users want to intergrate outside of the 22 data feeds? |
| A109 |  |  | ETF cannot provide examples at this time. Regarding the VBI Requirement 5.9.37 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements) and the statement that the "Contractors VBI's tool does not allow end users to integrate FOSS software.", if this statement is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. Rather than to enhance data beyond the DSE data file submissions, this Requirement allows for a more flexible environment and for lower cost outlays for core software, and avoids complex and costly customizations and workarounds required to meet key ETF business objectives. |
| Q110 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | VBI: 5.9.38 | “External Integration: Pending agreement by both ETF and the Contractor and in the context of other cost effective Contractor-proposed solutions to achieve similar goals, the Contractor solution shall allow for external data source integration that include flat files, or other, non-warehouse databases, to assist in supporting ad hoc analytics.”  Contractor's system currently does not allow ad hoc integration of external data sources into the DW or VBI tool but external data can used in conjunction with data exported from the VBI tool. What type of external data is ETF interested in integrating? Contractor can develop a solution to meet ETF needs with more information. |
| A110 |  |  | External data may be integrated in Phase 3. Regarding VBI Requirement 5.9.38 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements), if this statement is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. A system capable of supporting this Requirement will allow ETF to facilitate supporting future ad hoc analytic reporting needs and business requests in a scaled fashion. |
| Q111 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | VBI: 5.9.42 | “Time-Based Scheduled Reporting: Contractor's system shall have the ability to send out reports to multiple locations at defined time intervals.”  Contractor's system currently does not send out reports at a pre-defined time but can send out reports at any time based on user actions. Is this acceptble? |
| A111 |  |  | No. Regarding VBI Requirement 5.9.42 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements), if this statement is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q112 | Appendix 10 - TAB A | 32 | As per this section, the contractor's system shall have the ability to search databases to find reports. Does this search happen for all databases or select few that the Privileged users of the system shall have access to? |
| A112 |  |  | The search capabilities are inherently limited by the authorized end user level of access. |
| Q113 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | VBI: 5.9.49 | “Mobile Device Secure Support: Contractor's system shall provide a secure mobile platform access for iOS, Android, or other mobile devices. Contractor's system shall allow alerts/notifications to be sent to handheld devices.”  Contractor's system currently does not currently support Mobile Device Secure Support currently but is a planned future capability for late 2017. Is that acceptable? |
| A113 |  |  | Regarding VBI Requirement 5.9.49 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements), if this statement is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q114 | App. 10, Tab A: 5.9.5 5.9.6.e 5.9.34 5.9.37 Others | 30 30 32 32 | There are numerous requirements in Tab A that are technologically inconsistent with a COTS-based approach. A COTS approach is valuable because it provides it provides a high degree of functionality without expensive and risky customized software development. However, several requirements are appropriate only for one-off custom developed systems, not COTS solutions. Would ETF consider making these requirements optional, deleting them, or allowing the bidders to describe reasonable alternative approaches that are more consistent with the purchase of COTS solutions? Listed below are examples of the requirements of concern:  5.9.5: Development environment [to] support web svcs  5.9.6.e: Provide all purchased programming code 5.9.34: Compatible APIs to integrate other services 5.9.37: FOSS and IDE programming |
| A114 |  |  | Regarding the VBI Requirements noted, the Proposal should fully articulate and explain Proposer’s suggested approach, system and solution in the overall context of ETF's business needs and RFP Requirements. If this question is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q115 | Appendix 10 - TAB A | 30 | It is not clear if there are any department specific (within ETF) reporting requirements which need clear segregation (with possible restricted access/ usage) from other reporting requirements. If there are any such department specific reports/ dashboards, please provide details. |
| A115 |  |  | In the context of the RFP Security, Functional and Reporting Requirements (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements), the Contractor shall collaborate and participate with ETF in the development of detailed specifications and those who can access these reports, depending upon the end-user role, access, and the content of the report data. See also Q&A 128 for further details regarding Content and Role-Based Access Controls. |
| Q116 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Training: 5.10.5 | “In consultation and agreement with ETF, the Contractor shall provide training in multiple environments that shall include, but are not limited to, User Acceptance Testing (UAT), Development and Production.”  Contractor does not have separate UAT testing environment. All data will be tested and signed off prior to loading the DW and user acceptance testing can be performed. Is this acceptable to ETF? |
| A116 |  |  | The Proposer’s response shall fully articulate and explain their end user training in all environments within the proposed system available to the end user(s). If this question is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q117 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Training: 5.10.12 | “The Contractor shall plan and provide UAT training to ETF, prior to UAT.”  Contractor does not have separate UAT testing environment and will provide training in the production environment allowing full access to usable data. Contractor will not load any data until signed off by ETF. IS this acceptable? |
| A117 |  |  | The Proposer’s response shall fully articulate and explain their end user training in all environments within the proposed system available to the end user(s). If this question is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. |
| Q118 | Appendix 10 - Mandatory Requirements; | Training: 5.10.13 | “The Contractor shall develop help desk diagnostic scripts to aid Contractor help desk and ETF IT personnel in diagnosing problems.”  Contractor does not utilize a help desk for DW and VBI services. Contractor provides a dedicated team to support ETF with highly qualified, experience members. Does ETF require a help desk model? How many users are ETF anticipating? |
| A118 |  |  | See Requirements 5.10.13 and 5.2.24 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements). If this question is Proposer’s assumption/exception, please include it in Tab 3, Assumptions and Exceptions, of your Proposal. See responses to Q51, Q63 and Q131. |
| Q119 | App. 10, Tab A, Section 5.11 | 34-36 | These extensive escrow requirements cannot be fully met with a privately developed COTS solution. Such solutions include all of the mainstream analytical systems in the healthcare market. We request that ETF remove references to “source code” in all the escrow specifications; only object code can be escrowed. Also, we request clarification that the definition of Release Event be the bankruptcy or default of the Contractor. In addition, would ETF consider defining “purchased” as used in requirements 5.11.1 and 5.11.5 to exclude proprietary and commercial off-the-shelf software that is licensed from the maker? If the reason for these detailed requirements is to maintain continuity should the vendor fail, then please allow the bidders to propose alternative continuity approaches that protect ETF and offer a more practical benefit for the agency. |
| A119 |  |  | ETF shall receive a royalty free perpetual license to all software developed by Contractor(s) for ETF as part of the Contract. Such licenses shall extend beyond termination of the Contract. All software licenses of COTS software purchased by Contractor(s) on behalf of ETF to satisfy the Contract shall be transferred to ETF at no additional charge to ETF upon termination of the Contract. |
| Q120 | In Appendix 10 | Tab A, Escrow:  5.11.16 | Please clarify, does ETF expect to have system/DW access during the 180 day run-out period of the program? |
| A120 |  |  | Yes, ETF expects system access during this run-out time period. |
| Q121 | App. 10, Tab A 5.11.16 5.11.20 | 35 | Regarding Turnover services, Section 5.11.16 says that the Contractor must provide at no cost 180 days of run-out services after the contract termination date. That appears inconsistent with Section 5.11.20 which says ETF will pay a reasonable hourly fee for the services. Pleased clarify. We assume that an hourly fee applies, since it would be impossible to price now a fixed fee for un specified future services. |
| A121 |  |  | Remove Requirement 5.11.20. Proposer is required to build in the cost of the 180 days of run-out services into their Proposal. |
| Q122 | Appendix 10 - B. Reporting Requirements | Appendix 7 - Plan Utilization and Rate Review Information - Preventable, Wellness, Provider, Pharmacy, Health Care Performance Metrics Reporting, Management and Administrative | Can ETF provide a sample of the reports outlined in Appenix 10-B and noted in Column C? |
| A122 |  |  | The reports listed in the RFP have not yet been developed, and the intention of the RFP is that these reports shall be developed in collaboration between ETF and the Contractor. |
| Q123 | Appendix 10 - TAB B |  | ETF is looking to develop standard reports and visualization layer to facilitate predefined reporting capability. Appendix 10 –Tab b describes Data operation reporting and Analytic and Dashboard1. Has ETF already finalized these requirements or expects vendor to elaborate requirement from the level of information shared? |
| A123 |  |  | In the context of the RFP Reporting Requirements, the Contractor shall collaborate and participate with ETF in the development of detailed specifications for these reports. |
| Q124 | App. 10, Tab B  Health Care Performance Metrics Reporting | 5 | HEDIS Reporting – The RFP is somewhat unclear as to whether ETF requires the DW/VBI contractor to provide a comprehensive set of actual HEDIS reports as created by an NCQA-certified HEDIS reporting system. This would add significant cost to the solution.  If a complete set of HEDIS reports from the DW-VBI contractor is ETF’s requirement, please tell us how many separate entities must we calculate the measures for?  Also, HEDIS measures generally are reported annually, yet the RFP requirement mentions quarterly. That would add even more expense. Does ETF intend for the HEDIS measures to be re-calculated 4 times each year, is once a year sufficient, since HEDIS-like measures in the interim would be available? |
| A124 |  |  | The RFP Analytic Reporting Requirements (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab B Reporting Requirements) and Appendix 8 - Sample Healthcare Performance Metrics, contains a sample of healthcare performance metrics that are based on HEDIS measures. As such, it is ETF's intention that the Contractor shall develop a subset of HEDIS (or HEDIS-like) and other identified quality metrics/measures. However, it is not ETF's expectation that the Contractor should develop a comprehensive set of HEDIS (or HEDIS-like) measures. The final measures to be reported shall be provided to the final Contractor, and shall be re-calculated quarterly. See the response for Q99 as well. |
| Q125 | Appendix 10 - C. Performance Standards | Appendix 10 - C. Performance Standards | “The Contractor must guarantee performance sufficient to fulfill the needs of the Contract. The Contractor must meet all performance standards listed in this Appendix 10C - Performance Standards. After the Contract start date, if additional resources are needed, the Contractor will bear all costs necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Contract.”  Are the Performance Standards negoitatioble? |
| A125 |  |  | No. The paragraph immediately above Table 5 – No Assumptions or Exceptions on Page 20 of the RFP states: “ETF will not allow any assumptions or exceptions by the Proposer to any of the items listed in Table 5 below.” The performance standards that appear in Appendix 10, Tab C are listed in Table 5. |
| Q126 | Mandatory Reqs – Tab C | ETL Reqs. | ETL success depends on covering all data format types and potential missing or mismatching keys. Is there a warm up period (e.g., 3 months after deployment) to fairly enforce ETL success criteria to be fair since all DSE errors would require some time to appear? |
| A126 |  |  | Data validation, data cleaning, data quality and data file submissions rules shall be strictly enforced for all DSEs for a length of time required to demonstrate data submissions of sufficient quality. |
| Q127 | Mandatory Reqs – Tab C | Performance Reqs. | Query and response performance depends on active sessions, concurrent users and applications, and actual workload. The requirement can only be satisfied under some workload assumptions. Will you define or allow defining such assumptions? |
| A127 |  |  | As noted in the Functional Performance Standards (C.1) (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab C Performance Standards), the Contractor(s) shall provide quarterly reports on functionality and associated issues described in the Query/Navigation Speed and Performance standards. ETF and the Contractor(s) shall enter into a collaborative relationship, and as such, opportunities and methods to meet or exceed the Performance Standards Requirements shall be pursued. See responses to Q63 and Q76. |
| Q128 | Appendix 11 – TQ | 1 | Will ETF keep all the administrators rights – or will data submitting entities have their own admins to moderate their own roles and users? |
| A128 |  |  | Per the Functional Requirements in 5.4.9 through 5.4.14 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements), ETF expects the Contractor will facilitate a Content and Role Based Access Control (C/R-BAC) system to manage administrator roles, and to delegate permissions to the DSE users. While the administration system will be agreed upon by the Contractor and ETF, each DSE is currently expected to have an administrator to facilitate user role access with the Contractor. |
| Q129 | Appendix 11 – TQ | 1 | What kind of user types and roles are expected, in terms of complexity of role management, e.g., will there be any more complex rights other than basic read/modify rights on objects? |
| A129 |  |  | See the Security and Functional Requirements for further user roles and management details, as well as the reply for Q128.  The system shall enable content-based permissions to be configured in order to control what system features and data that users can access (e.g. Table, Column, and Row Level Security permissions). The system shall be able to restrict user access rights to functionality and data based on end-user profiles. In addition, the Contractor shall employ least-privilege, role-based access to ensure that users have access to only the functions and data required and authorized, and shall apply to all users of the website, the employees of the Contractor, and all subcontractors, and shall be applied at all layers of the system (e.g. web, application, database and network). |
| Q130 | Appendix11-TechnicalQuestionnaire | 1 | We assume that the term "Product" used in technical questionnaire can be custom developed solution for the RFP requirements and need not be Commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) product. |
| A130 |  |  | The Proposer is expected to propose a best practice solution within the context of ETF's expressed business needs and the overall RFP Requirements. |
| Q131 | Appendix 11 – TQ | 2 | In database analytics requires access rights to database objects and computational resources. Hence, in order for proper sizing, it is important to know what type of analytics would be done (e.g., bulk scoring on large tables) and the number of users that may run ad hoc models. |
| A131 |  |  | Given there are 22 DSEs, with up to four (4) users per DSE, ETF expects to have approximately 60-90 users with minimal growth throughout the duration of the Contract. Regarding peak utilization and in-database analytics, see Q&A 25. As a notable caveat and per the data flow diagram noted on Table 3 of the Requirements (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements), of all DSEs, ETF alone will have access to the both the DW and VBI environments, and all other DSEs shall only have access to the VBI layer. See the Reporting Requirements (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab B Reporting Requirements) for examples of the expected reports and analytics that ETF is expecting to initially conduct as part of this project. |
| Q132 | Appendix 11 - TQ | 5 | Time between data submission and actionable insights is a function of data quality, data format complexity, and data amount. Could you provide estimate for the amount of data to flow into the data warehouse, and what percentage of such data might be non-tabular such as in the form of JSON, XML, text and so on? |
| A132 |  |  | See the response to Q76 regarding the expected performance flexibility to scale Contractor system, and ETF's response to Q84 regarding expected data volume per DSE. |
| Q133 | Appendix 11, Q 38 & Q 50 | Pages 5 & 12 | Can ETF provide more details on the ‘verifiable proof of concept’ (POC)? 1) Would the POC leverage a subset of production data, all production data, test data? 2) When would/could the POC be targeted for completion?  a. During evaluation period, pre-contract award?  b. Pre-implementation, post-contract award?  c. During implementation?  d. Post-implementation, as side projects while solutions are in production? 3) Would these POC’s or pilots be separately priced as time and materials (e.g., included under consulting) or would ETF expect these delivered as part of scope of services? |
| A133 |  |  | Selected Contractor(s) will be asked to partner with ETF to complete and demonstrate a verifiable proof of concept (POC) or pilot for ETF's DW-VBI solution, based on ETF's criteria. This will be the opportunity for the Contractor(s) to demonstrate the capability of their systems to align with ETF requirements. |
| Q134 | Appendix 11 - Technical Questionnaire | Data Warehouse Questions; page 11 | How does EFT plan to embed the product? Is EFT planning on embedding the VBI to internal or external sources? See Q 75. Embedded Delivery: Explain the ability of the product to be embedded in third-party applications? |
| A134 |  |  | Embedded VBI is expected to allow significant customization that allows end users to author reports that combine data from multiple data streams to fit business, analytic and reporting needs. As part of the Technical Questionnaire (Appendix 11), ETF expects the Proposer to describe its system and solution to determine the best method to meet the RFP Requirements and ETF's business needs. See the VBI Requirements in 5.9 (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements) and the Reporting Requirements (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab B Reporting Requirements) for further details. |
| Q135 | Appendix 11 – TQ | 6 | What kind of legacy application support is expected? Is legacy support need only to ensure compatibility between Contractor’s implementation in the current and future states, or are there any existing legacy application that we need to import, integrate, or migrate from? |
| A135 |  |  | The Contractor is not expected to provide direct support for ETF legacy systems, applications, hardware or software. However, should ETF undergo a data source system migration from a legacy system to a new data source system or environment, additional data validation of expected eligibility/membership data file submissions shall be accommodated by the Contractor. |
| Q136 | Appendix 11 – TQ | 6 | Most common methodology for entity matching and record deduplication is to apply fuzzy similarity measures against structured data field and records. Do you need any more complex applications that require extracting data from flat text through NLP techniques? |
| A136 |  |  | Standard entity resolution, matching, data deduplication, and record linkage algorithms should be sufficient to meet the requirements of the RFP. However, there are common open source and dual-license products which address both "entity resolution" and "named entity recognition" capabilities, should the need for additional capabilities arise. |
| Q137 | Appendix 11 – TQ | 8 | Could you please provide an estimate for the number of portal, dashboard, and analytics users? Could you also add what percentage of growth in the number of those users? Moreover, what percentage of such users are expected to be concurrent at average and peak conditions? |
| A137 |  |  | Given there are 22 DSEs, with up to four (4) users per DSE, ETF expects to have approximately 60-90 users with minimal growth throughout the duration of the Contract.  Regarding peak conditions and utilization, see Q&A 55. As a notable caveat and per the data flow diagram noted on Table 3 of the Requirements (Appendix 10 – Mandatory Requirements Tab A Technical Requirements), of all DSEs, ETF alone will have access to the both the DW and VBI environments, and all other DSEs shall only have access to the VBI layer. |
| Q138 | Appendix 11 - Technical Questionnaire | Data Warehouse Questions; page 14 | Does ETF have a sense of how often Consulting services might be needed or requested? Contractor offers various options depending on the client's needs. Is it ETFs intent to utilize Segal for the majority of consulting services? See Q 78. What types of consulting do you offer, and how many hours are included in a standard contract, and at what cost? |
| A138 |  |  | As noted in the RFP, ETF expects the Contractor(s) will be a strategic partner, and that ETF and all ETF vendors shall work collaboratively. |
| Q139 | Exhibit 2, 17.0 Assignment | 2 | Can assignment to affiliates be made without the prior consent of the State of Wisconsin? Is it possible for the Contractor to be given the right of prior consent for any assignment of the agreement by the State of Wisconsin? |
| A139 |  |  | No. Section 17.0 of Exhibit 2 pertains to any assignment. ETF is not willing to provide prior consent to a contractor for any assignment under this agreement. |
| Q140 | Exhibit 2, 32.0 Hold Harmless | 3 | Can the indemnification language be mutual, as well as limited to a material breach or gross negligence or willful misconduct by either party? |
| A140 |  |  | No. The paragraph immediately above RFP Table 5 – No Assumptions or Exceptions on Page 20 of the RFP states: “ETF will not allow any assumptions or exceptions by the Proposer to any of the items listed in Table 5 below.” Section 32.0 of Exhibit 2 is listed in Table 5. |
| Q141 | Exhibit 4, 16.0 Termination | 4 | Is the State of Wisconsin willing to change the termination provision so that it does not take effect until after the first year of the agreement? |
| A141 |  |  | No. The paragraph immediately above RFP Table 5 – No Assumptions or Exceptions on Page 20 of the RFP states: “ETF will not allow any assumptions or exceptions by the Proposer to any of the items listed in Table 5 below.” Section 16.0 of Exhibit 4 is listed in Table 5. |
| Q142 | Exhibit 4, 17.0 Termination for Cause | 4 | Can the termination for cause language be made to be mutual? |
| A142 |  |  | No. The paragraph immediately above Table 5 – No Assumptions or Exceptions on Page 20 of the RFP states: “ETF will not allow any assumptions or exceptions by the Proposer to any of the items listed in Table 5 below.” Section 17.0 of Exhibit 4 is listed in Table 5. |
| Q143 | Exhibit 4, 18.0 Remedies | 5 | Is it possible to make the Remedies section mutual and have a mutually agreeable timeframe for the cure period? |
| A143 |  |  | No. The paragraph immediately above Table 5 – No Assumptions or Exceptions on Page 20 of the RFP states: “ETF will not allow any assumptions or exceptions by the Proposer to any of the items listed in Table 5 below.” Section 18.0 of Exhibit 4 is listed in Table 5. |
| Q144 | Exhibit 4, 22.0 Confidential Information | 6 | Can the Contractor notify the State of Wisconsin only in the cases of confirmed data breaches? Can the Contractor be given a longer period for notification of such a breach? |
| A144 |  |  | No. No. |
| Q145 | Form C |  | If a vendor is not proposing a subcontractor, may we omit submitting Form C Subcontractor Information with the proposal? |
| A145 |  |  | No. If you are not proposing any subcontractors, please write “none” on the form, sign it, and return it. |
| Q146 | Form I Cost Proposal | Tabs 2 and 3 | Will the State consider allowing vendors to enter a rolled up price in the Requirements line item rather that at each detailed item? The details are very granular and not all activities can be accurately separated from other activities. |
| A146 |  |  | Proposers shall utilize the Cost Proposal (Form I) as is, and provide a detailed breakdown by line item as indicated. |
| Q147 | General | General | Is contractor free to choose any cloud infrastructure provider that satisfies the requirements in order to build the system upon? |
| A147 |  |  | The Contractor is free to choose any cloud infrastructure provider that satisfies the RFP requirements, with the following ETF caveats and expectations: that the cloud infrastructure provider system shall have a high degree of inherent functionality and will be sufficiently compatible with the Contractor/subcontractor systems such that it will enable seamless or near-seamless functionality allowing for a high degree of end-user system or tool ease of use, plus a high level of security. |
| Q148 | General |  | What are the requirements / limitations for onsite vs offsite work? |
| A148 |  |  | Onsite staff is not a requirement of the RFP. Proposers are welcomed to provide onsite staff as part of their Proposal. |
| Q149 | General |  | The Technical Requirements document makes many references, explicit and implied, to the “Contractor system”.  Should this be interpreted as ETF prefers a ready-made solution?  Or should we interpret this as ETF simply wanting to know our recommended approach to the system we will implement for it? |
| A149 |  |  | ETF anticipates that the Contractor shall have an established system in place that is also responsive, flexible and adaptable. As noted in the Requirements, the system shall provide an improved analytic agility to support a flexible model that allows end users to customize analytics and dashboards based on current business needs and criteria. |
| Q150 | General |  | Can ETF provide us with averages of the daily (or weekly or monthly) data volumes of records received for pharmacy, wellness, medical, dental, and provider? |
| A150 |  |  | ETF does not currently receive any data feeds from the Data Submitting Entities (DSEs) noted in the RFP, and thus, cannot provide average daily or other data volumes. |
| Q151 | GENERAL |  | Does ETF perceive or see any conflict with a respondent also having consulting relationships that involve, among other services, rate setting with some of the regional and national contracted health plans that work with the State ETF? |
| A151 |  |  | ETF will need to have more information about the specific nature of the consulting relationships with those regional and national health plans in order to determine whether we believe there is a conflict of interest. |
| Q152 | N/A | N/A | Does ETF currently have a Data Warehouse vendor? How does ETF currently obtain reporting? Is it from each individual DSE? |
| A152 |  |  | ETF does not currently have a DW contractor, yet does have member eligibility, membership and benefit related data source systems that are used for ETF reporting. |
| Q153 | N/A | N/A | How many users will be utilizing the VBI tool? |
| A153 |  |  | Given there are 22 DSEs, with up to four (4) users per DSE, ETF expects to have approximately 60-90 users with minimal growth throughout the duration of the Contract. |
| Q154 |  |  | The current platform envisions integration data from various data sources and multiple data submitters. Will member demographics data be provided by each submitter directly to DW platform? or ETF will have member demographic data which will be used as source? Also can your clarify if a golden record for member to get complete 360 degree view is required as part of Phase 1 vision? |
| A154 |  |  | Per Table 1 in the RFP Technical Requirements, as a DSE, ETF will submit eligibility and membership data to the DW. See also the Value Added Requirement 5.8.6 to address the master member record/identifier question. |
| Q155 | Generic |  | Are you planning to award both projects ETF0004 & ETF0006 to same vendors or are you open for a multi-vendor strateg? Are you open to award Application and Infrastructure scope of work to different vendors or it will go to same vendor? |
| A155 |  |  | As noted on page four (4) of the RFP, ETF intends to use the results of this RFP process to award one or more Contracts for the solutions described below: 1) ETG0004 – Data Warehouse (DW) and 2) ETG0006 – Visual Business Intelligence (VBI). Proposers may respond to ETG0004, or ETG0006, or both. If responding to both ETG0004 and ETG0006, the response must be submitted in one comprehensive Proposal. It is the Proposer’s responsibility to ensure that the responses clearly provide the relevant information for each solution. |
| Q156 | Generic |  | Does ETF have their own User Experience(UX) team/ format or will they need the Vendor to provide that support? |
| A156 |  |  | As noted in the RFP, ETF's overarching goal of the project is to enter into a Contract with Contractor(s) who will collaborate with ETF in the development of a robust data warehouse and visual business intelligence tool set. As such, ETF expects the Contractor to lead User Experience (UX) design, yet collaborate with ETF. |
| Q157 | Generic |  | Does ETF have SMEs/ Business Owners who will be available at different stages of project – Requirement elicitation, Data Owners, User Acceptance, etc? |
| A157 |  |  | The expectation is that the Contractor shall collaborate with ETF business owners, and Subject Matter Experts (SMEs), and key DSEs during all phases of the project (e.g. minimally including the planning, development, implementation and production phases). |
| Q158 | N/A | N/A | Would ETF provide an estimate of the number of system users that would be ETF employees and, if applicable, the number of system users that are employees of other agencies or ETF contractors? How many of these users might be at the executive level or otherwise need only dashboard indicators or summary information, and how many users might be full-time analysts requiring access to all features and functions including claim-level detail data? (This question does not pertain to the data submission entities accessing the data submission portal.) |
| A158 |  |  | Given there are 22 DSEs, with up to four (4) users per DSE, ETF expects to have approximately 60-90 users with minimal growth throughout the duration of the Contract. In addition, ETF expects that less than ten (10) ETF staff will have access to the Contractor system, with approximately five (5) executive staff requiring dashboard or scorecard level access with the remainder requiring access to all features and functions. |
| Q159 | N/A |  | There are often challenges with obtaining data from fully insured plans, because of issues related to data ownership and issues related to capitated care (encounter records instead of claims).  Does ETF have contractual agreement from all of its data submitters to provide the data? Does ETF anticipate any difficulties obtaining the necessary data from its vendors?  If it does, are there plans in place to mitigate the difficulties and can you explain them? |
| A159 |  |  | ETF's health plan business partners will be under contract to send ETF's DW Contractor claims data on a monthly basis, and ETF and the Contractor shall collaborate to ensure DSE data submission compliance. |
| Q160 | N/A |  | Would the Department provide the bidders with an estimate of its budget for the DW/VBI contract?  This information would allow the bidders to propose solutions that are certain to meet your budget constraints.  Letting the vendors know your budget would not necessarily mean that all bids would propose 100% of the budgeted amount; bidders still face the powerful forces of competition and the lowest price still earns 25% of the score. |
| A160 |  |  | There is no approved budget for the DW/VBI initiative. The DW/VBI RFP is one of several RFPs outlined in the Benefit Consultant November 10, 2015 Report to the Board (Second Report) (Table 2 of Section 1.2.2 of the RFP) meant to contain future cost increases and improve health outcomes while increasing the efficient delivery of quality health care to health plan members. |
| Q161 |  |  | Would an extension on the due date be considered? |
| A161 |  |  | No, an extension will not be considered. |
| Q162 |  |  | Has the Department determined a funding source for this effort? If so, are you able to indicate which source(s) will be used? If not, are you able to indicate which source(s) will be looked at? |
| A162 |  |  | Yes. The DW/VBI project will be funded by an administrative fee that will be paid by employers and employees as an add-on to health insurance premiums. |
| Q163 |  |  | Did the Department have any third party help with development of this RFP? If so, are you able to provide the name of the vendor? |
| A163 |  |  | The Department had minimal assistance from third parties in the development of the RFP. The Department posted a DW/VBI RFI in June and received feedback from vendors, much of which was incorporated into the RFP. |
| Q164 |  |  | Will the Department hire any third party contracts to assist with this effort, such as QA, Project Management, etc.? If so, please indicate which services would be utilized and how the Department will contract for them. |
| A164 |  |  | At this time, the Department has no plans to hire contractors for the project. See Functional Requirement 5.4.100 for further information. |

END

This Addendum is available on ETF’s Extranet at <http://etfextranet.it.state.wi.us/etf/internet/RFP/rfp.html>.