

Connecticut Health Insurance Exchange Projects 2-3 Comments for Posting

Questions (dated October 18, 2011):

Q1. Can you tell me what is the place of performance of this contract? Can workstream work be done at vendors's facility?

Answer: Vendors are not required to work at the place of performance and can work out of their own facilities, but may be required to attend meetings and/or make presentations at state offices in Hartford, CT.

Questions (dated October 20, 2011):

Q2. Can you tell me the location of this contract? Do you require labors on site?

Answer: Please see the response to Question 1.

Questions (dated October 24, 2011):

Q3. Can you confirm this contract is at location of Bridgeport of CT?

Answer: Please see the response to Question 1.

Questions (dated 10/31/11):

Q4. Will bidding solely as a Sub-contractor be deemed a "non-responsive" or "incomplete" bid when only sub-sections of the RFP are being bid on? And, how should a Sub-contractor present and label a partial bid for submission?

Answer: We are seeking a prime contractor organization that will maintain full project ownership and be responsible for all deliverables from the entire team. We expect that proposers may assemble an interdisciplinary team consisting of one or more organizations with certain task performed by subcontractor organizations. A subcontractor presenting a proposal as a partial bid will not be accepted.

Q5. Does being teamed with a Workstream I or II Contractor assure selection as a Sub-contractor, or will the Selection Committee choose the best individual responses regardless?

Answer: Please see response to Question 4.

Q6. In bidding solely as a Sub-contractor, is the Sub-contractor disadvantaged by not directly teaming with a Workstream I or II bidder; or will the State partner the Sub-contractor with the chosen Contractor(s)? Or, will the State contract directly with the Sub-contractor?

Answer: Please see response to Question 4.

Q7. If bidding as a Sub-contractor on sub-sections of both Workstreams, will one combined bid submission be acceptable or must two bids be submitted; one for each Workstream?

Answer: Please see response to Question 4.

Q8. If contracted as a Sub-contractor through the chosen Contractor, should the Sub-contractor expect to be asked to provide separate reports to the State or will all reports be submitted to the Contractor for review, editing and submission to the State as a portion of the Contractor's report?

Answer: Please see response to Question 4.

Q9. If a Sub-contractor bidding on sub-sections of the RFP has Certified Minority Business Enterprise status or Small Business Enterprise status in the State of Connecticut, how should the status be noted and documented in the bid submission?

Answer: Please see response to Question 4.

Q10. Will the State review and consider proposed exceptions and additions to the standard contract language contained as part of a vendor proposal?

Answer: A prospective vendor may propose exceptions and additions, however, there are certain provisions that are not negotiable, e.g. jurisdiction and sovereign immunity. These are examples only and are not intended to encompass the universe of contract terms that are non-negotiable. Further, the RFP states: "All proposers must be willing to adhere to the following conditions and must positively state this in the proposal by completing the **OPM Vendor/Bidder Profile Sheet (OPM-A-15, June 2008)**."

If a prospective vendor desires to modify the standard contract language it would be a factor in the evaluation of the vendor's overall response to the RFP:

"The State reserves the right to award in part, to reject any and all bids in whole or in part for misrepresentation or if the proposer is in default of any prior State contract, or if the bid or proposal limits or modifies any of the terms and conditions and/or specifications of the RFP."

Q11. The proposal does not appear to have an RFP number in it. Is there an official RFP number that we should reference in our proposal?

Answer: You may refer to this proposal as Level One Establishment Project 2-3

Q12. Exhibit C lists the deliverables due to the State in September 2011 as part of the planning grant research. The content of those deliverables contain important information necessary to understand the scope for the current RFP. Can the State please post the deliverables so potential bidders can have the same understanding of Connecticut's Exchange as the vendor(s) who performed the planning grant research?

Answer: Please reference our website: www.ct.gov/opm/exchangegrant for information on Exchange planning. The Planning Grant period was extended therefore the deliverable outcomes are not yet available.

Q13. Exhibit C mentions that Mercer was the prime contractor for the planning grant research. Can the State please itemize the subcontractor(s), if any, used by Mercer to perform the planning grant research and IT gap analysis?

Answer: Mercer Health and Benefits, LLC is the prime Contractor for Connecticut's Planning Grant. Mercer has subcontracted with HMA and Oliver Wyman.

Q14. Has the State begun the activities necessary to accommodate the changes in Medicaid eligibility necessitated by the new MAGI rules? If so, can the State please provide a summary of the activities to date?

Answer: No, the State has not begun any activities to accommodate the changes in Medicaid eligibility necessitated by the new MAGI rules.

Q15. One of the dependencies for this RFP is the IT Gap Analysis produced as part of the planning grant. Can the State provide a copy of the IT Gap Analysis?

Answer: Please see the response to Question 12.

Q16. One of the dependencies for this RFP is the IT Gap Analysis produced as part of the planning grant. In a typical Health Insurance Exchange (HIX) verification and validation of data is performed using the Federal data hub and State data sources. Can the State please let us know how many State data sources and Departments the HIX will be required to interact with?

Answer: This has yet to be determined.

Q17. The RFP states, "As with most Exchange projects nationally, the establishment effort is likely contingent on APD and IAPD project schedules related to modernization of our Medicaid eligibility and enrollment systems". Is it in the scope of this RFP to assist the State with preparation of the APD documents required to secure funding to modify the Medicaid Eligibility system?

Answer: It is not anticipated, but may be considered as an option.

Q18. At this time, what work products and/or IT planning/design documents or software components does the State plan to leverage from the New England States Collaborative Insurance Exchange Systems (NESCIES)?

Answer: Connecticut hopes to leverage components from the NESCIES initiative as applicable. Specific components have not been identified yet. Connecticut realizes that there is significant potential in terms of reusability in the design and development of the State's technical approach and applications.

Q19. As with all State Exchanges, it will be necessary for multiple Departments/Agencies to be involved. The RFP mentions several existing State Departments/Agencies such as the Office of the

Healthcare Advocate (OHA), the Connecticut Insurance Department (CID) and the Department of Social Services (DSS). Can the State please enumerate a comprehensive list of the State Departments/Agencies that the winning vendor will be required to interact with to complete the scope of work? Please include the role/interest for each Department/Agency.

Answer: The primary agencies involved are CID, DSS, and OHA. Other agencies that may be involved include, but are not limited to, the Bureau of Enterprise Systems Technology (BEST), Department of Public Health (DPH) and Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS).

Q20. Has a comprehensive actuarial analysis been completed and are the results of that analysis available for review. The RFP mentions the need to have two simultaneous workflow streams, one for development and one for business process. Does the state have a preferred methodology in mind to balance both efforts across potentially different vendors? If not how will the State determine which methodology will be used when provided with two or more options?

Answer: The methodology used will be dependent on what the successful bidder proposes.

Q21. Can the State please describe how points will be allocated for each of the evaluation criteria.

Answer: No

Q22. Does the scope of the RFP include requirements development for SHOP Exchange functionality? If so, has the state decided if it will create a single Exchange to perform the functions of both the SHOP and Individual Exchanges, or if separate Exchanges will be developed? If the state has decided, which approach have they selected?

Answer: The Exchange Board of Directors has not made these decisions. Please see the response to Question 12.

Q23. Does the scope of the RFP Workstream I include requirements development for eligibility determination for the Exchange subsidies (tax credits and cost-sharing), the new income-based Medicaid and CHIP eligibility categories, non-income-based Medicaid and CHIP eligibility categories, and other social services programs?

Answer: The Scope of the RFP Workstream I includes requirements development for eligibility determination for Exchange related subsidies of premium tax credits and cost sharing reductions.

Q24. Does the scope of the RFP Workstream II include assessment of existing conditions and requirements development for customer support services and functions for the Exchange, the new income-based Medicaid and CHIP eligibility categories, non-income-based Medicaid and CHIP eligibility categories, and other social services programs?

Answer: The scope of the RFP work stream II includes assessment of existing conditions and requirements developments for Exchange related consumer support services and functions.

Q25. Will the state consider responses that propose different sequencing and timelines for tasks within Workstream I and Workstream II than those that are presented in the RFP on pages 18 and 19, as long as they fit within the proposed RFP timeline of January 3, 2012 through August 14, 2012?

Answer: The general times that are identified in the Scope of Services represent what Connecticut feels is most appropriate for our Exchange development and planning initiatives.

Q26. The Workstream I schedule on page 18 indicates that Task Area 5.0 should be completed during Project Month 8. Task Area 5.0 includes all tasks from publishing the RFP to post-award support. Moreover, page 19 states that the work is expected to be completed by August 14, 2012, suggesting that Project Month 8 consists of 14 days. Can you please explain how the RFP can be approved internally, issued, vendor responses received and evaluated, a contract negotiated, and post-award support for contracting and project start-up within Project Month 8?

Answer: We are looking for a Contractor that is able to be responsive to this general timeframe.

Q27. Due to the large volume of our financial data (over 200 pgs), would the State consider accepting our two (2) most recent annual financial statements via a website link or on a CD?

Answer: The prospective vendor must, at a minimum, provide one hard copy of each of the two most recent annual financial statements. Additional copies on a CD Rom coinciding with the number of responses required to be submitted would be acceptable. A website link is not acceptable.

Q28. Does the State have a required tool for documentation of Business Processes, Use Cases and/or Requirements? If so, will the State provide the Contractor staff access, including any required software licenses?

Answer: We do not have a required tool for documentation of Business Processes, Use Cases and/or Requirements. There are many high quality use case and requirements management tools available on the market today, including inexpensive open-source tools. Please use your proposal response to make a recommendation as to the tool or tools that you will be using. We will not be providing you with a specific requirement, nor access to pre-paid software licenses.

Q29. This section requires a proposer to state that it accepts the State's Standard Contract Language. There are some provisions in the Standard Contract Language that we would like the opportunity to negotiate with the State if we are selected as the successful bidder.

1. May we take exceptions to certain provisions in the State's Standard Contract Language?
2. May we condition our acceptance of the State's Standard Contract Language on the opportunity to negotiate certain provisions with the State if selected as the successful proposer?

Answer: Please see the response to Q10.

Q30. This section indicates that the RFP is not an offer and that no rights are conferred on any proposer until a contract is fully executed by the parties. Will the successful proposer have an opportunity to negotiate the terms and conditions of the contract resulting from this RFP?

Answer: Please see the response to Q10.

Q31. Based upon the requested services, it seems as though this RFP is not for a “large state construction or procurement contract.” Can the State confirm that the requirements of Connecticut General Statutes §1-101q do not apply to bids in response to this RFP or the resulting contract?

Answer: This RFP does qualify as a large state procurement project as it is estimated that the cost of such project would exceed \$500,000.00 in accordance with Section 4-250(4) of the Connecticut general statutes and additionally Governor Rell’s Executive Order 7(c) which establishes a threshold of \$50,000.00. In addition, Section 9-612 establishes the threshold at \$50,000.00 as well.

Q32. This section requires information regarding subcontractors if the bidder intends to subcontract specific services. We sometimes contract with individuals or consulting firms to provide services to us in a staff augmentation role. These independent consultants may provide a portion of the proposed services for this project. Would the State consider these independent consultants to be “subcontractors” as used in this section?

Answer: Yes.

Q33. The Contractor is required to deliver insurance certificates which “shall provide that no less than thirty (30) days advance notice will be given in writing to the State prior to cancellation, termination or alteration of said policies of insurance.” Our insurers will not guarantee 30 days notice of cancellation, termination or alteration for anyone other than our company, the primary insured. As a result, our insurance certificates will not include a provision for notice directly to the State. However, we can agree to provide such notice to the State should it ever become necessary. Can this requirement be modified to allow such notice from the Contractor as an acceptable alternative?

Answer: Yes, but the thirty day notice rule would still be in effect. Any prospective vendor would need to identify a process by which the State would receive notice in order to comply with this requirement.

Q34. With reference to "our SDLC approach", beyond the examples of best practice SDLC on page 14 of the RFP, can you please explain the States standard for SDLC approach and provide a link to any State IT guidance documents.

Answer: State IT policies and standards are issued and governed by the Bureau of Enterprise Systems and Technology (BEST) within the Department of Administrative Services. Please see BEST's IT Policy Resource website at the following URL for a list of State policies and standards:

<http://www.ct.gov/best/cwp/view.asp?a=1245&q=253994&doitNav=|&bestNav=|>

Regarding State standards for SDLC, please see the document "Policy for the Management of State Information Technology Projects, Version: 1.00" available at the above website.

Please note that there has been a change in agency name and reporting structure. The Department of Information Technology is now the Bureau of Enterprise Systems and Technology (BEST). We have recently updated our website to reflect the change but we are still in the process of updating all of the content within the site. Please consider all references to Department of Information Technology or DOIT to be the Department of Administrative Services, Bureau of Enterprise Systems and Technology.

Q35. Would a participant in Connecticut's Insurance Exchange Planning grant contract team (led by Mercer) be precluded from bidding on this RFP?

Answer: Yes, a participant would be prohibited from bidding in accordance with Section 1-101nn of the Connecticut general statutes.

Q36. Will the state consider an extension of the proposal deadline since answers of bidder questions are not released until November 7?

Answer: No