

RFP Questions and Clarifications Memorandum

To: Vendors Responding to RFP Number 3777 for the Mississippi Division of Medicaid (DOM)
From: Craig P. Orgeron, Ph.D.
Date: October 26, 2015
Subject: Responses to Questions Submitted and Clarifications to Specifications
Contact Name: Patti Irgens
Contact Phone Number: 601-432-8223
Contact E-mail Address: patti.irgens@its.ms.gov

RFP Number 3777 is hereby amended as follows:

1. Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 5.4 – 5.4.2 are being added:

- 5.1 The Vendors must respond to each specification in Section VII, Technical Specifications with a narrative description. The description must include the following:
- 5.1.1 A description of the methodology to be followed in accomplishing each requirement, in order to demonstrate the Vendors understanding of this RFP.
 - 5.1.2 Information about past performance results for similar work in a Medicaid environment; lessons learned from those projects and how they will be applied to this project.

2. Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 7.12.1 is being modified to read:

The selected contractor will **provide help desk services**, follow a standard escalation procedure and develop a best operation practice guide to ensure that:

3. Section VIII, Cost Information Submission Form is being replaced with the attached, Revised Cost Information Submission Form. All references to the 'Cost Information Submission Form' are replaced with, 'Revised Cost Information Submission Form'.

Vendor must include in their proposal a response to each amended requirement as listed above. Vendor must respond using the same terminology as provided in the original requirements.

The following questions were submitted to ITS and are being presented as they were submitted, except to remove any reference to a specific vendor. This information should assist you in formulating your response.

Question 1: Section IV, Item 18

Can a fully negotiated and executed teaming agreement that defines the services being provided by a proposed subcontractor suffice as the agreement executed between the parties? Normally, a subcontract agreement is executed post-award to ensure it includes all negotiated final terms and conditions of the prime contract.

Response: No, as stated in Section IV, Item 18, copies of any agreements to be executed between the Vendor and any subcontractors must be included in the Vendor's proposal.

Question 2: Section IV, Item 37

Given the requirement of Liquidated Damage penalties for the inability to meet various SLAs as well as a payment withhold requirement, would the State consider removing the requirement for a Performance Bond as sufficient protection for the State is already provided with the two other aforementioned protections?

Response: No, both will apply. As addressed in Exhibit A, Article 38 Liquidated Damages are set at \$500.00 per day for each day of delay in delivery or completion of the project. They don't represent the owner's actual damages but are established in the contract as a substitute for actual damages. They should represent the most realistic forecast possible of what the actual damages are likely to be.

The Performance Bond is a binding promise from a bonding company that promises to perform those obligations of the contractor, when the contractor fails to perform its obligations, in an amount up to but not exceeding the amount of the bond. A performance bond protects the State from financial loss should the contractor fail to perform the contract. The bonding company promises, for a price paid by the contractor and passed through to the public again in the amount of the bid, to perform the contract at the price agreed to in the contract if the contractor itself fails to do so. If the contract contained liquidated damages, the surety would also be responsible for paying those damages to the owner in the event the project is not completed on time.

Question 3: Section IV, Item 40

Is this paragraph implying that the anticipated budget for this initiative is only \$250,000? If not, please clarify the expected budget and whether this expenditure has already been approved by the legislature.

Response: No, that is referring to a protest bond. As a condition preceding to filing a protest, the Protestor must provide a Protest Bond as described in the ITS Procurement Handbook and RFP No. 3777. However, all State agency budgets are considered public record and may be viewed at www.dfa.ms.gov.

Question 4: Section VII, Item 2.2

Does the State wish for the vendor also to be the system integrator for ongoing operations of the SaaS environment?

Response: The Vendor will be responsible for implementation of the solution as well as ongoing SaaS and helpdesk efforts. The cost of the services must be listed as a separate line item on the attached Revised Cost Information Submission Form.

Question 5: Section VII, Item 2.2

If so, will the costing sheets be updated to allow for post-implementation ongoing support costs?

Response: Yes, please see the attached Revised Cost Information Submission Form.

Question 6: Section VII, Item 2.3

Does the DOM have a technology standards policy in place or a preference for a technology platform?

Response: DOM does not have a preference beyond the inclusion of the technologies specified in the RFP.

Question 7: Section VII, Item 2.5

Where it mentions developing a “configurable set of rules to allow for authorization, data mapping, and message routing” – does this pertain to the actual data integration/transformation to be conducted within the ESB (i.e., the code)? Is this owned and managed by the vendor? Does DOM play a part in the build-out and support of these functions? If not, how do necessary SLAs get defined to protect both parties?

Response: Rules and a rules engine will be required due to the disparate data and data sources in this project. The Vendor and DOM will jointly develop these rules, to be implemented by the vendor.

Question 8: Section VII, Item 3.1

Please share the details of the Health Information Technology interoperability vision and strategy.

Response: As indicated in the RFP, this strategy is detailed in the State Medicaid Health Information Technology Plan (SMHP). This document is available at:

<https://www.medicaid.ms.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/StateMedicaidHealthInfoTechPlan.pdf>

Question 9: Section VII, Item 3.2

What will be transitioned out of the existing State Medicaid Health Information Technology Plan (SMHP) that impacts this project?

Response: There is no plan to transition out any components of the SMHP.

Question 10: Section VII, Item 3.2

Does the ESB conduct any inbound message transformations, or is this all handled by MS-HIN?

Response: At this time, the ESB will not perform any message transformations. It is DOM’s requirement that the application(s) to support message transformation, including any required licenses, be included in the Platform and integration so that they may be configured and utilized in the future.

Question 11: Section VII, Item 3.2

Can MedeAnalytics utilize FHIR or RESTful web services today, or is this a future capability?

Response: DOM currently supports RESTful web services for a single stakeholder interface and FHIR is a roadmap item that is not currently used by DOM. It is a DOM requirement that the Vendor support both technologies, as outlined in Section VII, Item 7.2.

Question 12: Section VII, Item 3.2

Will “future (to be identified) stakeholders” be connecting directly to the DOM ESB rather than MS-HIN?

Response: Future stakeholder connections directly to the Interoperability Platform are possible and it is DOM’s requirement that the Interoperability Platform support this.

Question 13: Section VII, Item 3.2

What does existing DOM HIT ecosystem comprise?

Response: Please refer to Section VII, Item 3. Additional information can be found in the approved State Medicaid Health Information Technology Plan (SMHP), Section 3, and Appendix L at the following link.

<http://www.medicaid.ms.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/StateMedicaidHealthInfoTechPlan.pdf>.

Question 14: Section VII, Item 3.2

What are the activities it performs?

Response: Please refer to the response to Question 13.

Question 15: Section VII, Item 3.3

List the DOM internal systems, trading partners and stake holders. Also what level of security is implemented with internal and external systems?

Response: Please refer to the response to Question 13. Regarding security, all data is encrypted in transit and at rest.

Question 16: Section VII, Item 3.4

Please provide a complete list of the standards for the standards-based connections.

Response: The standards are SFTP, SMTP, FHIR, RESTful Web Services, and HealtheWay.

Question 17: Section VII, Item 3.5.3

Please provide details of the existing DOM ecosystem.

Response: Please refer to the response to Question 13.

Question 18: Section VII, Item 3.7.1

Does the Restful web service using which MS HIN or stake holders connect to DOM Interoperability platform already exists? Or do we have to develop and expose it as part of RFP requirements?

Response: The Vendor will need to implement production RESTful Web services as part of the Interoperability Platform.

Question 19: Section VII, Item 3.7.1

Does the MS-HIN transfer only HL7 2.5.1 format files to the DOM CDR and MPI?

Response: MS-HIN will transfer various formats of HL7, and the DOM CDR will be responsible for transforming this data. The Interoperability Platform will not be responsible for transformation of this data at this time, however it is DOM's requirement that the application(s) to support message transformation, including any required licenses, be included in the Platform and integration so that they may be configured and utilized in the future.

Question 20: Section VII, Item 3.7.1

Does the C-CDA in the Interoperable platform be stored in a transactional database?

Response: Each inbound and outbound transaction should be logged for auditability.

Question 21: Section VII, Item 3.7.1

Are the DOM CDR and MPI designed based in HL7 2.5.1 standards?

Response: The DOM CDR supports various versions of HL7, and transforms the data as needed.

Question 22: Section VII, Item 3.7.1

Projecting from the five (5) initial connections mentioned, how many additional connections to DOM ESB do you foresee? What is the timeframe for this expansion?

Response: The 5 initial connections are the only connections in scope for this RFP. Please refer to the response to question 12.

Question 23: Section VII, Item 3.7.1

it states, "future (to be identified) stakeholders will utilize RESTful Web Services or the emerging Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources Release 1 (FHIR R1) to connect to the DOM Interoperability Platform for submission of clinical data to DOM."

Is it possible that future C-CDA exchange would be conducted directly out of the DOM ESB, and bypass MS-HIN?

Response: Stakeholder connections directly to the Interoperability Platform are possible and it is DOM's requirement that the Interoperability Platform support this.

Question 24: Section VII, Item 3.7.3

Can you share the C-CDA version being exchanged between the HealthWay and DOM?

Response: The C-CDAs to be exchanged between Healthway and DOM will be compliant with Meaningful Use Stage 2 and with Stage 3 in the future.

Question 25: Section VII, Item 3.7.3

Please elaborate on "adequate scalability and extendibility." What is the current workload that the ESB will handle?

Response: Section VII, Item 7.7 details the anticipated workload of the Interoperability Platform for the foreseeable future.

Question 26: Section VII, Item 3.7.3

What is the expected workload increase each year over the next five years?

Response: Section VII, Item 7.7 details the anticipated workload of the Interoperability Platform for the foreseeable future.

Question 27: Section VII, Item 3.7.3

Please provide specifics of the extendibility needs.

Response: Section VII, Item 7.7 details the anticipated workload of the Interoperability Platform for the foreseeable future.

Question 28: Section VII, Item 3.7.3.8

Does the State of Mississippi DOM have an SOA Center of Excellence (CoE) that provides SOA governance, standards, best practices, or other areas? If so, can any of their work products be provided for review?

Response: DOM does not currently have a department/division providing these services.

Question 29: Section VII, Item 4, 5.1.2, 5.2

Since we are not to alter the RFP text in any way, how would you like us to acknowledge the amended due dates in quoting the RFP in our proposal?

Response: Please refer to Section VI, Item 7, Web Amendments.

Question 30: Section VII, Item 6.2

Should the vendor consider the Support and maintenance phase after development and implementation of the DOM Interoperability Platform in a SaaS model for Federal Fiscal Year 2017 onwards?

Response: Please see the attached Revised Cost Information Submission Form.

Question 31: Section VII, Item 6.2.1.1

Please provide specifics of what is considered an “appropriate commercial data center” by State of Mississippi DOM?

Response: An “appropriate commercial data center” would need to meet industry standards and would need to be capable of meeting all operational, security, and other standards required, as outlined in Section VII, Item 7.9.1.

Question 32: Section VII, Item 6.2.1.1

What preferences exist around whether the bidder should use your ITS hosting facility and disaster recovery location versus our own?

Response: DOM expresses no preference for the ITS hosting facility over a vendor-supplied hosting facility.

Question 33: Section VII, Item 6.2.1.2

Approximately how many Restful services will be routed via the DOM Interoperability platform and what is the expected growth rate of services in the future?

Response: Section VII, Item 7.7 details the anticipated workload of the Interoperability Platform for the foreseeable future. It is anticipated that each of the 5 trading partners/stakeholders would require at least one RESTful web service connection each.

Question 34: Section VII, Item 6.2.1.4

In a futuristic scenario, where there would be 5 disparate stakeholders participating, would it be correct to assume that in that scenario as well MS-HIN will be consolidating and providing HL72.5.1 messages?

Response: Various formats of HL7 will be transmitted to the CDR, where any needed data transformation will occur.

Question 35: Section VII, Item 7.2

Please confirm the scope or boundaries of the winning bidder's responsibilities regarding integration of the DOM Interoperability Platform with the MS-HIN Subproject and the DOM CDR and MPI Subproject. We assume that our scope is limited to building the standardized interfaces to communicate with MS-HIN and MPI subprojects but please confirm.

Response: Please refer to Section VII, Items 3.6.2.3 and Section 3.7.

Question 36: Section VII, Item 7.2

What are the current technology stacks involved in existing MS-HIN Subproject, DOM CDR and MPI Subproject?

Response: Please refer to Section VII, Item 3.6 for a description of these subprojects. No additional information is available.

Question 37: Section VII, Item 7.2.3

Will the C-CDA in the Interoperable platform be required to be accessed for analytics or reporting, or will these transactions be used only as a holding place?

Response: All data will be imported into the CDR for CDR functions, including analytics and reporting.

Question 38: Section VII, Item 7.2.5

What is the timeframe after implementation and roll-out for which the vendor has to provide the DOM Interoperability Platform's functional services, such as administration service, status monitoring service, and audit report?

Response: Administrative, monitoring and audit functionality must be functional at go-live.

Question 39: Section VII, Item 7.3.1

Do we have any preferred vendor platform for an ESB and Service Oriented Architecture that includes an application server with message routing, data mapping, and transformation functionalities?

Response: DOM does not have a vendor preference for any components of the RFP.

Question 40: Section VII, Item 7.3.1.6

Would the State be willing to remove Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources (FHIR) from the RFP and instead include a change order bucket to verify the standard is solidified, instead of introducing possible rework after implementation?

Response: No, however DOM recognizes FHIR is an emerging standard. Therefore, please provide details of how your solution will support FHIR now or in the future (and at what time).

Question 41: Section VII, Item 7.3.1.8

Provide specifics of the rules for authorization, data mapping and message routing. How many rules, how complex, and how frequently will they change?

Response: The actual rules will depend on each stakeholder's system. The rules will be fully discovered in the design phase. Extremely complex rules and frequent rule changes are not expected in the foreseeable future.

Question 42: Section VII, Item 7.3.1.9

Do we have approximate number of rules and types of stakeholder list as per current state ?

Response: The rules will be fully discovered in the design phase and the number of rules is not known at this time.

Question 43: Section VII, Item 7.3.1.10

Is there a scope for SFTP based communication? It is not explained anywhere in the Data Flow Architecture. Can you please explain.

Response: SFTP must be supported as it may be used for batch transmission and response of clinical data, as stated in Section VII, Item 7.2.4.

Question 44: Section VII, Item 7.3.1.11

Section 7.3.1.11 reads: Support high availability (99.9% uptime) with a vendor SLA; However, sections 7.8.1 and 7.9.1 both allude to an SLA requirement of 99.1% uptime. Can the State please clarify the uptime requirements of the DOM Interoperability Platform?

Response: Please refer to Section VII, Item 7.9.1.

Question 45: Section VII, Item 7.3.1.12

Please provide specific scalability metrics to accommodate future increases in messages and file throughput.

Response: Section VII, Item 7.7 details the anticipated workload of the Interoperability Platform for the foreseeable future.

Question 46: Section VII, Item 7.3.1.12

What is the forecasted value for increase in messages and file?

Response: Section 7.7 of the RFP details the anticipated workload of the Interoperability Platform for the foreseeable future.

Question 47: Section VII, Item 7.3.1.13

Please provide the acceptable Recovery Point Objective (RPO) and Recovery Time Objective (RTO) thresholds.

Response: The RPO for Interoperability platform is that each shareholder's input should be recoverable after the system resumes. Section 7.13 of RFP states the RTO.

Question 48: Section VII, Item 7.3.1.17

Why and where would the web services be exposed in SOAP? Is it expected that web services exposed to MS HIN and DOM CDR to be both Restful and SOAP based?

Response: Yes, the capability for both must be supported. The Healthway eHealth Exchange Gateway is based on SOAP.

Question 49: Section VII, Item 7.3.1.19

Does the DOM have an existing Identity and Access Management solution in place that this subproject will use?

Response: DOM does not have an existing Identity and Access Management system available for the Interoperability platform.

Question 50: Section VII, Item 7.3.1.19

Is implementation of an Identity and Access Management solution in scope of this RFP?

Response: Section VII, Item 7.6 details Interoperability security and privacy requirements. The use of Identity and Access Management is dependent on the Vendor's solution.

Question 51: Section VII, Item 7.3.1.19

How many concurrent users are projected to use this system?

Response: There will be minimal Administrative users.

Question 52: Section VII, Item 7.3.1.22

Does all the messages received from MS HIN or trading partners should be encrypted? Encrypted messages should be sent to DOM CDR?

Response: Please refer to Section VII, Items 7.3.1.23 and Section 7.6.2 for the message encryption requirements.

Question 53: Section VII, Item 7.3.1.23

What is the proposed scope for SMTP? Where does it fit in the data architecture explained?

Response: The Interoperability platform may be required to support direct secure messaging, therefore SMTP must be supported. Support of SMTP does not imply that an email server is part of the platform.

Question 54: Section VII, Item 7.3.2.1

There is a mention of the ETL adapter. Is there any requirement to move huge files in DOM interoperability system?

Response: Section VII, Item 7.7 details the anticipated workload of the Interoperability Platform for the foreseeable future.

Question 55: Section VII, Item 7.4.5.1

Will you prefer phased approach for implementation i.e. integration with Subproject in sequence?

Response: Section VII, Item 6 of the RFP defines the anticipated project schedule, however the Vendor will need to show some flexibility as connectivity to and with trading partners/stakeholders is also dependent on said trading partners/stakeholders.

Question 56: Section VII, Item 7.5.1

Per section 7.5, does the State request that the response include pricing and a solution for on premise AND/OR state hosted, or may the respondent select the best choice for the proposed solution and architecture, and therefore propose only one approach and pricing?

Response: The respondent may select the best choice for the proposed solution and architecture, and therefore propose only one approach and pricing. A Standard Software License and Application Service Provider Agreement is being drafted and will be posted at a later date to address those situations where the Vendor hosts the proposed solution.

Question 57: Section VII, Item 7.6

Will the State of Mississippi DOM use an existing external Certification Authority (CA) to provide certificates and tokens for identification, authentication, and authorization?

Response: DOM does not issue certificates or have a preferred external CA. Vendors must be prepared to create self-signed certificates or acquire commercial certificates based on the requirements that emerge during implementation of connectivity to stakeholders.

Question 58: Section VII, Item 7.6.2.1.2

Does the State have an existing Consent Framework and Service in place today? If so, does it support standards based interactions for access/use (e.g., XACML or BPPC) and where is it managed?

Response: There is no existing Consent Framework and Service at DOM for interoperability.

Question 59: Section VII, Item 7.9.1.6

Is the infrastructure set-up in scope for the vendor? And is maintenance after installation part of the scope for the vendor in this RFP?

Response: Infrastructure setup is in scope for the Vendor. Regarding maintenance, please see the attached Revised Cost Information Submission.

Question 60: Section VII, Item 8.1.5

How often will the staff be required to be in Jackson? Frequency of Days per month/year? Hours per day?

Response: The requirements for staff to be on-site in Jackson are detailed in Section VII, Items 8.1.5 and 8.1.7. Staff would generally be expected to be present for a minimum of 6 hours per day.

Question 61: Figure 1

What is the interface engine used to convert C-CDA files which are HL7v3 version to the DOM CDR and MPI? This is based on the assumption that DOM CDR and MPI are designed on HL7v2.5.1.

Response: The DOM CDR is responsible for transforming this data. The Interoperability Platform will not be responsible for transformation of this data at this time, however it is DOM's requirement that the application(s) to support message transformation, including any required licenses, be included in the Platform and integration so that they may be configured and utilized in the future.

Question 62: Figure 1

Please clarify why some of the data transaction flows in Figure 1 are color coded differently. Is there a key?

Response: The orange color lines in Figure 1 represent the data flow of the patient record request and the corresponding response from stakeholders/trading partners. There is no key.

Question 63: Section VIII, Cost Information Form

Per the Vendor Conference, please confirm that the State will release a new Cost Form with Answers to Questions that will include a SaaS-based structure with ongoing operations and a defined number of internal and external trading partners.

Response: See the attached Revised Cost Information Submission Form. Please see the response to question 12.

Question 64: Section VIII, Cost Information Form

Will we be afforded the opportunity to ask additional questions based on the updated Cost Form?

Response: One additional row was added on the form, no additional questions will be addressed.

Question 65: Section IX, References

For the Contact Name, do you want a vendor POC or the project's client POC?

Response: The State will need to talk to the client's point of contact, not the Vendor.

Question 66:

What is the ITS position on use of offshore personnel? If permitted, what are the limitations or conditions?

Response: Due to CMS limitations on off-shore resources, both off-shore and near-shore resources will not be permitted for any part of this project.

Question 67:

Please elaborate on the specific business issues that this initiative is expected to resolve—for example, what are the business impacts of not having this ESB in place today, and why hasn't it been addressed to date?

Response: Please refer to Section VII, Item 3.

Question 68:

Does the RFP include any ongoing roles or is the scope limited to installation? If the former, please elaborate on the roles, duration, or other aspects.

Response: The RFP includes roles needed for support and maintenance as noted in the amended section 7.12.1 and the attached Revised Cost Information Submission Form.

Question 69:

Regarding SOA and ESB technology, would the State consider it advantageous to propose technology already under contract?

Response: Vendors are encouraged to present their best solution, that the Vendor believes to be the most beneficial to DOM.

Question 70:

Can you elaborate on your desire for the solution to be deployed in a SaaS model? Does this mean: 1) the vendor hosts the environment in its data center; or 2) the solution utilizes the State of Mississippi, Office of the Governor, Division of Medicaid (DOM) data center resources? If the latter, is this a remote management capability, where the vendor's resources have access to the DOM's data center resources? If not, then is it a correct assumption on our part that the vendor would host the hardware, OS, application, security, servers, etc., in its data center?

Response: DOM does not have a preference regarding hosting in the ITS data center or a commercial data center chosen by the Vendor. If the Vendor hosts in the ITS data center, vendor staff will have physical and remote access to the hosted systems.

Question 71:

Further, with a SaaS model, does this entail the vendor managing the interfaces deployed by DOM? Manage as in; promoting to production, monitoring the environment, fixing bugs in code not created by the vendor, and SLAs as defined mutually by DOM/vendor?

Response: Vendor staff will implement and maintain the interfaces, and the Vendor will be held to the SLA for project components that are under their control. The Vendor will not be held responsible for problems outside of their control.

Question 72:

Does DOM envision the vendor building the interfaces needed, or will DOM provide resources to be trained by the vendor, and those DOM resources will own the build-out of the interfaces?

Response: The Vendor will build the interfaces.

Question 73:

What relationship does this ESB have with the state MMIS?

Response: There is no relationship between the Interoperability platform and the MES system for the foreseeable future.

Question 74:

Does the ESB conduct any inbound message transformations, or is this all handled by MS-HIN?

Response: At this time, the Interoperability Platform will not perform any message transformations. It is DOM's requirement that the application(s) to support message transformation, including any required licenses, be included in the Platform and integration so that they may be configured and utilized in the future.

Question 75:

Please clarify the contract period of performance, to include milestones.

Response: The term of the contract will be 5 years and DOM will have the option to add one-year renewals after the initial 5 years.

RFP responses are due November 20, 2015, at 3:00 p.m. (Central Time).

If you have any questions concerning the information above or if we can be of further assistance, please contact Patti Irgens at 601-432-8223 or via email at patti.irgens@its.ms.gov.

cc: ITS Project File Number 41532

Enclosure: Revised Cost Information Form

REVISED COST INFORMATION SUBMISSION

Vendors must propose a summary of all applicable project costs in the matrix that follows. The matrix must be supplemented by a cost itemization fully detailing the basis of each cost category. The level of detail must address the following elements as applicable: item, description, quantity, retail, discount, extension, and deliverable. Any cost not listed in this section may result in the Vendor providing those products or services at no charge to the State or face disqualification.

Milestone	Cost	15% Retainage	Cost Less Retainage
Project Team and Project Plan			
Interoperability Platform Architecture and Design			
Delivery of the Interoperability Platform to the ITS Datacenter or commercial datacenter			
Test data flows for ADT messages			
Test data flows for Laboratory ORU messages			
Test data flows for Radiology ORU messages			
Test data flows for Pathology ORU messages			
Test data flows for C-CDA messages via the HealthWay			
Go live of Interoperability Platform			
Training and acceptance of Documentation			
Hosting, Support, Maintenance and Helpdesk			
Year 1 and Year 2 - Development Phase	N/A	N/A	N/A
Annual SaaS (Hosting, Support, Maintenance and Helpdesk) Year 3		N/A	
Annual SaaS (Hosting, Support, Maintenance and Helpdesk) Year 4		N/A	
Annual SaaS (Hosting, Support, Maintenance and Helpdesk) Year 5		N/A	
TOTAL COST			

Performance Bond	Amount

FULLY LOADED CHANGE ORDER RATE	
Description/Role	Hourly Rate

Maximum Annual Support & Maintenance Increase _____%