ITS Mississippi Department of
Information Technology Services

3771 Eastwood Drive
Jackson, MS 39211-6381
Phone: 601-432-8000
Fax: 601-713-6380
www.its.ms.gov

David C. Johnson, Executive Director

RFP Questions and Clarifications Memorandum

To: Vendors Responding to RFP Number 4283 for the Mississippi Division of Medicaid (DOM)

From: David C. Johnson

Date: June 8, 2021

Subject: Responses to Questions Submitted and Clarifications to Specifications

Contact Name: Jordan Barber

Contact Phone Number: 601-432-8005

Contact E-mail Address: jordan.barber@its.ms.gov

RFP Number 4283 is hereby amended as follows:

1.   **Title page, INVITATION is modified as follows:**

INVITATION: Proposals, subject to the attached conditions, will be received at this office until **Tuesday,** ~~February 23, 2021~~ **August 3, 2021 @ 3:00 p.m. Central Time** for the acquisition of the products/services described below for Mississippi Division of Medicaid.

2.   **Title page, third box is modified as follows:**

> PROPOSAL, SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO
> RFP NO. 4283
> due ~~February 23, 2021~~ **August 3, 2021** @3:00 p.m.,
> ATTENTION: Jordan Barber

3.   **ITS RFP Response Checklist, Item 6 is being revised:**

"6) Point-by-point response to Technical Specifications (Section VII and <u>ATTACHMENT G – Technical Specifications Worksheet)</u>"

4.   **ITS RFP Response Checklist, Item 7 is being revised:**

"7) Vendor response to Cost Information Submission (~~Section VIII~~ <u>ATTACHMENT D – Revised Cost Information Submission</u>)"

5.   **Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 1.1.1 is being added:**

"Items 7 through 8.9.7 have been moved to ATTACHMENT G – Technical Requirements Worksheet. For ATTACHMENT G, label and respond to Item 7 through Item 8.9.7 as it is described in the Attachment."

6.   Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 3.1 is being revised:

3.1   Common Terms

Term	Definition
API	Application Programming Interface
AWS	Amazon Web Services
Beneficiary	DOM term used for their recipients of Medicaid benefits
C-CDA	Consolidated Clinical Document Architecture
CCPS	Child Care Payment System
CDIP	Clinical Data Interoperability Program
CHIP	Children's Health Insurance Program
CSBG	Community Services Block Grant
Client	MDHS term used for their recipients of multiple program benefits
CMS	Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
DOM	Division of Medicaid
DXC	Digital Transformation Company
E&E	Eligibility and Enrolment
eFITS	Contains records that tracks all EBT transactions of SNAP benefit recipients both current and historical.
EHR	Electronic Health Record
EID	Enterprise Identifier
EMPI	Enterprise Master ~~Patient~~ Person Index
ESB	Enterprise Service Bus
FAM	Fraud and Abuse Module
HHSTP	Health and Human Services Transformation Project
HIPAA	Health Insurance Portability and Accountability
JAWS	Contains the records of MDHS clients who are actively participating in the TANF Work Program and supportive services.
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LIHEAP	Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program
Linked System	Any host system that provides person identifying information, i.e. a system that maintains person information, see Appendix A
IOP	Interoperability
IV&V	Independent Verification and Validation
MARS-E	Minimum Acceptable Risk Standards
MAVERICKS	Contains the records of MDHS clients who are actively receiving SNAP/TANF benefits as well as historical eligibility information.
MCO	Managed Care Organization
MDHS	Mississippi Department of Human Services
MDM	Master Data Management
MECT	Medicaid Enterprise Certification Toolkit
MES	Medicaid Enterprise System
METSS	Contains records of MDHS clients who are involved in a child support case managed by the Child Support Enforcement Division of MDHS as well as historical case information.
MMIS	Medicaid Management Information System
MPI	Master Person Index
MRN	Medical Record Number
MRP	Medicaid Replacement System

Term	Definition
M&O	Maintenance and Operations
OS	Operating System
PHI	Personal Health Information
PMBOK	Project Management Body of Knowledge
PMI	Project Management Institute
SNAP	Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program
SSAP	Statement on Standards for Attestation Engagements
SSP	System Security Plan
TANF	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families
Virtual ROMA	Contains the records of MDHS clients who are actively receiving LIHEAP, CSBG, and weatherization benefits as well as historical eligibility information.

7.   Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 3.3 second paragraph is being revised:

"The State expects the Vendor to propose the optimal solution and architecture to resolve the issues identified in this RFP. Vendor may choose to propose one or multiple Master Person instances to identify and manage unique person identities. If multiple instances are proposed, the State expects the EMPI to keep internal autonomy and work in harmony with each of the other proposed Master Person instance(s). ~~MDHS has included the attached Appendix B to provide additional context around what MDHS is seeking to solve with an MPI. MDHS may reuse the Award made from this RFP to procure its own MPI. Appendix B will not be evaluated and is provided for informational purposes only.~~"

8.   Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 4 Procurement Project Schedule is amended as follows:

Task	Date
Deadline for Questions Answered and Posted to ITS Web Site	~~02/02/2021~~ 06/08/2021
Open Proposals	~~02/23/2021~~ 08/03/2021
Evaluation of Proposals	~~02/23/2021~~ 08/03/2021 – 09/03/2021
ITS Board Presentation	~~03/18/2021~~ 09/16/2021
Contract Negotiation	~~03/01/2021 - 04/30/2021~~ 09/03/2021 – 10/04/2021
Proposed Project Implementation Start-up	~~05/01/21~~ 11/01/2021

9.   Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 5.13 is being added:

"The Certificate of Liability Insurance referenced in Section VI: Item 10 should include, at a minimum, Professional and General Liability, as well as a Cyber Security Insurance addendum in an amount commensurate with the professional responsibilities and liabilities under the terms of this RFP. The coverage should be no less than $1 million for each type."

10.   Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 6.3.3 is being revised:

"~~The Vendor must observe the MECT and maintain compliance with any updates published by CMS. https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/data-and-~~

systems/mect/index.html The Vendor must meet the following Federal compliance requirements:"

11.   Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 6.3.3.1 is being added:

"The Vendor must observe the MECT and maintain compliance with any updates published by CMS. https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/data-and-systems/mect/index.html "

12.   Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 6.3.3.2 is being added:

"The Vendor's proposed solution must meet FedRAMP required security standards. https://www.fedramp.gov/documents/ "

13.   Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 7 through Item 7.10.9 are being moved to ATTACHMENT G – Technical Specifications Worksheet:

7. Functional Requirements

7.1   The proposed solution shall be a synchronized EMPI environment comprised of the appropriate number of MPI instances as necessary to provide a successful solution. If multiple MPI instances are proposed, each instance shall have the same functional capabilities and communication methods but shall maintain separate data governance rules. If an EMPI is proposed for DOM, the State desires the EMPI to provide harmony between all DOM-related MPI instances and ensure a single ID exists for all unique persons stored across the EMPI environment and all DOM-related MPI instances (CDIP, HHSTP, and any additional DOM optional instances). Additionally, the State expects DOM MPI instances to harmonize with any future DOM or MDHS instances that may be purchased as a result of this award.

7.2   The proposed solution shall match and resolve all agency persons (i.e., beneficiary, client, patient, provider, etc.) with an unattended probabilistic matching methodology, using an algorithm, at the enterprise level and shall not rely only on a Medicaid ID, MDHS Person ID or SSN to match a person. In the event the Vendor uses an equivalent alternative matching methodology, the Vendor shall propose the preferred methodology and explain the benefits.

       7.2.1   The Vendor should include optional pricing for a one-time referential match or something similar for each linked system.

7.3   The proposed solution shall support person validation and matching to support currently operational DOM-specific programs and program-specific rules.

7.4   The proposed solution shall have well documented standard APIs as described in the Technical Specification section of this request to allow the MPI to be interoperable with other DOM programs and systems for person management and person harmonization.

7.5   The proposed solution shall resolve the issues identified in this RFP. Vendor may choose to propose one or multiple Master Person instances to identify and

manage unique person identities. Vendor must detail the approach for one, or multiple instances proposed.

7.6   The proposed solution shall support the Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources, FHIR, at a minimum, as well as other standard APIs, and fully support the CMS Final Rule and ONC Final Rule.

https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Interoperability/index

7.7   Data Management:

7.7.1   The Vendor shall provide a solution that can store and manage robust person information from all linked systems including but not limited to name, address, DOB, SSN, MRN, phone numbers, Medicaid ID, etc.

7.7.2   The proposed solution shall have rules capable of identifying single best record data at the conceptual level (e.g. name, address, phone number, etc.). Coupled with this, the proposed solution shall maintain aliases and past values for conceptual data structures.

7.7.2.1   The instances will receive demographic data and other data from a variety of sources and will in some cases receive multiple records with different persons from the same source (requiring merge).

7.7.2.2   The proposed solution shall define and support a process to determine and flag the "Single Best Record" for all demographics data fields. This could consist of different fields from different sources. Wherever possible this process shall be automated. DOM and the awarded Vendor shall work in collaboration to determine the best solution. DOM shall be able to lock the Single Best Record such that it cannot be changed or overridden by any process, either automated or otherwise, even though the related demographic fields could be changed. DOM must approve the process and procedures to create the Single Best Record.

7.7.3   The criteria used for matching must be adaptable to the persons loaded and the State requires the ability to work with the Vendor to adjust the matching algorithm.

7.7.4   The proposed solution shall make information available through various methods such as screens, reports, and API/messaging services so that the State has visibility into the process being used to identify the single best record and its originating source.

7.7.5   The proposed solution shall be able to receive information through various methods such as direct entry and API/messaging services.

7.7.6 The proposed solution shall respond to message requests for person information by returning a customized set of person record fields, based on the linked system.

7.7.7 **MANDATORY:** The proposed solution shall support an EMPI/MPI number (a unique identifier) as well as separate, multiple person identifiers.

7.7.8 The proposed solution shall support receiving and integrating unsolicited messages from linked systems containing one or more new and/or updated person records.

7.7.9 The proposed solution shall flag a deceased person and integrate information with other systems and instances.

7.7.10 The proposed solution shall support alternative name/alias processing between all instances.

7.7.11 The proposed solution shall store and manage an indexed person list containing identifying information.

7.7.12 The proposed solution shall provide cross-reference indices that link the MPI number (a unique identifier) to all linked systems including state data sources and external facility identifiers.

7.7.13 The proposed solution and all instances shall use demographic data received from other sources, including provider Electronic Health Record (EHR) systems, Person Benefit systems, and other person information systems as necessary, for linking and resolving persons.

7.7.14 The proposed solution shall supply audit data limited by filter information provided upon request through the message interface.

7.7.15 The proposed solution shall have the ability to update all connected instances with new persons when changes to persons or demographics are updated, regardless of system or instance.

7.7.16 The Vendor shall assume the linked systems are the ultimate authority on merging and unmerging.

7.7.16.1 The proposed solution shall have API/messaging services to allow those systems and the MPI instances to negotiate a merge or unmerge action.

7.7.17 The proposed solution shall send industry standard messages to all linked systems that know the merged person that informs the linked systems that the persons were merged.

7.7.18   The proposed solution shall receive messages from linked systems informing that a merge or unmerge occurred and the merge or unmerge should be reflected in the proposed solutions data.

7.7.19   The proposed solution shall reject a pending merge request when receiving a message from a linked system that rejects the merge.

7.7.20   The proposed solution shall provide the means to configure and implement a rule set that automates the detection and resolution of duplicates and possible duplicates.

    7.7.20.1   Provide an embedded weighted algorithm or other methodology to assist with the identification of potential duplicates.

7.7.21   The proposed solution shall allow authorized users to manually merge and unmerge.

    7.7.21.1   Optional Services: The Vendor shall provide change order rates for manual merge or unmerge activities as required for each MPI instance these services. Vendor must describe in the response all rules and processes needed to perform these activities.

7.7.22   The Vendor shall provide a solution that supports reporting via onscreen display of results, printed output of results, and export of results.

    7.7.22.1   The proposed solution shall allow authorized users to view, sort, export, and print report data, search results, and lists in a variety of formats (e.g., HTML, Excel, TXT, CSV, PDF, or character delimited).

7.7.23   The proposed solution shall support pre-defined reports produced at regular intervals.

7.7.24   The proposed solution shall provide ad hoc reporting that allows users to define when a report will be run and within the report's capabilities, define attributes such as date range or other filters.

7.7.25   The proposed solution and all instances shall provide periodic and on request reports of the accuracy and success rate of the automated merge process and all automatically merged persons.

7.7.26   The proposed solution shall provide periodic reports to be used in exception handling, to allow manual merging and unmerging of person records that are not able to be handled automatically by the automated process.

7.7.27   The proposed solution shall provide on demand access to a periodic (any date range) report of assumed matches and potential

matches as well as the algorithm score for the match across the proposed solution and all instances.

7.7.28   The proposed solution shall allow for the reporting on person requests either by linked systems or overall and shall allow these reports to requests all, partial or specific persons to be detailed.

7.7.29   The Vendor shall provide a solution that supports flexible search criteria during the person identification process: for example, partial name, Soundex, Medicaid ID, MDHS Person ID, SSN, medical record number, encounter number, date of birth, sex, or combinations of data searching and matching on persons stored in the proposed solution.

7.7.29.1   The proposed solution provides multiple methods to identify its persons when provided with partial person information, enabling exact and fuzzy match logic.

7.7.29.2   The proposed solution shall have logic that can score returned results such that failure to find an exact person match can yield ranked potential matches.

7.7.29.3   The proposed solution shall support sort, filter, and search functionality through key fields in all data collections.

7.8   Audit/Log: The Vendor shall provide a solution that is capable of auditing and logging events. Auditing and logging are integrated such that the system cannot take actions and avoid auditing and logging. Solution logging is available for review through various methods such as screens, reports and API/messaging services.

7.8.1   The proposed solution shall support the ability to audit all solution and component activities, by user or process such as but not limited to:

7.8.1.1   Additions/Deletions,

7.8.1.2   Merges/Unmerges,

7.8.1.3   Rejected merges,

7.8.1.4   Logins,

7.8.1.5   Errors,

7.8.1.6   Searches,

7.8.1.7   Reports ran, and

7.8.1.8   Messages received/sent.

7.9   Technical

   7.9.1   The Vendor shall provide a solution that can technically support the functional requirements within the framework of the overall DOM infrastructure.

   7.9.2   The proposed solution shall provide both a user interface for limited interaction as well as a robust and comprehensive API or service interface capable of communicating through the HHSTP ESB, the CDIP ESB as well as other systems and services. Support for FHIR APIs (CMS Final Rule and ONC Final Rule) for the solution is required, and utilization of FHIR for this requirement is highly recommended. The technical services include providing messaging security, user security, activity logging, archiving, error handling and recovery, single sign on as well as any technique necessary to support the functionality. DOM expects the primary role of the proposed solution to be a network type appliance that communicates automatically with other linked systems.

   7.9.3   The proposed solution shall support the real-time person validation management, including supporting real-time queries and responses with the DOM ESB.

   7.9.4   The proposed solution shall share and integrate the instance demographic data with other systems and instances via open APIs that are accessible and updatable in real time.

   7.9.5   The proposed solution and all instances shall support open APIs to harmonize (in real time) persons between all MPI instances. Open APIs shall be provided to onboard other DOM systems and services such as the DOM ESB, DOM Eligibility and Enrollment (E&E) system and the DOM MMIS and MES as well as MDHS ESB, MAVERICS, JAWS, Virtual Roma, METSS, Child Care Payment System (CCPS), and eFITS.

   7.9.6   The proposed solution and all instances must support sending and receiving standards based HL7 transactions, including HL7 merge transactions (ex. A18, A30, A34, etc.).

   7.9.7   The proposed solution and all instances must provide online inquiry and retrieval capabilities to the history for an unlimited number of years.

   7.9.8   The proposed solution and all instances must have the ability to provide real-time access and user validation from other, interfaced systems. Though not meant to be exclusive, this would include interfacing with multiple State Active Directory or LDAP user database(s) to determine user access privileges to achieve a single sign on user experience.

7.9.9 The proposed solution shall be able to deal with all errors, unexpected responses, and other problems by properly detecting a problem exists and logging the problem and responding to a request message with error information.

7.9.10 The proposed solution must automatically log web users off after a set amount of time as determined by the proposed design.

7.9.11 The proposed solution shall allow administrators to change the automatic web user logoff time as a normal site administration function.

7.9.12 The proposed solution shall programmatically return customized data messages in response to a person identification message request from a linked system.

7.10 User Interface

7.10.1 The Vendor shall provide a solution that supports a user interface that allows users to interact with elements of the system so that the State has visibility into the process being used to identify the single best record and its originating source.

7.10.1.1 The screens are intended to support manual activities in areas such as merging, unmerging, reviewing logs, maintaining user security, testing matching logic, and searching stored persons.

7.10.1.2 The proposed solution screens shall be browser based and conform to project approved usability guidelines.

7.10.1.3 The proposed solution must provide a password secured browser-based user interface.

7.10.2 The proposed solution shall provide screens to review past person merges, selecting person merges, and a means to instruct the proposed solution to unmerge the persons.

7.10.3 The proposed solution must provide a screen that allows searching the person index and testing all variations of the matching logic.

7.10.4 The proposed solution should have a screen that allows users to perform the following audit log functions such as but not limited to select audit log, view, search, filter, sort, export, date range, and print.

7.10.5 The proposed solution must provide a screen allowing viewing and editing of person records by properly authenticated users.

14. **Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 8 through Item 8.9.7 are being moved to ATTACHMENT G – Technical Specifications Worksheet:**

~~8. Operational Requirements~~

~~8.1 The Vendor shall deliver, host, implement, and support the infrastructure and the software for the proposed solution in a Software as a Service (SaaS) offering.~~

~~8.2 The proposed solution shall be able to provide ongoing matching of disparate persons at the following rates:~~

~~8.2.1 Match over 500 disparate persons per second; and~~

~~8.2.2 Match over 2,000 disparate persons in 3 seconds or less.~~

~~8.3 The proposed solution shall support an initial load and processing of persons into the MPI's from various source systems at a minimum rate of 10,000 per hour.~~

~~8.4 All operational aspects, including the location of infrastructure must be in the continental USA. All operational resources including Help Desk must be in the continental USA. Under no circumstances will PHI be moved offshore either for testing purposes or in production. (The use of offshore and near-shore resources may be permitted for development efforts only.)~~

~~8.5 The proposed solution shall maintain HIPAA compliance and support Minimum Acceptable Risk Standards (MARS-E) 2.0 access, privacy and security requirements.~~

~~8.6 The Vendor will responsible for System Security Plan (SSP) requirements associated with an EMPI.~~

~~8.6.1 The SSP will based on the current version of MARS-E, including the collection of SSP implementation statements from all parties involved in the system.~~

8.6.2 ~~The Vendor shall follow the standards and best practices to ensure security for all data and messages, and~~

8.6.3 ~~The Vendor will perform vulnerability tests, penetration tests, and all other, appropriate tests on mutually agreed upon basis, and will report these results to DOM on a monthly basis.~~

8.7 ~~The Vendor shall follow the standards and best practices to ensure security for all data and messages, and perform annual vulnerability tests and penetration tests, and all other, appropriate tests on a normally scheduled basis on the proposed solution and reporting results to DOM on a mutually agreed upon schedule (typically monthly).~~

8.8 ~~The Vendor shall use TLS 1.3 or higher as a standard and shall upgrade as the standard evolves.~~

8.9 ~~The proposed solution must include the following access control requirements:~~

8.9.1 ~~Each instance must be equipped to establish role-based security levels based on user profiles,~~

8.9.2 ~~Each instance of the proposed solution shall limit access to PHI and sensitive information based on the role of the user,~~

8.9.3 ~~Roles to be implemented will include: Administrator, Super User, User, and Others as required,~~

8.9.4 ~~All access to PHI must be recorded and made available for reporting to include: Timestamp, content accessed, person accessing, physical location of access with IP address, reason for access and method of access. Demographic data is PHI,~~

8.9.5 ~~Data will be available to DOM staff, auditors, and HIPAA reporting/auditing request,~~

8.9.6 ~~Each instance of the proposed solution must prohibit unauthorized users from accessing PHI and other sensitive information according to State and Federal confidentiality rules, and~~

8.9.7 ~~Vendor staff including development and support staff shall use two factor authentications when accessing any aspect of the production application or its data.~~

15. Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 9.2 is being revised:

"The State seeks a single host setting for all MPI instances. Potential host settings to be considered are ~~the Information Technology Services data center in Jackson, Mississippi or~~ any cloud-based HIPAA and MARS-E 2.0 compliant facilities."

16. **Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 9.6 is being deleted:**

   "~~The Vendor shall provide WAN encrypted tunnel support to DOM from both the primary and the DR site.~~"

17. **Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 9.8 is being revised:**

   "The Vendor shall provide dedicated services with no intermingling of data or resources with other clients other than the State of Mississippi, Division of Medicaid, and the Mississippi Department of Human Services. ~~This includes all internet connectivity.~~"

18. **Section VII Technical Specifications, Appendix A is being replaced by ATTACHMENT F – Revised Appendix A.**

19. **Section VII Technical Specifications, Appendix B is being deleted.**

20. **Section VIII Cost Information Submission is being replaced by ATTACHMENT D – Revised Cost Information Submission.**

21. **Section VIII Change Order Rates Cost Information Submission is being replaced by ATTACHMENT E – Change Order Rates Cost Information Submission.**

22. **ATTACHMENT G – Technical Requirements Worksheet is being added.**

23. **ATTACHMENT G – Technical Requirements Worksheet, Item 7.7.15 is being revised:**

   "The proposed solution shall have the ability to ~~update~~ flag a record ~~all connected instances with new persons~~ when changes to persons or demographics are updated, regardless of system or instance."

24. **ATTACHMENT G - Technical Requirements Worksheet, Item 8.5.1 – 8.5.3.14 are being added:**

   8.5.1   **MANDATORY** – All Vendors must annually attest to meeting the CMS Minimal Acceptable Standards for Exchanges (MARS-E) and attest to a MARS-E compliant environment.

   8.5.2   **MANDATORY** – All Vendors shall assist DOM in meeting CMS certification requirements for their components, including CMS Outcomes Based Certification (OBC).

   8.5.3   **MANDATORY** – All Vendors shall meet, adhere, and annually report on compliancy with the following CMS NIST requirements:

   8.5.3.1   PL-2: System Security and Privacy Plan (SSP)

   8.5.3.2   CM-9: Configuration Management Plan

   8.5.3.3   CP-2: Contingency Plan

   8.5.3.4   CP-4: Contingency Plan Testing and Exercises

   8.5.3.5   IR-8: Incident Response Plan

8.5.3.6   <u>IR-3: Incident Response Testing and Exercises</u>

8.5.3.7   <u>AT-3: Security Training</u>

8.5.3.8   <u>AT-4: Security Training</u>

8.5.3.9   <u>CA-3: System Interconnections</u>

8.5.3.10   <u>RA-3: Risk Assessment</u>

8.5.3.11   <u>AP-1: Authority to Collect</u>

8.5.3.12   <u>AP-2: Purpose Specification</u>

8.5.3.13   <u>AR-1: Governance and Privacy Program</u>

8.5.3.14   <u>AR-2: Privacy Impact and Risk Assessment</u>

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.

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Question 1	RFP No. 4283	Are there any other needed documents to do business in the state and for this RFP?
Response		**All documents needed to do business with the State of Mississippi are detailed in RFP No. 4283. Please review RFP No. 4283 in its entirety to ensure all documents are included.**
Question 2	RFP No. 4283	If selected as the winning vendor to this opportunity as a Prime exclude the vendor from additional RFPs in the future for DOM?
Response		**No, the awarded Vendor of RFP No. 4283 will not be precluded from responding to any future DOM RFP's.**
Question 3	RFP No. 4283	If selected as the winning vendor to this opportunity as a Sub to a Prime exclude the vendor from additional RFPs in the future for DOM?
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 2 above.**

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Question 4	RFP No. 4283	Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, many businesses have closed their offices for the protection of staff. Since March, we have submitted RFPs to other states electronically. This RFP states that vendors are required to submit USBs. This would require staff to be in the office. Is it possible to submit our response by email and/or uploading to a portal?
Response		**No, Vendors cannot submit responses via email or portal. Vendors must submit one response of a complete proposal including all sections and exhibits, on a USB flash drive.**
Question 5	RFP No. 4283	When will you sign a NDA, and will it be your paper or vendors?
Response		**The NDA will be provided by DOM and will be signed during contract negotiations.**
Question 6	RFP No. 4283	The RFP calls out several on-site activities. Given the current pandemic, what is the State's plans for these activities? Note, the Vendor has successful deployed MPIs during the pandemic with little to no on-site activities.
Response		**Vendors must adhere to the on-site requirements outlined in the RFP. The State will work with the awarded Vendor during the pandemic.**
Question 7	RFP No. 4283	According to public records, the current Medicaid Clinical Data Infrastructure contract through September 30, 2021 shows the new not-to-exceed Contract Price of $53,418,035.00. With this RFP, the State is breaking the EMPI requirements into a separate procurement. What is the estimated budget for the EMPI solution?
Response		**Project specific budget information will not be provided. Agency Budget information is available at: www.transparency.ms.gov**
Question 8	Section I: Submission Cover Sheet & Configuration Summary Page 4	The RFP states that the cover sheet should have an original signature. Does that mean the Vendor needs to submit a hard copy with this? If yes, how many copies are needed as part of the submission?
Response		**a. No, Vendors are not required to submit a hard copy of their proposal response. The Vendor can include a scanned copy of the submission coversheet on their USB flash drive.** **b. NA.**
Question 9	Section II: Proposal	Requirement 5 states that original ink signatures are required on the Submission Cover Sheet and Configuration Summary

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	Submission Requirements, Item 5 Page 6	however Requirement 9.1 states that all documents should be submitted on a USB flash drive. Please confirm that all documents are to be electronic versions and that digital signatures will be accepted for all forms.
Response		**Yes, all documents are to be electronic versions submitted on a USB flash drive, but digital signatures are not acceptable. Vendors must include a scanned copy of their submission coversheet with an original ink signature with the RFP proposal response.**
Question 10	Section II: Proposal Submission Requirements, Item 9.1 Page 6	Due to concerns and local and state restrictions regarding COVID-19, accessing production equipment and supplies for producing and shipping hard copies presents challenges and risks. Would the State accept soft copy submissions in lieu of printed proposals? If so, how should vendors submit proposal files (email, portal, etc.)?
Response		**a. Yes.** **b. Vendors must submit one response of the complete proposal, including all sections and exhibits, on a USB flash drive.**
Question 11	Section II: Proposal Submission Requirements, Item 9.2 Page 6	Please confirm whether there are any special handling requirements for the client references; for example, must they be sealed in separate envelopes, or simply scanned into the USB?
Response		**No, there are no special handing requirements. Vendors must include client reference information with their RFP proposal response on a USB flash drive. Vendors are responsible for ensuring the timely delivery of their proposal response. Vendors should confirm with Jordan Barber, Technology Consultant that their proposal response is received prior to the deadline.**
Question 12		Will we need any financials if we get to the RFP bid?
Response	Section III: Vendor Information, Item 13 Page 11	**No, financial information is not required at this time. However, the State reserves the right to request financial information from responding Vendors. Refer to Section III: Vendor Information, Item 13.**
Question 13	Section III: Vendor Information, Items 14	Please clarify whether item 14 on p. 12 applies to this RFP, and if so, to which positions? Just the Project Executive, or also the other Key Personnel for whom resumes must be submitted?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	Page 12	
Response		a. **Section III, Item 14 applies to RFP No. 4283.** b. **Section III, Item 14 applies to all personnel performing the services described in the RFP.**
Question 14	Section III: Vendor Information, Items 14.1 – 14.5 Page 12	This set of requirements differs from other sections requesting information on vendor personnel. Should vendor proposals present a response to these items first, adhering to the numbering of the RFP and RFP instructions, or does the State prefer that these requirements be addressed with other personnel requirements Items?
Response		**Yes, Vendors must respond to items 14.1 through 14.5 first, adhering to the numbering format of the RFP.**
Question 15	Section III: Vendor Information, Item 15	Where should this required information be presented in vendor proposals?
Response		**Vendors must provide an inline response to all applicable requirements in RFP No. 4283. Vendors can make reference to additional information and include any additional attachments in their proposal response if necessary.**
Question 16	Section IV: Legal and Contractual Information, Item 28 Page 20	DOM specifically asks for a SaaS based solution; however, there are several requirements that run counter to this concept (i.e., Software Ownership, Change Orders). A typical SaaS arrangement consists of the customer utilizing a vendor-owned, vendor-maintained standalone service that is not developed for that customer, but configurable within bounds to meet the specific needs of the customer. Can DOM elaborate on your definition of a SaaS solution to help eliminate any misunderstandings of what your desired approach is?
Response		**Sections I – VI are standard boilerplate language that are included in all ITS RFPs. If the Vendor believes that their proposed solution is not applicable to any requirements in RFP No. 4283 then the Vendor must take exception to those requirements.**
Question 17	Section IV: Legal and Contractual Information, Items 28,29, &30 Page 20	Please clarify, if under a SaaS agreement, these questions are no longer applicable or should be adjusted.
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 16 above.**
Question 18	Section IV: Legal and Contractual	Please clarify, if under a SaaS agreement, a Subscription software license is allowed for a 5-year initial term as mentioned in Article 2?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	Information, Item 30 Page 20	
Response		**Yes, under a SaaS agreement a Subscription software license is allowed for a 5-year initial term.**
Question 19	Section IV: Legal and Contractual Information, Item 33 Page 21	Is there a preferred Cloud platform, i.e., Azure, AWS, GCP, etc.? If so, please provide the preferred Cloud platform.
Response		**a. The State does not have a preference.** **b. NA.**
Question 20	Section IV: Legal and Contractual Information, Item 35 Page 21	Although RFP Item 35 states that all submitted information contained in the Vendor's Response to the RFP is subject to a public disclosure under the Mississippi Public Records Act, can other information (such as an analysis or evaluation of the performance of the Service once operational) be kept confidential by the state?
Response		**Unless records held by a public body are specifically exempted by law or decision of a court which specifically declares a public record to be confidential or privileged or provides that a public record shall be exempt, the public record is subject to production, inspection, and/or copying in accordance with the Public Record Act. "Public records" shall mean all books, records, papers, accounts, letters, maps, photographs, films, cards, tapes, recordings or reproductions thereof, and any other documentary materials, regardless of physical form or characteristics, having been used, being in use, or prepared, possessed or retained for use in the conduct, transaction or performance of any business, transaction, work, duty or function of any public body, or required to be maintained by any public body. "Public records" shall not mean "personal information" as defined in Section 25-62-1. Vendors should review Miss. Code Ann. § 25-61-1 et. seq. and the ITS Public Records Public Policy and Procedures** http://www.its.ms.gov/Procurement/Documents/ISS%20 Procurement%20Manual.pdf#page=155
Question 21	Section IV: Legal and Contractual Information, Item 37	Please confirm that no Performance Bond is required for this procurement. Page 5 indicates no bond, but other references (such as pp. 22 and 86) specify a bond requirement.

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	Page 22	
Response		**Vendors are required to provide a performance bond or irrevocable letter of credit with their response to RFP No. 4283. Page 5 of RFP No. 4283 references a Proposal Bond. A Proposal Bond is not a requirement of this RFP.**
Question 22	Section IV: Legal and Contractual Information, Item 37 Page 22	Will the State please confirm if a performance bond is required with proposal submission?
Response		**Vendors are required to provide a performance bond or irrevocable letter of credit with their response to RFP No. 4283.**
Question 23	Section V: Proposal Exception Summary Form Page 27	Within the form it asks for the Page, section, items in Vendor's proposal where exception is explained. If we are taking exceptions to agreements/contracts included in the RFP, where should we provide the agreement and exceptions?
Response		**Vendors must provide exceptions to agreements/contracts using the proposal exception summary form. Vendors must reference the page number and Article number of the Agreement they are taking exception to.**
Question 24	Section VI: RFP Questionnaire, Item 1 Page 28	Do we need to register our company with the state if we do not operate business or have an office in your state?
Response		**Yes, Section VI, RFP Questionnaire, Item 1.1 of RFP No. 4283 states "Any Vendor who has not previously done business with the State and has not been assigned a MAGIC Vendor code should visit the following link to register: https://sus.magic.ms.gov/sap/bc/webdynpro/sapsrm/ wda_e_suco_sreg?sap-client=100"**
Question 25	Section VI: RFP Questionnaire, Item 1.2 Page 28	If we are an MBE in another state and certified would that be sufficient for your state and contract to qualify?
Response		**No, assuming "MBE" stands for "Minority Business Enterprise", Vendors who claim Minority Business**

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
		Enterprise status need to follow the instructions detailed in Section VI, RFP Questionnaire, Item 1.2 of the RFP.
Question 26	Section VI: RFP Questionnaire, Item 10 Page 30	Will we need a certain type of Liability Insurance Policy and if so would that be needed before after winning an RFP?
Response		**Section VI, RFP Questionnaire, Item 10 of RFP No. 4283 states "Vendor must provide a copy of their Certificate of Liability Insurance with the RFP response". Vendors must include their Certificate of Liability Insurance with their RFP response. The Certificate of Liability should include, at a minimum, Professional and General Liability, as well as a Cyber Security Insurance addendum in an amount commensurate with the professional responsibilities and liabilities under the terms of this RFP. The coverage should be no less than $1 million for each type. Refer to Clarification Number 9 of this Memorandum.**
Question 27	Section VI: RFP Questionnaire, Item 11 Page 30	Although we acknowledge the requirements, an award has not yet been given. Can documentation be provided subsequently?
Response		**No, Vendors must submit their E-Verify documentation with their RFP proposal response.**
Question 28	Section VII: Technical Specifications Pages 32 - 84	Several of the RFP items cover multiple requirements. How should a vendor respond if the vendor's solution meets some but not all of the requirements called for in that Item.
Response		**The Vendor must fully respond to each requirement within the Technical Specifications and provide explicit details as to the manner and degree by which the proposal meets or does not meet each requirement within each item. Vendor can also propose an alternative solution that meets or exceeds the requirement.**
Question 29	Section VII: Technical Specifications Pages 32 - 84	TRANSLATION & STANDARDIZATION a. Does each system have a unique member/person ID? b. How does the State currently capture or use a person's Social Security Numbers? c. If a person is on, then off, then on a program – does the program assign a new number each time or link back to the prior number?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
		d. How much is data shared across systems today?
Response		a. **Yes.** b. **Social Security Numbers are captured via applications and used internally for help in identification of individuals as allowed by law.** c. **Eligibility systems make every effort to maintain the original person record and number. (New MEDS, MAVERICS, VR2).** d. **Persons records are not coordinated between systems today.**
Question 30	Section VII: Technical Specifications Pages 32 - 84	Domain Types - What types of domains will be implemented? Is this a Patient only domain or is there also Provider and/or Organization?
Response		a. **A Person only domain will be implemented.** b. **A Person only domain will be implemented.**
Question 31	Section VII: Technical Specifications Pages 32 - 84	Entity Types - Within each defined domain, what are the Entity Types to be defined? i.e will Patient only be Individual or will there be household?
Response		a. **All references to EMPI should be Enterprise Master Person Index. Anticipated entities in the EMPI should be applicants, non-applying household members, self-service web portal account holders, authorized representatives, and beneficiaries. Refer to Clarification Number 6 of this Memorandum.** b. **Patients will be individual only.**
Question 32	Section VII: Technical Specifications Pages 32 - 84	How will the EMPI EID be used - will it be published (batch or real time) to consuming system? Who are the consumers (both source systems and business units) of the EID?
Response		a. **The EID is available in real time to all linked systems as a unifying ID for persons across different systems.** b. **Consumers are expected to include both person entity source/contributing systems and business function only systems. e.g. MAVERICS contributes and consumes, Fraud and Abuse Module consumes.**
Question 33	Section VII: Technical Specifications Pages 32 - 84	What is the criteria that DOM will use to determine if the Medicaid beneficiary is eligible? Is this as simple as an Active MRN existing in MDM or will it be based on payload data stored on a MRN in MDM?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		**a. Criteria will be determined by the Eligibility & Enrollment system. This procurement is for an EMPI only.** **b. The MRN will be a decision piece of the matching criteria.**
Question 34	Section VII: Technical Specifications Pages 32 - 84	Data Stewardship - will there be a Data Stewardship workflow required? Will Data Stewards from the State be available to assist when the MDM engine requires human intervention?
Response		**a. The State assumes that the workflow will be worked out by the Vendor in joint application development sessions with the State.** **b. Yes.**
Question 35	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.2 Page 34	What are the Number of Sources to be matched in MDM? How many sources does DOM contribute and will these be unique source within MDM or a single "DOM" source?
Response		**a. The list of systems is included in Revised Appendix A. Refer to Clarification Number 18 of this Memorandum.** **b. DOM has one system.**
Question 36	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3 Page 34	The RFP leaves the option to propose one or multiple Master Person instances. Does the State have any preference toward one or more than one instance?
Response		**DOM does not have a preference.**
Question 37	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3 Page 34	How many unique identities will be managed in the MPI? Vendor defines identities as equal to a person, an identity can have multiple linked source records under it.
Response		**Currently there are approximately 2,500,000 persons between DOM and MDHS eligibility systems. This includes people receiving benefits as well as other people not receiving benefits, but whose identities must be resolved. Approximately 880,000 are active beneficiaries.**
Question 38	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3 Page 34	From a volumetric perspective, should the vendor size the environment and services to only the DOM volume, or rather to the 880,000 total lives representative of DOM + MDHS? Or, do we need to also consider the 2.4 million historical Medicaid identities with the CDIP system?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		a. **DOM would anticipate loading approximately 1.2 million historical identities from DOM, up to 400,000 historical identities from MDHS in addition to the active beneficiaries. This would approximately equal 2.48 million beneficiaries.** b. **No, we will not be loading the 2.4 million from CDIP.**
Question 39	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3 Page 34	Section 3. General Overview. The overlap of recipients between the two agencies is estimated to be around 880,000 lives. Is that the expected volume for the initial data load for the EMPI? As a follow-up, what annual volume growth is expected?
Response		a. **Refer to the response to Question 38a. above.** b. **The annual volume growth is estimated at 10,000/month between DOM and MDHS.**
Question 40	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3 Page 34	There is a verbiage in requirement that the Vendor may choose to propose 1 or multiple Master Person instances to identify and manage unique person identities. Is this simply referring to number of MDM application instances processing API's to singular MDM data set? This is not referencing anything about multiple unique MDM application installations, correct?
Response		a. **No, it is not referring to the number of MDM's. DOM is looking for the best solution for an Enterprise Master Person Index.** b. **That is correct.**
Question 41	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3 Page 34	Are there any H/A (High Availability) requirement above and beyond what Cloud offers?
Response		**No.**
Question 42	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.1.1 Page 35	Will the state please provide a copy of the HHSTP Transformation Project document?
Response		**The HHSTP Architecture Flow document (Figure 1) is included in the Section VII of RFP on page 37.**
Question 43	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.1.3 Page 35	It is our understanding that DXC is the provider of the ESB. What are the specs and technology used for the ESB?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		**The ESB is OXi, an AWS hosted cloud ESB solution provided by Gainwell Technologies, formerly known as DXC.**
Question 44	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.1.3 Page 35	The RFP indicates that an ESB will be used to connect to the procured MPI. Can the technical details of the ESB technology be shared? Details such as Vendor, Product, Version, etc. Reason for the question is we have pre-built connectors to several of the commonly used ESB technologies and having those details would allow a more tailored response.
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 43 above.**
Question 45	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.1.3 Page 35	Could you please let me know the current technology product being used for the existing Enterprise Service Bus? For reference, please see 3.3.1.3: DOM and MOHS developed a joint roadmap to implement a series of modules to accomplish the vision of HHSTP and comply with the provisions of the Hope Act. Figure 1 is a diagram of the project vision. The Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) provides the foundation of a modular design and development services infrastructure for HHSTP. All modules implemented between the two agencies shall utilize the ESB for real time and standards-based connectivity.
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 43 above.**
Question 46	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.1.4.1 Page 36	This section identifies a "Common Web Portal (CWP): DOM and MDHS envision a single, centralized web portal that allows Mississippians to apply for Medicaid, CHIP, SNAP, TANF, LIHEAP, and other social services programs. The CWP is a collaborative streamlined eligibility application." Is the CWP expected to be built, priced, and included as part of this response?
Response		**No, the CWP is a separate project.**
Question 47	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.1.4.1 & 3.3.1.4.3 Page 36	Please clarify whether the vendor is responsible for providing solutions related to the requirements in Section 3.3.1.4.1 and 3.3.1.4.3 or are these requirements provided as background context only.
Response		**No, the Vendor will not be responsible for either of those projects. This RFP is specifically for an EMPI.**
Question 48	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.1.4.2 Page 36	Does the state expect to include healthcare providers, both individuals and organizations as well as patients and beneficiaries in this solution?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		**DOM does not expect the Vendor to include healthcare providers. The proposed solution will include DOM and MDHS people only. If a Vendor solution allows for providers to be linked with beneficiaries, the Vendor should state that they have that capability, and whether that capability is included in the pricing. If pricing is separate, the Vendor should include the costs associated with this service in Section VIII, Cost Information Submission, under optional costs.**
Question 49	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.1.4.2 Page 36	This section identifies a "Master Person Index (MPI): The Master Person Index will be a system that connects all clients between each participating agency's eligibility system(s). It is to be considered the source of truth for all clients for all programs managed by the participating agencies. Access to the MPI will be granted through the ESB." Is the MPI expected to be built, priced, and included as part of this response?
Response		**No, the MPI will be built after the award and contract negotiations. However, Vendors must include all cost associated with meeting the requirements of RFP No. 4283 in their proposal response.**
Question 50	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.1.4.3 Page 36	This section identifies a "Fraud and Abuse Module (FAM): The FAM will provide a common fraud and abuse platform that shall perform enhanced eligibility verification, identity authentication and verification, and asset verification." Is the FAM expected to be built, priced, and included as part of this response?
Response		**No, FAM is a separate project.**
Question 51	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.1.4.3 Page 36	Please describe how fraud is detected? What is considered when determining fraud?
Response		**a. Fraud is detected with the FAM system, not through the EMPI.** **b. The FAM Vendor will be responsible for detecting possible fraud not the EMPI Vendor.**
Question 52	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.2 Page 38	Is the intent to store Clinical data in MDM or will this continue to be stored in another application?
Response		**No, this will be an EMPI with demographics only.**
Question 53	Section VII: Technical	This section lists 8 current trading partners who are integrated to the existing CDIP MPI. Should we assume for purposes of

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	Specifications, Item 3.3.2.1 Page 38	determining implementation timeline and costs that we will integrate the new MPI with only these same 8 trading partners? If not, what is the full list of facilities that will need to be integrated?
Response		**a. No, the EMPI will connect to the ESB to validate beneficiaries for the trading partners.** **b. Refer to Revised Appendix A for the list of integrations. Refer to Clarification Number 18 of this Memorandum.**
Question 54	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.2.2 Page 38	The section identifies the fact the existing CDIP MPI exchanges approx. 30,000 real-time clinical data transactions daily with Medicaid Trading Partners and MCOs via real-time clinical integrations. Can you provide a list of the different types of messages being sent (HL7 ADT, C-CDAs, other) along with an approximate breakdown on the relative volume of each as a percentage of the whole?
Response		**The listed HL7 messages and IHE transactions listed in the RFP (Section VII Figure 2) are the anticipated required messages; however, DOM is seeking the best, most modern, solution and thus would encourage Vendors to propose solutions that use standards and emerging standards (such as HL7 FHIR) to achieve a highly efficient MPI and match rate.**
Question 55	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.2.2 Page 38	The existing integrated MPI to the CDIP system holds "2.4 million historical Medicaid identities." Will the procured MPI need to hold these historical identities?
Response		**It is anticipated that these legacy identities will not need to be included in the new EMPI solution. If the Vendor has a use-case for inclusion of these legacy identities, the Vendor should state said use-case in their response.**
Question 56	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.2.2 Page 38	What is the number of unique MRNs to be loaded into MDM from each Source?
Response		**If the Vendor is referring to unique entities, refer to the Question 37 response. It the Vendor is asking about IDs, not entities, one person can have unlimited MRNs.**
Question 57	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.2.2	RFP states DOM has 750k Active Medicaid identities and 2.4 million historical. First, is "identity" referring to unique MRN record? Second, will we be loading all historical records and will these be matched again the Active records?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	Page 38	
Response		a. **No, the MRN is just a medical record number that is sent from a trading partner. Those numbers are specific to the CDIP project. Refer to the response to Question 35 above.** b. **Refer to the response to Question 38 above.**
Question 58	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.2.2 Page 38	What are the Add/Update workload requirements for both transactions / sec and latency requirements? For example, the requirement states 30,000 real-time clinical data transactions daily. Will this data be stored in MDM and if so, is there a peak TPS rate observed throughout the day?
Response		a. **During peak load, DOM receives up to 1,000 applications with an average of 2.5 individuals per application.** b. **The 30,000 real-time clinical data transactions will not require an add or an update to the EMPI, this process will only provide a yes or no response to indicate if the beneficiary is a Medicaid recipient.**
Question 59	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 3.3.2.2 Page 38	What are the retrieval workload requirements for Search and MRN Retrieval for both transactions / sec and latency requirements?
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 58 above.**
Question 60	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Items 3.3.2.2, 3.3.2.3, 7.9.6 Pages 38 & 57	The RFP calls out the use of HL7 messages for some of the interactions with the procured MPI. For example, section 7.9.6 calls out merge related ADT messages (A18, A30, A34, etc.) and Figure 2 (page 39) also mentions PDQ actions. Can a complete list of HL7 messages (Message Type, Event Type and Version) that are required be shared?
Response		**The Vendor's proposed solution must be able to send and receive messages using Health Level Seven standards as defined here:** **http://www.hl7.org/implement/standards/index.cfm?ref=nav**
Question 61	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 4 Page 40	As per the schedule, the due date for submission of the response is February 23, 2021. We recognize the State's requirements for implementation and go-live. Due to the complexity, the shelter-in-place requirements across much of the U.S. due to COVID-19, and the USB requirements, is there a possibility for an extension to March 19, 2021?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		**Yes, refer to Clarification Numbers 1, 2, and 8 of this Memorandum.**
Question 62	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 5.8 Page 40	Are there more specifics available: is this for an unlimited license or are record volumes available? Are there specific projects or business use cases in mind to help define the scope?
Response		**a. No, we do not have specifics available other than those defined in Section VII, Items 3.3, and 3.3.2.2.** **b. We currently have two use cases, the HHSTP that is outlined in Section VII, Item 3.3.1, and the CDIP project that is outlined in Section VII Item 3.3.2.**
Question 63	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.1 Page 51	This section uses the term "data governance rules". Please clarify if this term and provide examples.
Response		**DOM is seeking the ability for the EMPI to have programmatic-specific rules and functions for source of truth and consistency across the enterprise.**
Question 64	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.1 Page 51	Please provide a list of internet browsers that the State currently allows its staff to use.
Response		**DOM users have access to Edge Chromium.** **MDHS users have access to Google Chrome, Firefox, and Edge Chromium**
Question 65	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.2 Page 52	Please confirm the "provider" mentioned in the list is just another entity in the (E)MPI, and this is not a requirement for a Provider Registry.
Response		**That is correct. This is a beneficiary EMPI only.**
Question 66	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.3 Page 52	Please clarify what currently operational DOM-specific programs and program-specific rules are in place today. Please also provide typical volume of each use case.
Response		**a. DOM currently has a Medicaid Eligibility Determination System (New MEDS) which processes eligibility applications using CMS guidelines for MAGI and ABD**

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
		populations. In addition, as part of HHSTP, there is an applicant self-service portal (CWP) and the FAM which is used for fraud detection. All of these modules will need to be able to correctly identify unique individuals. b. **The typical volume for each use case cannot be provided.**
Question 67	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.1 Page 52	This section introduces the "linked systems" term. Please confirm that "linked system" is used to refer to a State system that is connected to the procured MPI for 1) contributing person/identity information to the MPI, 2) searching the MPI to retrieve person/identity information, or 3) a combination of both. [Note for the remainder of our questions, we will used "linked system(s)" as defined above] Alternately, please provide a detailed definition for "linked system(s)."
Response		a. **Refer to the "Common Terms" in Section VII, Item 3. A linked system is "Any host system that provides person identifying information, i.e. a system that maintains person information, see Appendix A"** b. **Refer to the response to Question 67a. above.**
Question 68	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.9 Page 53	This section calls for a deceased person flag. Will the State be providing deceased person from one or more of the linked systems? In other words, is the State providing the death information for the population of the procured MPI.
Response		**Yes, DOM is expecting the Vendor to flag a record based on a date of death field in a linked system, or through referential matching.**
Question 69	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.9 Page 53	Please clarify this requirement. Presumably this would be just storing a deceased flag based on information provided by the source systems. What integration is needed in this case, to notify other systems of the deceased flag status change?
Response		**DOM would expect that if a source reports a person as deceased, the MPI would flag that person and send a transaction to all connected systems that know that person to notify them of the fact.**
Question 70	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.10 Page 53	Please clarify "alternative name/alias." Is this intended to cover 1) historical names for the person that were previously sent to the MPI, 2) additional active names for the person, 3) a completely separate demographic item/field that is separate for the main name demographic items/fields, or 4) some other definition, in this case please provide a detailed definition for "alternative name/alias."
Response		**DOM is expecting the Vendor to determine if an alias is being used using a matching algorithm with the rest of the**

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
		demographic information. It should cover all historical names, as well as any active names, whether they come in one field or multiple fields.
Question 71	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.13 Page 53	Please provide a list all such systems that will feed data into the EMPI.
Response		**The linked systems which will provide data feeds are in Appendix A to the RFP. Refer to Clarification Number 18 of this Memorandum. In addition to the linked system, the EMPI will have to validate beneficiaries via the ESB. DOM is anticipating future systems and services could access and benefit from this MPI.**
Question 72	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.14 Page 54	Can you further explain what the nature of the audit data you desire needs to be?
Response		**DOM should be able to receive audit log information for any record within the system upon request. Refer to Section VII, Item 7.8 of the RFP for a complete list of audit log activity types.**
Question 73	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.14 Page 54	What "audit data" is expected to be returned?
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 72 above.**
Question 74	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.15 Page 54	Does this item apply only to multiple MPIs?
Response		**No, this would include both scenarios. Refer to Clarification Number 23 of this Memorandum.**
Question 75	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.16 Page 54	Please explain what is meant by linked systems being the ultimate authority on merging and unmerging? By 'linked systems" is the state referring to multiple interconnected MPIs?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		**a. The EMPI will not be final authority on a merge. The linked system will make the final decision.** **b. No, refer to the response to Question 67 above.**
Question 76	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.15, 7.9.5 Pages 54 & 57	Regarding what appear to be "automatic update" of DOM's connected systems (as expressed in 7.7.15 and 7.9.5): these seem to go well beyond the concept of a Master Patient Identifier. In situations where updated information on individuals is detected via the MPI, the typical arrangement is to make that information available to all participating systems but allow for the individual operational systems to utilize their own logic and program rules to access that "golden record" – many problems could arise from the automated promulgation of information directly into operational systems. As written, these requirements seem to extend into Master Data Management, which requires detailed knowledge of each involved system, when and why to update based on its interaction with the various other sources, and DOM-defined logic to prioritize certain datasets over others. Can DOM provide clarity on the intent of these two sections?
Response		**Refer to Clarification Number 23 of this Memorandum. If multiple MPI's are proposed, they should harmonize persons between all MPI instances, as well as flag the persons record when changes to persons or demographics are updated, regardless of system or instance.**
Question 77	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.17 Page 54	This Items appears to be a duplicate of 7.7.14, please confirm that this item does not need to be answered in the vendor's response
Response		**Item 7.7.14 is related to audit data and Item 7.7.17 is related to sending industry standard messages between systems. Both requirements need to be responded to appropriately.**
Question 78	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.19 Page 54	Please provide more details on this requirement. A sample data flow of the expected behavior would help.
Response		**The proposed solution shall reject a pending merge request when receiving a message from a linked system that rejects the merge. If a linked system rejects a merge, the merge shall be rejected, or not processed, at the EMPI.**
Question 79	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.21.1	Please clarify what is intended by manual merge or unmerge activities. Is this a human user working in the MPI User Interface merging two records; or is it a linked system calling the MPI to merge the two records? Is it referring to a true merge action where one record survives, and one record is retired to a merged

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	Page 54	state; or a logical linkage where both records remain active but now linked to the same identity? Note the vendor supports both a link/unlink action and a merge/unmerge action within the MPI.
Response		**a. DOM has a business analyst who currently reviews MPI records and manually merges and unmerges when necessary.** **b. Vendors shall propose the best actions and methodologies to support the manual merge and unmerge process for the State.**
Question 80	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.21.1 Page 54	Where are the "manual merge or unmerge activities" taking place? Within the MPI or withing the State source systems?
Response		**DOM anticipates the manual merge to take place within the EMPI.**
Question 81	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.21.1 Page 54	Are these "clean up" services? Do they occur prior to go-live? Are these the same as mentioned in Sec VII: 6.4.9.2.8? Does this also include activity in downstream systems?
Response		**a. Yes, DOM has a business analyst who currently reviews MPI records and manually merges and unmerges when necessary.** **b. This would be conducted on a daily basis, not just prior to go-live.** **c. No, this would not include the linked systems.**
Question 82	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.25 Page 55	Please clarify "automated merge process". Does it refer to records that the MPI automatically linked together or records that were merged as a result of an API call from a State system?
Response		**Any merge that was completed automatically whether it is between the MPI's or if merged via the linked systems.**
Question 83	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.7.27 Page 55	Please define "assumed matches" and "potential matches" and how they are different.
Response		**Algorithmic scores will determine if a match is assumed, potential, or not a match. On demand access is required so that DOM staff can review these potential matches to**

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
		determine if they are a match or not. DOM must be able to see the scores that the system has generated.
Question 84	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.9.3

Page 56 | Please define "person validation management". A sample use case or data flow of the expected behavior would help. |
| **Response** | | **The proposed solution must be able to send a validation message back to an entity on whether the requested person is a valid State entity. This is a yes/no validation. No demographic information will be returned.** |
| **Question 85** | Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.9.5

Page 57 | Please advise which of the following sources of MPI data are in scope:

a. DOM – Claims, Member Masterfile(s), Eligibility and Enrollments, LTC, FWA – and whether each module has a different Member number, driving complexity

b. Member &/or Applicant Web Portal – Common/Enterprise, Medicaid or program specific

c. DHS Social programs: – We assume SNAP, TANF, WIC, LIHEAP, NEMT, and the Social E&E system / Member master file(s)

d. Children's system of care – Foster care/Adoption, Protective services, Support payments, BH, etc.

e. Behavioral Health

f. DoH – Population Health

g. Corrections |
| **Response** | | **The current scope is the HHSTP, which includes the systems contained in Section VII, Technical Specifications, Figure 1 on page 37.** |
| **Question 86** | Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.9.5

Page 57 | Data sources -- Please confirm that the list of systems in Section 7.9.5 is complete. |
| **Response** | | **Yes, that is the current list.** |
| **Question 87** | Section VII: Technical | Please describe the responsibilities of the State, with the use of the EMPI solution? (e.g., data stewardship, any manual resolution of duplicate identities, etc). |

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	Specifications, Item 7.9.5 Page 57	
Response		**DOM is looking for a Vendor to provide this solution with limited State resources.**
Question 88	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.9.7 Page 56	Please clarify "history". Is it referring to historical demographic attributes (such as pervious addresses) or please provide a definition?
Response		**Yes, that is correct. DOM should be able to look back at a beneficiary from a random date and determine what the demographics for that individual were during that time frame.**
Question 89	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.9.12 Page 57	Please provide more details on this requirement. A sample use case or data flow of the expected behavior would help.
Response		**DOM wants the ability to customize the message coming back from a linked system to include items that DOM (today) does not know are being stored about a person on the MPI.**
Question 90	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.9.12 Page 57	Please provide more details on this requirement. What is meant by "customized data messages"?
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 89 above.**
Question 91	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.10.1.1 Page 57	Vendor assumes that the majority of additions, edits, and actions (merge, unmerge, etc.) on records will come via API calls from the State. What volume of additions, edits, and actions will be manual and how many human users would need manual edit of records inside the procured MPI's user interface?
Response		**That is correct, currently DOM has one individual who works on manual processes. The individual who works on the manual processes averages merging and unmerging approximately 20-30 identities per day, thus the desire for automation and other support for these processes.**
Question 92	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.10.1.1	Item 7.10.1.1 calls for the ability to manually merge and unmerge records, this seems to conflict with Item 7.7.16 that says "linked systems are the ultimate authority on merging and unmerging". Please clarify.

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	Page 57	Note the vendor supports both a link/unlink action and a merge/unmerge action within the MPI.
Response		**Since algorithms are not always correct, it is necessary to have manual backup. When two linked systems disagree, an individual will review and determine which record is correct.**
Question 93	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.10.1.1 Page 57	Please clarify what is meant by "testing matching logic" in this Item.
Response		**DOM will review the proposed solution's matching logic scores periodically for quality purposes.**
Question 94	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.10.5 Page 58	Vendor assumes that the majority of edits on records will come via API calls from the State. What volume of additions, edits, and actions will be manual and how many human users would need manual edit of records inside the procured MPI's user interface?
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 91 above.**
Question 95	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 7.10.5 Page 58	On the mandatory call yesterday there was a question about Cloud security. A respondent from the state indicated that a cloud-based solution would require FedRAMP compliance to validate the security of cloud services. I do not see FedRAMP listed as a requirement in the main RFP document. Can you please clarify whether FedRAMP is a required security standard for a SaaS Cloud offering?
Response		**Yes, refer to Clarification Numbers 10, 11, and 12 of this Memorandum.**
Question 96	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 8.2 Page 58	Please explain the business need for these desired match rates.
Response		**Since DOM is anticipating a high volume of queries from outside entities, whether they are individual requests or a bulk request, the proposed solution must be able to respond to these requests for validation within the times defined.**
Question 97	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 8.2 Page 58	Please clarify the two scenarios for matching disparate persons. By matching disparate persons is the state referring to matching an incoming search request to 500/2000 match candidates that are already in the MPI?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		**No, The 500/2000 match rates stated in Section VII Item 8.2 are not match candidates that are in the MPI. DOM is anticipating that queries will come from outside entities whether they are individual request, or a bulk request. The proposed solution must be able to respond to these requests for validation within the times defined.**
Question 98	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 8.5 Page 58	Please clarify if there are any FedRAMP requirements for this RFP, as CMS MARS-E 2.0 Minimum Acceptable Risk Standards does not call out FedRAMP as a requirement. Would the state accept other security related certification such as HITRUST, SOC 2 Type 2, etc.?
Response		**No, refer to Clarification Numbers 10, 11, and 12 of this Memorandum.**
Question 99	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Items 8.10.4.1 & 8.11.5 Pages 62 &64	Some of the items listed here (such as Hardware inventory replacement/upgrade) would not apply to a cloud-hosted SaaS solution that the RFP calls for. For vendors who are proposing a cloud-hosted SaaS solution, how should these questions be answered.
Response		**Vendors should respond with N/A.**
Question 100	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 8.10.6 Page 62	Please define current Maintenance and Operations (M&O) Vendor and provide what cutover operations are required.
Response		**The current Maintenance and Operations Vendor is MedeAnalytics who contracts with NextGate. DOM will work with the awarded Vendor and MedeAnalytics for this transition.**
Question 101	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 8.10.7 Page 62	Please provide existing or sample Quality Assurance procedures for review.
Response		**Prior to production, DOM would like to review and test any changes in a non-production environment.**
Question 102	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 8.11.1 Page 63	Will the solution be accessed 24 x 7 or just during DOM working hours - 7AM to 7PM Monday through Friday?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		**Automated messages will be sent and received 24 x 7. Manual merges will be done during working hours.**
Question 103	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 8.11 Page 63	Given that the RFP calls for a cloud-hosted SaaS solution there are several factors outside the control of the vendor that might impact SLA-related items. These could include (but not limited to): performance issues within the state system (such as the ESB) that is connecting to the MPI; Internet performance issues at the State location that is connecting to the MPI; and general Internet performance issues between the State's ISP and the Vendor's hosting center. Given these items, how does the state plan to measure the various performance related SLAs?
Response		**SLA's are reviewed on a per incident basis to determine fault.**
Question 104	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 8.11.2 Page 63	The vendor's solution is a SaaS offering that that is configured in a highly available environment that has very little downtime for planned maintenance. As a SaaS solution the vendor has a fixed maintenance window across all customers that does not align with the time slot called for in 8.11.2. Given that planned maintenance has little to no downtime, would different early morning maintenance window be acceptable?
Response		**No.**
Question 105	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 8.11.2 Page 63	Since DOM working hours are 7 AM to 7PM Central Time Monday through Friday, why is the scheduled downtime limited to 1 a.m. to 4 a.m. for all days of the week?
Response		**Downtime is scheduled after hours as to not impact entities requesting validation during normal working hours. This is due to the IOP project, and queries that come in from Trading Partners. There are also batch jobs that run at night to process Account Transfer application from Healthcare.gov as well as consumer applications coming 24 hours a day from the Common Web portal.**
Question 106	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 8.11.27 Page 67	Please clarify that this applies to Production instances after Go-Live, and not pre-go-live or non-production instances.
Response		**That is correct; all operational instances that are live.**
Question 107	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 9.2 Page 70	Potential host setting to be considered include the ITS data center in Jackson. If we want to utilize the ITS data center in Jackson, who can we work with to get pricing to utilize the data center, details on available services, and SLA for ITS as the data center operator?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		**The ITS Data Center's hosted offerings are structured and configured to pass through infrastructure costs directly to State agencies, but not to sell hosting services to private sector companies. With this model, State agencies are responsible for managing the application environment, which includes monitoring and sizing the hardware for efficient application functionality. Since the State is asking for a Software as a Service (SaaS) solution in this RFP, the State expects the Vendor to be responsible for all aspects of the proposed solution including hosting, management of the infrastructure and application, and adhering to the required service level agreements. Refer to Clarification Number 15 of this Memorandum.**
Question 108	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 9.2 Page 70	Is hosting of the procured EMPI in the ITS managed data center preferred over external cloud hosting services?
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 107 above.**
Question 109	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 9.2 Page 70	In the event that ITS were to host the EMPI solution, would certain SLAs around uptime, disaster recovery, RTO/RPO, etc. be waived or aligned with the SLA provided by ITS?
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 107 above.**
Question 110	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 9.2 Page 70	Requirement 9.2 requests the vendor provide any cloud-based HIPAA and MARS-E 2.0 compliant facility for hosting. Please confirm the state will consider proposals using commercial cloud service provider hosted solutions.
Response		**Yes, the State will consider proposals using commercial cloud service provider hosted solutions. Refer to Clarification Number 15 of this Memorandum.**
Question 111	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 9.6 Page 71	What is the requirement for the WAN encrypted tunnel and what types of WAN encrypted tunnels supported by the State? Typical integrations do not require an WAN encrypted tunnel between the customer and Vendor as all interaction with the MPI are through encrypted web service calls.
Response		**This requirement has been removed. Refer to Clarification Number 16 of this Memorandum.**
Question 112	Section VII: Technical	Please provide guidance on how some of the requirements, such as "internet connectivity," in this item would apply to a cloud-hosted SaaS solution that the RFP calls for.

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	Specifications, Item 9.8 Page 71	
Response		**Internet connectivity is no longer a requirement. Refer to Clarification Number 17 of this Memorandum.**
Question 113	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 9.8 Page 71	Under Hosting requirements in the RFP, the state calls for "dedicated services with no intermingling of data or resources with other clients….". Identity matching services offer increased efficacy when more data sources are used, collocated, and correlated. Will the State entertain the utilization of environments with numerous identity sources, as long as they are protected and in compliance with FedRAMP, MARS-E, HITRUST, etc.?**ATTACHMENT F – Revised Appendix A for the correct list. Refer to Clarification Number 18 above. Appendix B has been removed from the RFP and MDHS will not use this procurement for their EMPI. Refer to Clarification Numbers 7 and 18 above.**
Question 114	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Appendix B Page 83	There are 6 eligibility systems listed for integration with the MDHS MPI instance in Appendix B; however, Appendix A has a 7 system "new Meds" for purposes of determining implementation timeline and costs should we assume 6 or 7 systems will need to be integrated?
Response		**There is a total of 7 systems. New MEDS is the Medicaid eligibility system within DOM. Appendix B has been removed from the RFP and MDHS will not use this procurement for their EMPI. Refer to Clarification Numbers 7 and 18 above.**
Question 115	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Appendix B Page 84	Figure 1 – Architecture Diagram in Appendix B seems to indicate that there are two separate ESBs, one for HHSTP and one for MDHS. Is this correct? If there are two, can the technical details of both ESB technologies be provided. Details such as Vendor, Product, Version, etc.
Response		**There is only one ESB. Refer to the response to Question 43 above. Appendix B has been removed from the RFP and MDHS will not use this procurement for their EMPI. Refer to Clarification Numbers 7 and 18 above.**
Question 116	Section VII: Technical Specifications, Appendix B Page 84	Is it a requirement that the MDHS MPI be a separate instance from the DOM MPI instance as defined in Figure 1 – Architecture Diagram or can we propose a single combined instance?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		**No, it is not a requirement. Appendix B has been removed from the RFP and MDHS will not use this procurement for their EMPI. Refer to Clarification Numbers 7 and 18 above.**
Question 117	Section VIII: Cost Information Submission

Page 85 | Does the State have a specific expectation surrounding the time frame to implementation? (This could affect milestone determination, among other things.) |
| **Response** | | **No, that will be determined by the Vendor.** |
| **Question 118** | Section VIII: Cost Information Submission

Page 85 | The Operations & Maintenance table contains a reference to the years 2020 through 2024. Can the vendor modify this table to reflect 2021 through 2025, given that 2020 is past? (i.e., Are you still seeking a 5-year O&M period?) |
| **Response** | | **Refer to Clarification Number 19 of this Memorandum.** |
| **Question 119** | Section VIII: Change Order Rates Cost Information Submission

Page 86 | Will the State please confirm that the "Rate" in the Vendor Staffing charts under Supplement to Deliverable Costs, should be fully loaded inclusive of all overhead, indirect costs, and fee? |
| **Response** | | **Vendors must propose fully loaded change order rates. Refer to Clarification Number 21 of this Memorandum.** |
| **Question 120** | Section VIII: Change Order Rates Cost Information Submission

Page 86 | How should vendors propose different rates for future years? Should vendors create a table for each year of the contract and calculate a Grand Total for all years? |
| **Response** | | **Fully loaded change order rates cannot change for the life of the contract.** |
| **Question 121** | Section VIII: Change Order Rates Cost Information Submission

Page 88 | This appears to incorrectly refence item 7.6.21.1 instead of the correct 7.7.21.1, please confirm. |
| **Response** | | **Yes, refer to Clarification Number 21 of this Memorandum.** |
| **Question 122** | Exhibit A: Standard | I have a question regarding unlimited liability - according to Mississippi Code - will this be available for this RFP? What will |

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	Contract, Article 20 Page 105	be on the table as open to negotiate in terms of limitations on liability? MS Code § 25-53-21(e) **https://law.justia.com/codes/mississippi/2010/title-25/53/25-53-21/** Under Executive Director of IT Responsibilities: "In the negotiation and execution of such contracts, the executive director may negotiate a limitation on the liability to the State of prospective contractors provided such limitation affords the State reasonable protection. "
Response		**Yes; in accordance with State law, the ITS Executive Director may negotiate a limitation on the liability to the State of prospective contractors provided such limitation affords the State reasonable protection. The State will negotiate terms with the Awarded Vendor.**
Question 123	Exhibit A: Standard Contract, Page 93	Can a clause be inserted into the Standard Contract that states there is no customized software being generated by the Vendor (so as to avoid ownership issues of the software)?Alternatively, if it is so stated in the Standard Contract, is that enough to reserve all IP rights with the Vendor.
Response		**Any Vendor proposed edits to the Exhibit A, Standard Contract must be included in the Proposal Exception Summary form. The State will negotiate contract terms with the Awarded Vendor.**
Question 124	Exhibit A: Standard Contract, Article 1 Page 93	Is it possible to define "Developed Work" as a deliverable; and state that there are no deliverables / Developed Works to be performed under the contract / award?
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 128 above.**
Question 125	Exhibit A: Standard Contract, Article 1.8 Page 94	Can there be stated limit as to who has access to the MPI Service [BOOKEND IT]?
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 128 above.**
Question 126	Exhibit A: Standard Contract,	Please confirm term is for 5 years.

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	Article 2.1 Page 94	
Response		**The initial contract term is for 5 years.**
Question 127	Exhibit A: Standard Contract, Article 3.2(D) Page 95	What are access rates; and are they similar to success rates of matches; and if so, are they published?
Response		**No, access rates refer to system access.**
Question 128	Exhibit A: Standard Contract, Article 3.2(L) Page 95	Given the RFP calls for a cloud-hosted SaaS solution, many of the items listed in the Item do not apply, for example server specifications. Please clarify the State's expectation for this item for a SaaS solution.
Response		**Vendors must identify any language in Exhibit A, Standard contract that is not applicable to the proposed solution and include that language in the Proposal Exception Summary form.**
Question 129	Exhibit A: Standard Contract, Article 3.2(U) Page 96	This Section refers to Vendor providing transition assistance post-expiration or post-termination, but is open-ended as to the duration of that assistance. Is it possible to have a fixed period of time for that transition assistance?
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 122 above.**
Question 130	Exhibit A: Standard Contract, Article 7.6 Page 99	If the vendor utilizes continuous threat monitoring technology would that fulfill the daily test requirement?
Response		**Yes.**
Question 131	Attachment B & Attachment C Pages 126 & 127	Are Attachment B and C for vendor review only, or are vendors to review and provide exceptions if applicable?
Response		**Vendors must review the Attachments and take exception if applicable.**
Question 132	Clarifications Memorandum 2	Amendment states "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." Is the state expecting vendors to respond

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	Pages 1 - 21	inline (requirement by requirement) to each of the specified requirements in Section 6 thus duplicating some sections of our response that answer these requirements?
Response		**No, Section VII, Item 6 in the RFP has been completely replaced with Amendment 2. No response to Section VII, Item 6 in the RFP itself is required. All of the requirements in Amendment 2 must be responded to in line with each individual requirement.**
Question 133	Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2 Pages 1 - 21	The solicitation references numerous on-site requirements for various project activities and key personnel. Will the State consider exceptions to these on-site requirements due to the COVID-19 pandemic to reduce the spread of the virus. We have established innovative approaches and best practices that have enabled our teams to effectively operate in remote project settings and deliver on-time, on-budget projects that meet our clients' expectations and maintain our high client satisfaction rating. In fact, we have been able to effectively shift all on-site projects to 100% remote without experiencing any negative consequences. It is also worth noting that all of our employees live within the continental United States and, as such, all project work would occur within the continental United States.
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 6 above.**
Question 134	Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2 Pages 1 – 21	Please confirm if responsibilities designated as "on-site" can be attended virtually, and if so, for what duration.
Response		**No, refer to the response to Question 6 above.**
Question 135	Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.3 Pages 11 & 12	Are there additional key dates required for the project that are not provided in the RFP – for example, is there a targeted go live date?
Response		**No, key dates will be established with the project plan.**
Question 136	Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.3.4 Page 12	Our reading of this Item is that the Project Management Plan is to be presented post-contract. Is that correct?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
Response		**A sample project plan and work plan are acceptable with the proposal. Vendor should propose a project management plan deliverable, as well as a project work plan deliverable with Section VIII, Cost Information Submission.**
Question 137	Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Items 6.3.4 & 6.3.5 Pages 12 & 13	Sections 6.3.4 and 6.3.5 state that the vendor shall prepare a project management plan and Project Work Plan. Is this plan expected as part of the proposal response, or is this expected as part of delivery? Please clarify.
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 141 above.**
Question 138	Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.3.5 Page 12 & 13	Our reading of this Item is that the Project Work Plan is to be presented post-contract. Is that correct?
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 141 above.**
Question 139	Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.3.5 Page 12	Please clarify if "bi-weekly" is occurring every two weeks or twice a week.
Response		**Bi-weekly is every two weeks.**
Question 140	Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.3.6.2 Page 13	Please clarify if "bi-weekly" is occurring every two weeks or twice a week
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 144 above.**
Question 141	Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.3.6 Page 13	Our reading of this Item is that Project Artifacts are to be presented post-contract. Is that correct?
Response		**Yes, once a negotiated contract has been executed these items will be required.**
Question 142	Clarifications Memorandum	The State requires on-site train the trainer sessions. Given the impact of COVID-19, does the State anticipate converting these on-site sessions to remote sessions?

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	2: Amendment 2, Item 6.4.1

Page 13 | |
| **Response** | | **Refer to the response to Question 6 above.** |
| **Question 143** | Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.6

Page 14 | As mentioned in the RFP: Due to the pandemic, is the state considering any exception to the onsite requirement for Key Personnel or the travel requirement? |
| **Response** | | **Refer to the response to Question 6 above.** |
| **Question 144** | Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.6

Page 14 | Amendment 2. Section 6.6. Key Personnel. The Business Analyst is under this section and not marked with a KP like the Project Executive and others. Are the Business Analysts (minimum of two required) considered Key Personnel? |
| **Response** | | **No, Business Analysts are not considered Key Personnel.** |
| **Question 145** | Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.6

Page 14 | Amendment 2. Section 6.6. Key Personnel. The technical training staff is listed under this section and not marked with a KP like the Project Executive and others. Is the lead trainer or are any of the training staff considered Key Personnel? |
| **Response** | | **No, Technical Training staff are not considered Key Personnel.** |
| **Question 146** | Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Items 6.6 & 6.6.4

Page 14 | The State requires on-site monthly meetings. Given the impact of COVID-19, does the state anticipate converting these on-site sessions to remote sessions? |
| **Response** | | **Refer to the response to Question 6 above.** |
| **Question 147** | Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.6.3

Page 14 | Our reading of this Item is that the staffing contingency plan is to be presented post-contract. Is that correct? |
| **Response** | | **Yes, once a negotiated contract has been executed, these items will be required.** |
| **Question 148** | Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.6.5 | If the vendor is proposing only one (1) Master Person instance, are multiple Lead PMs required? |

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
	Page 15	
Response		**No, the expectation is one Lead PM per instance.**
Question 149	Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.6.6.2.2 Page 18	Is the minimum requirement of 80 hours per month of on-site time for the Technical Architect role for the duration of the project negotiable?
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 6 above.**
Question 150	Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.6.7 Page 18	If the vendor is proposing only one (1) Master Person instance, are multiple BAs required?
Response		**A minimum of two business analysts are required for this project, even if only one instance is proposed.**
Question 151	Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.6.7 Page 18	Earlier in the RFP, multiple MPIs were described as optional. However, this item assumes 2 MPIs. If a single MPI instance is proposed as the best solution, can we assume that only one BA is needed?
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 155 above.**
Question 152	Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.6.7.2.6 Page 19	Is the minimum requirement of 80 hours per month of on-site time for the Business Analyst role for the duration of the project negotiable?
Response		**Refer to the response to Question 6 above.**
Question 153	Clarifications Memorandum 2: Amendment 2, Item 6.6.7.2.8 Pages 19 & 20	Please confirm the merge and unmerge activities are to take place within the MPI/EMPI, and not the downstream systems. If activity is to take place on downstream systems, is the Vendor responsible for those merges/unmerges as well, or is the Team/Owner of the downstream system?
Response		**It is anticipated that DOM will have resources to work on these activities in the downstream systems. Merge/Unmerge should take place in the EMPI. If a**

Vendor Question No.	Verified RFP Cite	Question/Answer
		downstream system rejects a merge/unmerge, the merge/unmerged should be resolved in the EMPI.

RFP responses are due August 3, 2021, 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 Jordan Barber at 601-432-8005 or via email at jordan.barber@its.ms.gov.

cc: ITS Project File Number 44909

Attachments: Attachment D – Revised Cost Information Submission
                Attachment E – Change Order Rates Cost Information Submission
                Attachment F – Revised Appendix A
                Attachment G – Technical Requirements Worksheet