

## RFP Questions and Clarifications Memorandum

---

**To:** Vendors Responding to RFP Number 4634 for Mississippi State Department of Health (MSDH)  
**From:** Craig P. Orgeron, CPM, Ph.D.  
**Date:** March 28, 2025  
**Subject:** Responses to Questions Submitted and Clarifications to Specifications  
**Contact Name:** Solicitations Team  
**Contact Email Address:** [RFP@its.ms.gov](mailto:RFP@its.ms.gov)

---

### RFP Number 4635 is hereby amended as follows:

- Attachment A, E. Vendor Qualifications, Item 23 shall be and hereby is deleted and replaced with the following:**

**MANDATORY:** The Vendor shall demonstrate a minimum of one (1) year of prior experience and consistent use in at least one (1) jurisdiction with the proposed system with a local, state, or territorial public health jurisdiction located in the United States, including but not limited to (NOTE: consistent use defined as the jurisdiction is currently utilizing the proposed solution to support their EPI, STD/HIV, and TB programs. Partial usage does not meet the requirement [e.g. the jurisdiction uses the solution for EPI and STD/HIV – but not TB]):

- Attachment A, G. User Interface, Data Entry and Searches, Item 42 shall be and hereby is revised as follows:**

42. **MANDATORY:** Patient Search capabilities.

~~43. The solution shall provide patient searches capable of finding information.~~

- The solution shall allow users to save ad hoc searches as named searches and copy and/or edit existing named searches.
- The solution shall support ad hoc searches as well as named searches that are available by selection to all users, limited to user groups or individuals/creators.
- The Vendor shall provide a solution that supports flexible search criteria during the person identification process, for example: partial name, common pseudonyms, Soundex, Social Security Number (SSN), medical record number, encounter number, date of birth, sex, or combinations of data searching and matching on persons stored in the proposed solution.
- The proposed solution shall provide multiple methods to identify its persons when provided with partial person information, enabling exact and fuzzy match logic.

- e. The proposed solution shall have logic that can score returned results ranked by potential matches when a failure to find an exact person occurs.
- f. The proposed solution shall support limiting the number of returned matches to avoid excessive number of returned rows based on criteria or rules.
- g. The proposed solution shall allow users to provide demographic, diagnostic factors, and identification (IDs) (at a minimum: RVCT Number, Correctional ID (incarcerated patients), Medical Record Number (MRN), lab ID, patient ID, investigation ID, age, race, gender, ethnicity, name, dob, disease name(s), county, case classification, case status, diagnosis date, onset date) that limit results.
- h. The solution shall provide patient searches capable of finding information.

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

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

**Question 1:** RFP, Section IX: References: Our proposed solution is currently being implemented across the EPI, STD/HIV, and TB programs in a large East Coast state, with full deployment underway. While it has been in place for less than 12 months, it is actively supporting these programs and meeting client goals. Given its relevance and alignment with Mississippi's objectives, would this reference be considered acceptable?

**Response:** **No.**

**Question 2:** RFP, Section IX: References: Would other solutions of similar scale and size to the EPI, STD/HIV and TB programs for more than 12 months be considered as our integrated reference?

**Response:** **No.**

**Question 3:** RFP, Section VIII: Cost Information Submission: What level of funding has been identified for this project and are there any constraints or expectations around funding?

**Response:** **MSDH will not be providing this information.**

**Question 4:** Attachment A, E. Vendor Qualifications, Item 23: In Section E (Vendor Qualifications) number 23 states that the vendor will need to demonstrate the full functionality of all three modules in use. Is this a mandatory minimum requirement for responding or will this be a scored criterion?

**Response:** **All of Item 23 is considered MANDATORY. Please see Attachment A, B. Mandatory Provisions in Technical Requirements for this RFP for details about mandatory requirements. Please also see Amendment 1 above.**

**Question 5:** Attachment A, E. Vendor Qualifications, Item 23: Would the State consider assigning a lower score or deducting points, rather than fully disqualifying a vendor,

if their proposed system meets all functional requirements and has been adopted by multiple state public health jurisdictions but has not yet been in consistent use for a full year?

**Response: No.**

**Question 6:** Attachment A, H. Case Investigation Functionality: Does MSDH have an electronic output of the list of questions in its legacy system for each disease? If so, can you share an example of the output format.

**Response: No, MSDH will not provide an electronic output of the list of questions.**

**Question 7:** Attachment A, F. Staffing Requirements: Will MSDH assign dedicated Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) for the implementation to assist with requirements gathering and knowledge transfer? If so, what percentage of their time will be allocated to this effort?

**Response: Please see Attachment A, Item 240.**

**Question 8:** Attachment A, J. IDSP Integration / Interoperability and Data Requirements: Will MSDH have staff available during the implementation who have a thorough understanding of the legacy database configuration? If so, will they be accessible to assist with data migration and integration tasks?

**Response: As stated in the RFP, MSDH SMEs shall have no more than 25% availability to assist with implementation. However, legacy database configuration details are dependent upon existing vendor requirements and capabilities at migration.**

**Question 9:** Attachment A, G. User Interface, Item 42: Does the State currently use an MPI?

**Response: No.**  
***[NOTE: Vendor referenced Patient Search Capabilities in their question; State assumes this is in reference to Item 42.]***

**Question 10:** Attachment A, G. User Interface, Item 42: Will the MPI component be used only for EDSS records, or will it also link to other systems like Medicaid?

**Response: The RFP requires bidirectional interface with Epic.**  
***[NOTE: Vendor referenced Patient Search Capabilities in their question; State assumes this is in reference to Item 42.]***

**Question 11:** Attachment A, J. IDSP Integration / Interoperability and Data Requirements, Data Migration: Can the State provide estimated record counts by source for data migration?

**Response: Refer to Table 1 in Attachment A for case volume per year.**

**Question 12:** Attachment A, J. IDSP Integration / Interoperability and Data Requirements, Data Migration: What % availability will there be from dedicated State personnel

assigned for data cleanup and migration? We have tiers of data migration support and staff availability will give us insight into which level the State requests.

**Response:** Please see Attachment A, Item 240.

**Question 13:** Attachment A, F. Staffing Requirements, Item 33.b.6: Can the State confirm that the vendor is required to provide office space for BA tasks such as JADs? Or will the State be able to offer conference rooms?

**Response:** MSDH conference rooms can be available upon request.

**Question 14:** RFP, Section II: Proposal Submission Requirements: Can vendors submit additional attachments to supplement the required responses, such as case studies or white papers, beyond the required documents listed in the response checklist?

**Response:** Yes. Vendors should include reference to the supplemental materials in their point-by-point response so the State is aware of the additional details.

**Question 15:** Attachment A, J. IDSP Integration / Interoperability and Data Requirements: Besides Epic, does MSDH currently use or plan to integrate additional EHR systems into the IDSP?

**Response:** Only Epic is used as an EHR at the agency.

**Question 16:** Attachment A, K. Operational Requirements: The RFP states that the system must have “real-time ELR processing capabilities.” What is MSDH’s expectation regarding real-time processing speed (e.g., under x seconds/minutes)?

**Response:** There are no processing speed capabilities other than ensuring customer satisfaction.

**Question 17:** Attachment A, G. User Interface, GIS Capabilities: What GIS platform does MSDH currently use, and are there existing GIS data layers available for integration with the IDSP?

**Response:** MSDH current uses ArcGIS / Esri. There are no known data layers for integration.  
*[NOTE: Vendor referenced page 41 in their question; State assumed this was supposed to be page 22.]*

**Question 18:** Attachment A, F. Staffing Requirements: The RFP states that key personnel must be on-site during critical implementation phases. Can vendors propose a hybrid model where key personnel are available remotely but travel to Mississippi for major milestones?

**Response:** Yes, hybrid is allowed and can be discussed and negotiated upon award.  
*[NOTE: Vendor referenced page 43 in their question; State assumed this was supposed to be page 7.]*

**Question 19:** Attachment A, Y. Warranty/Maintenance Requirements: The RFP states that product updates must be applied at no additional cost. Does this include major version upgrades, or only minor patches and security updates?

**Response:** **Upgrades, versioning and patching originated by the Vendor would be at no additional cost to MSDH.**

**Question 20:** Attachment A, R. Cloud Hosting Requirements: What cloud platforms does MSDH currently have approved for hosting (e.g., AWS GovCloud, Azure Government, Google Cloud)?

**Response:** **The proposed solution is intended to be hosted on the Vendor's secure, compliant cloud instance.**

**Question 21:** RFP, Section VIII: Cost Information Submission: The RFP requires fully loaded rates for change orders. Should we add a column for the fully loaded blended rate?

**Response:** **The Change Order Rates Cost Information Submission table includes a row for Blended Change Order Rate. Vendor should include a fully loaded, blended rate for on-site and off-site.**

**Question 22:** RFP, Section VIII: Cost Information Submission: Does MSDH have a preferred pricing structure for cloud hosting (e.g., fixed annual fee vs. pay-as-you-go pricing model)?

**Response:** **There is no preference.**

**Question 23:** Attachment A, I. Federal Reporting Requirements: Are there any anticipated upcoming CDC Message Mapping Guides (MMGs) that MSDH expects to adopt beyond those required at go-live?

**Response:** **MSDH expects current and future MMGs developed by CDC to be implemented in the proposed solution. See Items 164 and 165.**

**Question 24:** Attachment A, Section II. IDSP FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS: Can the State confirm whether there is a preferred sequence for bringing specific diseases or disease classes online in the new system? For example, does MSDH prioritize certain high-volume condition (e.g., STDs, TB, general infectious diseases) to go live first, or should all disease programs be implemented simultaneously?

**Response:** **There is no preference.**

**Question 25:** RFP, Section IV: Legal and Contractual Information, Item 38: On Section IV in part 38, the solicitation states that a performance bond may be a requirement upon contract award. The State requests that the offer includes the price of a performance bond or irrevocable bank letter of credit with its RFP Proposal.

Can the State clarify how they will determine upon contract award if a Performance Bond or Irrevocable Bank Letter of Credit will be required?

Is pricing of the performance bond or irrevocable bank letter of credit required for submission of the proposal?

**Response:** The decision to require a Performance Bond would be at the discretion of the State. Yes, responding Vendors are required to include the cost of a Performance Bond/Irrevocable Letter of Credit in their Cost Information Submission (Section VIII of the RFP). Vendors that do not provide this cost risk procuring and providing the Performance Bond/Irrevocable Letter of Credit at no cost to the State.

**Question 26:** RFP, Section III: Vendor Information, Item 14.5: Generally, we have resources that are part of the implementation that are not necessarily involved with or dedicated to ongoing support functions. Are these situations considered here?

Also, for example if a person is promoted, is the State agreeable to colleague transitions assuming any replacements are approved by the State and the person is of equal or greater skillset?

**Response:** Yes. This requirement applies to Key Personnel proposed in this RFP.

Article 50 of the Standard Contract (Exhibit A of the RFP) requires MSDH written approval for the awarded vendor to substitute personnel for persons of equal or greater abilities, experience, and qualifications. Any exceptions to this clause should be included on the Proposal Exception Summary (RFP, Section V).

**Question 27:** Attachment A, C. General Overview and Background, Item 15: Understanding that the State is no longer tracking most COVID-19 cases, is the State planning to migrate their historical COVID-19 data into the new system?

**Response:** This is unknown; however, Vendor should be prepared to migrate this data if it is required.

**Question 28:** RFP, Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 5.2.4.2: Section states that any presentation/demo must be given by the PM assigned to the project. Can the State confirm if other SME's can participate/lead parts of any presentations/demos required?

**Response:** Other SMEs may also be included in any presentation/demo.

**Question 29:** Attachment A, F. Staffing Requirements, Item 26: Can the State define what it considers to be critical times or key meetings where it expects on-site presence from the vendor staff?

**Response:** Critical times and key meetings are JAD sessions and other meetings and/or times at MSDH request.

**Question 30:** Attachment A, G. User Interface, Item 89: Does the State have a geocoding tool that it currently uses? Does the State prefer to continue using their own? Are there any IT policies that would prohibit the State from using a Vendor's integrated geocoding service from a large provider such as Google, ArcGIS, etc.?

**Response:** Yes, ArcGIS / Esri. No policies would prohibit an integrated geocoding service, but the proposed solution must comply with security and privacy policies, as applicable.

**Question 31:** Attachment A, K. Operational Requirements, Item 215: Related to the following requirement: “Vendor must provide wide area network (WAN) encrypted tunnel or virtual private network (VPN) tunnel support to MSDH from both the primary and the DR site.”

Can the State provide additional information for the purpose of the tunnel and what data is expected to be traversing it?

**Response:** **Upon award and during implementation, specific data fields and ePHI will be determined. The requirement is that the vendor system is capable of encrypted transactions (encryption in transit).**  
***[NOTE: Vendor referenced Item 216 in their question; State assumed this was supposed to be Item 215.]***

**Question 32:** Attachment A, K. Operational Requirements, Item 217: Related to the following requirement: “The Vendor shall provide dedicated services with no intermingling of data or resources with other clients other than MSDH. This includes all internet connectivity.”

Would the State consider a multi-tenant system as an option with shared internet connections?

**Response:** **Logical separation is acceptable for multi-tenant environments as long as MSDH data is not available to any other tenants.**  
***[NOTE: Vendor referenced Item 218 in their question; State assumed this was supposed to be Item 217.]***

**Question 33:** Attachment A, S. Service Level Agreements, Item 291: The monthly report requirements mention opt-in and opt-out requests. Can the State clarify what these are?

**Response:** **Examples of these types of requests are automated email system subscription metrics or data on users opting in or opting out of email subscriptions provided by the proposed solution.**  
***[NOTE: Vendor referenced Item 293 in their question; State assumed this was supposed to be Item 291.]***

**Question 34:** RFP, Section IX: References: Would the agency be open to revisiting the reference(s) and/or amending the references(s) requirements in this RFP? Given the rapid advancements in technology for this public health use case, a more flexible approach may be worth considering ensuring the State is able to review all options.

**Response:** **No.**

**Question 35:** Attachment A, J. IDSP Integration / Interoperability and Data Requirements: The RFP indicates multiple integration points including Epic, eHARS, and MIIIX. Can you clarify if MSDH has a preferred enterprise integration platform, e.g. Rhapsody or Mulesoft, or if the vendor should propose an integration solution as part of this implementation?

**Response:** MSDH uses Rhapsody. See Data Flow Diagram for specific formats and channels.

**Question 36:** Attachment A, J. IDSP Integration / Interoperability and Data Requirements, Data Migration / Conversion and Retention: The RFP mentions three legacy systems (Epi-Tracks, CDC-IS, and PRISM). Can you provide details about the data volume and export format from each system that will need to be migrated?

**Response:** Please refer to Table 1 in Attachment A for the case volume per year. Specific export formats may be proposed by Vendors and approved by the State.

**Question 37:** Attachment A, C. General Overview and Background, Item 16: What is the expected steady-state number of internal users? Can you please share ab

**Response:** **Epidemiology: between 30-50 internal users.**  
**STD/HIV: between 45-55 internal users.**  
**TB: 40 program staff and 180 field staff.**

**Question 38:** Attachment A, C. General Overview and Background, Item 16: What is the expected steady-state number of external users?

**Response:** Between 1,300-1,500 external users in a non-surge capacity.

**Question 39:** Attachment A, J. IDSP Integration / Interoperability and Data Requirements, Auditing and Security: The system self-service capabilities should be available to external facility administrators. Can you please share a bit about what the external users do in the system and what the role of the external facilities is?

**Response:** Please refer to Attachment A, Items 87 and 88.

**Question 40:** Attachment A, G. User Interface, Dashboards: The RFP specifies user-customizable dashboards with drill-down capability. Can you provide examples of the types of metrics and visualizations that users typically need to access?

**Response:** Examples include, but are not limited to, trends over time, geographic patterns, meaningful thresholds, and case management productivity by various parameters

**Question 41:** Attachment A, Q. General: What are the different types of internal and external roles that will need to access the system? E.g. Epidemiologist, case investigator, DIS

**Response:** This will be decided during discovery.

**Question 42:** Attachment A, G. User Interface, GIS Capabilities: The RFP requires automatic geocoding of incoming lab and case reports. Does MSDH have a preferred DIS platform that should be integrated with, or should the vendor propose a solution? If yes, should this licensing cost be included in the price?

**Response:** That State assumes that Vendor meant a preferred GIS platform. MSDH does not have a preferred GIS platform. If Vendor has a preferred platform and



wants MSDH to use it, Vendor should provide all costs for the platform in Section VIII, Cost Information Submission. If not, Vendor must be willing to integrate with MSDH's existing GIS platform.

**Question 43:** Attachment A, I. Federal Reporting Requirements, ELR/eCR Processing: The RFP includes several requirements related to eCR processing and integration. To properly scope the eCR implementation effort, can MSDH answer the following:

- a) What is the current state of eCR implementation, including the number and types of healthcare providers currently submitting eCRs?
- b) What is the anticipated volume of eCRs expected during the initial implementation period?
- c) Is MSDH currently using the AIMS platform for eCR routing, and if so, how it is ingesting the data?
- d) What is the current workflow for processing and validating incoming eCRs, and any detail on the case creation process from eCR?
- e) Are there any specific performance requirements or SLAs for eCR processing?

**Response:**

- a) **MSDH has not declared readiness for eCR and is not receiving any production-level eCRs from providers.**
- b) **Unknown at this time.**
- c) **Not applicable at this time. Upon award, will be discussed during discovery.**
- d) **Not applicable at this time. Upon award, will be discussed during discovery.**
- e) **ELR and eCR performance parameters are included and covered by the SLA table.**

**Question 44:** RFP, Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 1: Given the comprehensive nature of this RFP, including multiple system integrations, complex data migration requirements, and numerous implementation plans required with the initial proposal, would MSDH consider extending the proposal due date beyond April 16, 2025 to ensure vendors can provide thorough, well-documented responses that fully address all requirements?"

**Response: No.**

**Question 45:** Attachment A, G. User Interface, Item 45: The RFP mentions natural language processing capabilities for search validation. Given recent advancements in AI technology, would MSDH consider the use of AI/ML capabilities for the automated processing and classification of eCRs or to aid the vendor in the development of the platform? If yes, what are MSDH's requirements regarding AI and data security?

**Response: This is not in the scope of the published RFP at this time.**

**Question 46:** Attachment A, J. IDSP Integration / Interoperability and Data Requirements, Data Migration / Conversion and Retention: How many years or what is the estimated

total number of records to be extracted from legacy systems? (RFP provides the number of cases and reports for years 2020-2023 per program)

**Response:** **Epidemiology: 2009 - present**  
**STD/HIV: 2014 - present**  
**TB: 2006 - present**

**Question 47:** RFP, Section III: Vendor Information, Item 8: The RFP states that ITS reserves the right to make multiple awards. Please explain how this would work for this RFP.

**Response:** **This is boilerplate language. The State anticipates making a single award but reserves the right to award to multiple vendors if advantageous to the State.**

**Question 48:** RFP Section III: Vendor Information, Item 18: Regarding the section entitled "Rights Reserved to Use Existing Product Contracts," please clarify how this would work and provide an example.

**Response:** **This is boilerplate language. The State does not feel that this applies to this RFP.**

**Question 49:** RFP Section IV: Legal and Contractual Information, Item 7.3: Will the State please include a mutual waiver of indirect and consequential damages?

**Response:** **Any matters for consideration by the State in reference to this item should be included in the Proposal Exception Summary Form.**

**Question 50:** RFP, Section IV: Legal and Contractual Information, Item 7.3: If the Vendor desires to propose a limitation of liability provision, where should it be included in the response? In the Proposal Exception Summary Form?

**Response:** **Any additional contractual provisions that Vendors want the State to consider should be provided in the Proposal Exception Summary Form.**

**Question 51:** RFP Section IV: Legal and Contractual Information, Item 7.3: Is the State willing to limit carveouts from any Vendor liability cap to infringement claims or Vendor's willful misconduct or gross negligence? In other words, will the State agree that any claims arising from Vendor's simple negligence would be covered by any liability cap?

**Response:** **Any matters for consideration by the State in reference to this item should be included in the Proposal Exception Summary Form.**

**Question 52:** RFP Section IV: Legal and Contractual Information, Item 28.1: Will the State please confirm that it will only own software that has been developed and paid for exclusively by the State? In other words, the State would not own software developed by the Vendor and paid for by the Vendor.

**Response:** **The State agrees.**

**Question 53:** RFP Section IV: Legal and Contractual Information, Item 28.1: Will the State please confirm that the Vendor will not be required to pay license fees for the license of custom developed software that will be provided/offered by the vendor to other states in accordance with Federal regulations?

**Response:** **The State assumes that Vendors are proposing SaaS solutions, and this requirement is not applicable to this procurement.**

**Question 54:** RFP, Exhibit B, Service Level Agreements: Is the State willing to negotiate a reasonable monthly cap on liquidated damages that may be assessed against the Licensor?

**Response:** **No.**

**Question 55:** Attachment A, I. Federal Reporting Requirements, Item 167: To better understand the scope of onboarding and monitoring requirements for ELR and eCR trading partners, could you provide details on the types of interfaces and data exchange methods currently used by trading partners? Additionally, is MSDH currently utilizing Rhapsody as a middleware for message transformation and routing, or are there any other middleware solutions in place?

How many trading partners are sending the ELR and eCRs currently?

**Response:** **At present, MSDH utilizes Rhapsody as the integration engine. Refer to the data flow diagram in the RFP documents for specific message formats and channels.**

**ELR - At this time MSDH anticipates 50 - 60 ELR interfaces in production**  
**eCR - At this time MSDH has none in production**

**Question 56:** Attachment A, O. Test Plans, Item 256: Will the State be responsible for creating and executing their own test cases in UAT?

**Response:** **Requirements 250 and 251 require a vendor to develop and provide test scripts, test data sets, and test cases. The vendor is expected to execute test cases.**

**Question 57:** Attachment A, K. Operational Requirements, Item 213: Could you please provide the defined Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and Recovery Point Objective (RPO) requirements for the *system hosting*? For example, RFP of 4 hours and RTO of 24 hours.

**Response:** **See Table 3: SLA Matrix.**

**Question 58:** Attachment A, Section VI. DELIVERABLES, Item 337: Will the State please elaborate on this statement: "MSDH resource availability may be awarded additional points or consideration in the proposal evaluation.

**Response:** **Due to the lack of MSDH resources available for implementation, additional evaluation points may be given to vendors that realize and account for these constraints in their Implementation Plan.**

**Question 59:** RFP, Exhibit A, Standard Contract, Article 20: Would the State be willing to limit the hold harmless and indemnification provisions to fault-based claims (i.e., claims relating to Licensor's negligence or breach of contract)?

**Response:** **Any matters for consideration by the State in reference to this item should be included in the Proposal Exception Summary Form.**

**Question 60:** RFP, Section II: Proposal Submission Requirements: Would the State consider an email submission rather than a USB submission?

**Response:** **No.**

**Question 61:** ITS Procurement Handbook Section 019-010, Page 161: Could the State please offer clarification to whether marking Proprietary or Confidential Information is acceptable?

**Response:** **Please see RFP, Section IV: Legal and Contractual Information, Item 35 and Exhibit A: Standard Contract, Item 30.**

**Question 62:** RFP, Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 1: Will the State please consider an extension of the Proposal close date to four weeks beyond the current deadline? The additional time will allow Respondents to digest the State's answers to bidders' questions and appropriately apply information in proposal responses resulting in higher value-based solutions and services to the State of Mississippi.

**Response:** **No.**

**Question 63:** RFP, Exhibit A: Standard Contract, Article 9.3: What type of SOC 1 and SOC II do they need, Type 1 or Type II?

**Response:** **SOC Type 2 report.**

**Question 64:** RFP, Exhibit A: Standard Contract, Article 9.3: When will they need the first report by? We need at least 120 days.

**Response:** **120 days post-award is acceptable. 120 days post go-live is not acceptable.**

**Question 65:** RFP, Exhibit A: Standard Contract, Article 9.3: Is the client stating that they will require access to configure our system for application security and logical access? Need clarification.

**Response:** **State agencies are required to maintain secure environments for all on-premises system that is managed by the agency or managed by a third party on behalf to the agency. As such, agencies must also ensure that hosted environments that they utilize and depend on, must also meet similar security requirements to that of their on-premises environments. Any matters for consideration by the State in reference to this item should be included in the Proposal Exception Summary Form.**

**Question 66:** RFP, Exhibit A: Standard Contract, Exhibit B: The penalty is \$25k/day for failure to notify both in writing and by telephone of a privacy breach. Please clarify “potential or otherwise.”

**Response:** **“Potential or otherwise” is in reference to a Vendor knowingly withholding notification of a breach or potential breach that may affect MSDH.**

**Question 67:** RFP, Exhibit A: Standard Contract, Article 2: The RFP states that the project “shall continue in effect for five (5) years after acceptance of implementation services (“Initial Term”).” Can the State clarify if the 5-year term includes the initial implementation period. Or are we to plan for a separate implementation period outside of the 5-year term?

**Response:** **The intent is for Year 1 to start upon successful implementation.**

**Question 68:** RFP, Section VIII: Cost Information Submission: Can the State provide additional guidance on where the Vendor should include the Cost Itemization requirement listed in Section VIII?

**Response:** **This can be provided as a separate, supplemental document.**

**Question 69:** Attachment A, Functional and Technical Requirements: Does MSDH have a preferred technology stack or cloud provider (e.g., AWS, Azure, Google Cloud)? If the vendor proposes an alternative, what factors will be considered for acceptance?

**Response:** **No, as long as the solution is secure and compliant with applicable RFP, policy, and statute requirements.**  
***[NOTE: Vendor did not provide a requirement in question, other than page 34; State is providing a generic response.]***

**Question 70:** Attachment A, E. Vendor Qualifications, Item 23.d.2: What is the volume and format of legacy data that needs to be migrated? Will MSDH provide sample data for validation during the RFP response phase?

**Response:** **Refer to Table 1 in Attachment A for the case volume per year. MSDH will not provide sample data at this time.**  
***[NOTE: Vendor referenced page 7 in their question; State assumed this was referencing Item 23.d.2.]***

**Question 71:** Attachment B: Will MSDH accept vendor experience from projects in other public health domains, or must it be strictly related to Integrated Disease Surveillance Platforms (IDSP)? What specific metrics or outcomes should be highlighted?

**Response:** **Only IDSP experience is acceptable.**

**Question 72:** RFP, Section IX: References: Is there a maximum percentage of work that can be subcontracted?

**Response:** **No; however, the responding Vendor must provide substantive value or investment in the total proposed solution.**

**Question 73:** RFP, Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 5.2.5: Can MSDH clarify whether the site visit refers to 1) MSDH visiting the vendor's office or facilities, 2) the vendor arranging a visit to a client reference site where a similar solution is implemented?

**Response:** **If site visits are conducted, this would refer to the Vendor site or a client reference site.**

**Question 74:** RFP, Section VIII: Cost Information Submission: Are there any specific cost allocation formats required (e.g., licensing, maintenance, implementation, training)?

**Response:** **No. Vendor should propose costs how they are requested. If there are any costs not anticipated in the Cost Submission Form, Vendors should add line items to address any necessary costs for successful solution.**

**Question 75:** RFP, Exhibit A: Standard Contract, Exhibit B: Will there be opportunities to negotiate SLAs based on industry best practices?

**Response:** **Any exceptions to the stated SLAs must be provided in the Proposal Exception Summary Form (Section V of the RFP).**

**Question 76:** RFP: What level of post-go-live support is required from the vendor?

**Response:** **At a minimum, software maintenance, Help Desk (levels 2 and 3), ELR and eCR onboarding and data quality monitoring, and solution administration training is required.**  
***[NOTE: Vendor only referenced "Post Go Live" in their question; State provided a generic response.]***

**Question 77:** RFP, Section IV: Legal and Contractual Information, Item 38: The RFP mentions that a Performance Bond may be required upon contract award. What percentage of the contract value should vendors estimate for this, and when will MSDH confirm the final requirement

**Response:** **The Performance Bond or Irrevocable Letter of Credit should be for the total amount of the contract. Vendors may provide the cost of acquiring the bond in Section VIII, Cost Information Submission. A decision will be made upon contract award.**

**Question 78:** RFP, Section VII: Technical Specifications, Item 5.2.1: The RFP states that proposals must meet all mandatory requirements and that vendors cannot take exceptions to these. Can MSDH confirm whether failure to meet a single mandatory requirement results in outright disqualification?

**Response:** **Yes, confirmed.**

**Question 79:** Can MSDH provide an estimated budget range or funding allocation for this project? If not, can MSDH clarify whether there are any budgetary constraints that vendors should consider while proposing pricing models?

**Response:** **MSDH will not be providing this information.**

**Question 80:** Attachment A, K. Operational Requirements, Item 212: Are there any geographical limitations on Development Resources?

**Response:** No, so long as there is no State data being stored by these resources and all equipment resides within the continental US.

***[NOTE: Vendor only referenced "Staffing" and "Page 35" in their question; State assumed this was supposed to reference Item 212.]***

RFP responses are due on April 16, 2025, at 3:00 p.m. (Central Time).

If you have any questions about the information or if we can be of further assistance, please email the Solicitations Team at [RFP@its.ms.gov](mailto:RFP@its.ms.gov).

cc: ITS Project File Number 48420