



STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

RFP NO. 15-1400

*All Payer Health Care Claims Database (APCD)
Lead Organization & Data Vendor Services*

**AMENDMENT NO. FOUR (4)
INSTALLMENT #1**

OFM RESPONSE TO BIDDER QUESTIONS

11.17.2015

OFM Answers to Bidders' Questions

This OFM Answer to Bidders' Questions may only explain or clarify some aspect that is already addressed in the RFP. However, some of the answers may also supplement or change what was previously stated in the RFP or in an exhibit.

Therefore it is important that bidders review all questions and answers, and not just those which they may have submitted.

Question #1

I was just wondering whether RFP#15-1400 was related to the RFP No. 15021 issued on September 14, 2015 by the Health Care Authority for a "Lead Organization to Accelerate Value-based Payment Strategies Using A Multipayer Data Aggregation Solution." The latter is clear that it is not a procurement for an APCD, but they are so closely related that I wanted to check how the two projects were different and how they might overlap?

OFM's Response:

OFM's RFP #15-1400 for the All Payer Health Care Claims Database Lead Organization and Data Vendor Services is not related to HCA's RFA #15021 for a Multi-Payer Data Aggregation Solution. As per the law (Chapter 43.371 of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) {(as amended by Chapter 246, Laws of 2015)}) OFM's WA-APCD is the state's official health care all payer claims database to which legally mandated and voluntary organizations shall submit health care claims and from which these claims data may be requested and produced.

Question #2

Can you please tell us what company is currently providing support for the WA APHCCD? This is in reference to procurement: OFM RFP #15-1400 For Washington All Payer Health Care Claims Database

OFM's Response:

No business is providing support as a Lead Organization or Data Vendor for the WA-APCD. This is a new system for the state.

Question #3

Is this a new requirement, or is there an incumbent vendor/contract for this project? If so, may I know the vendor name?

OFM's Response:

There is no incumbent vendor/contract for the Lead Organization of the WA-APCD, as this is the initial establishment of the WA-APCD and procurement of the Lead Organization.

Question #4

As an independent contractor with experience combining health care cost and quality data and making the data available via publicly accessible websites, I'm wondering if the State of Washington OFM would consider a proposal for these specific areas. Then, if awarded, if the independent contractor would subcontract with the selected Lead Organization on these specific tasks?

OFM's Response:

No. This RFP is for the WA-APCD Lead Organization and its contracted Data Vendor and any other subcontractors the Bidder brings forward in its proposal.

Question #5

1. Page 1 - The contract terms of the RFP state "*The Office of Financial Management reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to extend the contract for additional **two-year** periods...*" The contract terms on Page 7 state "*OFM reserves the right at its sole discretion, to extend the contract in **one year** increments...*" Please clarify which statement is correct.

OFM's Response:

Page 1 of the RFP, Estimated Time Period for Contract should read:

The Office of Financial Management reserves the right at its sole discretion, to extend the contract for additional one-year periods as set forth in the contract document.

Question #6:

2. Page 5, Chart #1: WA-APCD Envisioned Roles and Contracting - The Lead Organization box shown in the chart refers to the following footnote on item “*reporting perform analytics*” --- ****Access to the WA-APCD system itself is limited to the Data Vendor. In the event the Lead Organization would like to obtain data for analytical analysis or to develop data products on its own behalf as a private entity or on behalf of another third party, it will also be required to follow the data request process.***”

Section 5.4.b (ii) of ESSB 5084 authorizes “*Any entity when functioning as the lead organization under the terms of this chapter*” to have access to claim data as defined in Section 5.4. A key reason for this section was to allow the Lead Organization to fulfill data and reporting requests from third parties to improve sustainability of the APCD.

Please clarify whether the Lead Organization, when operating as the Lead Organization, will have access to authorized claims data in the WA-APCD to produce reports, analytics and fulfill data requests from third parties *without* having to go through a data request process to fulfill a request that has already been approved.

OFM’s Response:

Chapter 43.371 RCW {as amended by Chapter 246, Laws of 2015, Section 2 (3)} states, “*As part of the competitive procurement process in subsection (2) of this section, the lead organization shall enter into a contract with a data vendor to perform data collection, processing, aggregation, extracts, and analytics.*”

OFM interprets this section to mean that the Data Vendor shall perform the extracts of data from the WA-APCD for approved data requests and provide the extracts directly to the data requestor or its designee. The Lead Organization, acting as the Lead Organization, may receive data and produce a report or perform analytics on behalf of a third party data requestor when the third party’s approved data request stipulates this.

Question #7:

3. Page 5 - Please clarify the meaning of “health care fee schedule” at the bottom of the page. Is this related to fee schedules as indicated in the Cycle III grant or fee schedules associated with WA-APCD data products? If related to the Cycle III grant, please provide additional clarification as to how this information can be released given restrictions in ESSB 5804, particularly in regard to the definition of “Proprietary Financial Information.”

OFM’s Response:

The “Health care fee schedule” noted in Section 1.1.3. SCOPE of RFP is related to the OFM’s Rate Review Cycle III and Cycle IV grant deliverables. It is also related to SOW #1, Deliverable 7. Publish Health Care Price Schedule and Quality Data Set on the WA-APCD Website, and to SOW #2, Deliverable #3. Update the Health Care Price Schedule and Quality Data Set and Website.

Health care fee schedules will be constructed so as to not violate the release of “Proprietary Financial Information.” Additional guidance will be provided in Phase 2 of OFM rule making for Chapter 43.371 RCW {as amended by Chapter 246, Laws of 2015, Section 5 (6)}.

Question #8:

4. Page 6, Section 1.4 FUNDING states that OFM received \$3,350,000 in federal funds for the project. Will this full amount be available to the successful bidder? If not, please indicate what portion may not be available and for what additional uses it will be reserved.

OFM’s Response:

Yes. The full amount of \$3,350,000 is available to the successful bidder.

Statement of Work #1 (funded from the CMS Cycle III grant) shall not exceed \$ 2,000,000

Statement of Work #2 (funded from the CMS Cycle IV grant) shall not exceed \$ 600,000

Statement of Work #3 (funded from the State Innovation Model grant) shall not exceed \$ 750,000

Total **\$ 3,350,000**

Question #9:

5. Page 9, “Products” - Please provide examples of what is meant by “intangible deliverables” in the “Products” definition.

OFM’s Response:

Products that are “intangible in nature” refers to those deliverables that are delivered in other than physical form, such as a website.

Question #10:

6. Page 20, Section 3.1.2 LETTER OF SUBMITTAL – Item 3.1.2.8 specifies “WA-APCD data must remain at all times within the continental United States.” Please clarify whether off-shore resources are permitted to work on implementation of the WA-APCD and data submission processes as long as all data remains in the United States.

OFM’s Response:

Offshore resources shall not be allowed to work with the WA-APCD data.

Question #11:

a. 7. Page 22, Section 3.2.2 SUBCONTRACTOR INFORMATION requires that the Bidder “*accepts full responsibility for successful performance of the entire scope of work requested in this RFP and will indemnify the State of Washington for the acts and omissions of its subcontractors. The Lead Organization shall ensure, through its contract with the Subcontractor, that all relevant terms and conditions are flowed down and included in such subcontract.*” To whom should Bidder’s legal counsel direct questions about this requirement?

OFM’s Response:

Questions about this requirement must be directed to the RFP Coordinator.

- b. In the event the Successful Bidder is a state entity, we anticipate the indemnification will be fully covered by the state of Washington. How will a level playing field be created for Bidders who are not state entities if this is the case?

OFM’S Response:

The premise of this question is faulty, as any state entity that might be the Successful Bidder would still incur expenses for liability.

- c. Please provide clarification regarding any impacts this section may have with respect to state anti-trust protections when users of WA-APCD are reporting on price transparency and other sensitive uses of pricing data.

OFM’s Response:

At this time we are unaware of any negative impacts with respect to anti-trust protections.

Question #12:

8. Page 25, Section 3.2.6 BUSINESS STRATEGY AND SUSTAINABILITY PLAN – Please provide examples of the “*external data sets*” referenced in 3.2.6.1.3 with which the Bidder is expected to provide Identity Matching.

OFM’s Response:

Examples of “external data sets” may include:

- Researcher’s data set of individuals for IRB-approved research, such as matching with the Cancer Registry data
- Death data file from the Department of Health

Question #13:

9. Page 25, Section 3.2.6 BUSINESS STRATEGY AND SUSTAINABILITY PLAN – It appears that items 3.2.6.1.7 and 3.2.6.1.8 relate to the same item. Please clarify how you would like sequencing to flow for written responses.

OFM’s Response:

Please respond under 3.2.6.1.7 and omit 3.2.6.1.8.

Question #14:

10. Page 26, Item 3.2.6.2.1(i) – Please explain the need for a five-year projection when the contract term is three years.

OFM’s Response:

Investment Plans for information technology projects in the state require a 5-year budget projection by the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) and the state budget. This project has an initial 3-year contract plus optional 2-year renewals.

Question #15

11. Page 27, Section 3.3.1 STATEMENT OF WORK #1 - Item 1 requests information detailing “*whether the technical infrastructure is owned by the Data Vendor or procured from a third party.*” Please clarify whether OFM is seeking a Lead Organization/Data Vendor arrangement in which the

WA-APCD is built upon existing capabilities owned by the Lead Organization, Data Vendor or third parties (e.g. vendor tools/products) or is the state seeking to have a new, custom built, State-owned WA-APCD environment? Please clarify whether OFM is seeking a Lead Organization/Data Vendor arrangement in which the **WA-APCD website** is built upon existing capabilities owned by the Lead Organization, Data Vendor or third parties (e.g. vendor tools/products) or is the state seeking to have a new, custom built, State-owned WA-APCD website? These are critical components of the RFP which greatly affects a proposed solution and its related cost structure

OFM's Response:

It is ok for the proposed solutions to the WA-APCD and WA-APCD Website to be either built upon existing capabilities or newly created. OFM's expectations are that the solutions will meet legal, RFP and contractual requirements.

Question #16

12. Page 27, Section 3.3.2 STATEMENT OF WORK #2 – Item 5 does not contain any information. Please clarify how responses should be numbered for this section.

OFM's Response:

Reference the number in your response so that your other responses are in the correct order. Leave Section 3.3.2 Statement of Work #2, Item 5 blank.

Question #17

13. Page 29, Section 3.4 COST PROPOSAL – In order to accurately estimate project costs, please provide general assumptions as to what percentage of the Washington population will be included in the APCD and the anticipated number of data elements for claims, enrollment and other data to be included in the database at its start and annually thereafter for the first 3 year contract.

OFM's Response:

Assumptions for enrollment are as follows:

- Medicaid enrollment figures (includes all enrollees):
 - 2011 1,489,086
 - 2012 1,491,073
 - 2013 1,515,186
 - 2014 1,982,426
 - 2015 2,065,137 (as of June 30, 2105)
- Public Employees Benefits Board (PEBB) enrollment figures:
 - Please see the PEBB website for enrollment reports here:
http://www.hca.wa.gov/pebb/Pages/about_pebb.aspx
- Commercial:
 - SOW #1, Attachment 1 provides an extract of the state Washington's Office of the Insurance Commissioner's *Annual Report Appendix E: Top 40 Companies by Line of Business*, for each of the years 2011 – 2014, with the enrollment figures for each of the top 40 Accident and Health companies.
 - There is overlap between the enrollment figures listed in the OIC's report and the number of caseloads/enrollees for Medicaid (managed care caseload) and PEBB (non-Uniform Plan enrollees).

OFM does not have any assumptions around the number of data elements to be included.

OFM rule-making and the creation of the Data Submission Guide will provide additional guidance.

OFM does not have any assumptions around the rate of growth of the Washington population and data elements included in the WA-APCD.

Question #18

14. Page 30, Section 3.4.3 STATEMENT OF WORK #3 – Items 1 and 2 require quarterly reporting for the Washington State Common Measure Set for Health Care Quality and Cost “*initially and throughout the 3-year contract.*” Please clarify what time period will be granted to build the infrastructure necessary to support this frequency of public reporting, taking into account the requirements for data validation prior to public reporting specified in ESSB 5084.

OFM’s Response:

As per SOW #3, the start date for this work is 10/1/2016 and the first quarterly report of the Washington State Common Measure Set for Health Care Quality and Cost is due in March 2017.

Question #19

15. A related question to #14 is as follows: Section 6(4)(a) of ESSB 5084 requires the Lead Organization to “*verify the accuracy of the information submitted to the data vendor, comment on the reasonableness of the conclusions reached, and submit to the lead organization and data vendor any corrections or errors*” Is OFM interested in having the process for and costs associated with conducting this validation process included in the RFP response?

OFM’s Response:

Chapter 43.371 RCW {as amended by Chapter 246, Laws of 2015 Section 6(4)(a)} states: *The lead organization may not release a report that compares and identifies providers, hospitals, or data suppliers unless:*

- (a) *It allows the data supplier, the hospital, or the provider to verify the accuracy of the information submitted to the data vendor, comment on the reasonableness of conclusions reached, and submit to the lead organization and data vendor any corrections of errors with supporting evidence and comments within thirty days of receipt of the report;*

The law specifies that data suppliers, hospitals or providers, are to verify the accuracy of the information submitted to the data vendor for comparison reports. OFM requires the Lead Organization to create a process for the data suppliers, hospitals to perform this verification in Statement of Work #1, Deliverable 5e. Establish the Verification Process for Comparison Reports.

Question #20

16. Page 31, Section 4.2 EVALUATION WEIGHTING AND SCORING - The scoring overview shows a possibility for 100 bonus points on the written proposal. Pages 24-26 indicate six possible areas on which bonus points will be assigned. Are bonus points awarded equally between these six areas or in some other manner?

OFM’s Response:

The 100 bonus points available for the written proposal are not awarded equally amongst the

six bonus areas.

Question #21

17. Appendix J, SOW #1, Page 4 – Item 3.b.vi. references “*actuarial support.*” Please clarify the expected actuarial support to be provided.

OFM’s Response:

OFM does not have specific expectations around actuarial support. The requirement for this comes from Chapter 43.371 RCW {as amended by Chapter 246, Laws of 2015, Section 2.(3)(g).}

Question #22

18. Appendix J, SOW #1, Page 6 – Item h. states “*The Lead Organization shall ensure that all methodologies and algorithms of grouper software used to group individual claims into episodes of care and other grouping shall be made public.*” Understanding that standard market grouper software available to the Lead Organization and Data Vendor include some amount of proprietary methodology and software code or algorithms, how will the “shall be made public” standard reasonably be met?

OFM’s Response:

Chapter 43.371 RCW {as amended by Chapter 246, Laws of 2015, Section 6 (4) (a)} requires the Lead Organization to allow data suppliers, hospitals or providers, to verify the accuracy of the information submitted to the data vendor for comparison reports and comment on the reasonableness of conclusions reached. To do this, methodologies and algorithms used to produce data outcomes for these reports must be published so there is no “black box” around how an outcome was calculated.

Additionally, section 2794(c)(1)(C)(e) of the of the Public Health Service Act, “Ensuring That Consumers Get Value for Their Dollars,” under which the CMS Rate Review Cycle III and Cycle IV grants are authorized, requires that APCD data centers (the Lead Organization) funded with grant money must,

...regularly publish information concerning the statistical methodologies used by the center to analyze health charge data and make such data available to researchers and policy makers.

Question #23

19. Appendix J, SOW #1, Page 15 – Section 3 Timeline and Period of Performance – This section states, “*the period of performance for this project will start on January 1, 2016.*” Please confirm the period of performance start date, as the estimated contract start date according to the RFP is February 12, 2016. Note that the same conflict with period of performance and estimated contract start date is referenced in Appendix K, SOW #2, Page 7, Section 6.

OFM’s Response:

The estimated start date of the period of performance for SOW #1 and SOW #2 is February 12, 2016, as per the RFP, Section 2.2, ESTIMATED SCHEDULE OF PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES.

Question #24

- a. 3.2.6.4 – please elaborate this request for a “Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Risks (SWOR) Analysis of the Bidder’s proposed Business Strategy and Sustainability Plan.”

OFM’s Response:

The purpose of the Bidder’s Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Risks response is to provide additional information and insight in each of these areas, from the Bidder’s perspective, to OFM regarding the Bidder’s proposed Business Strategy and Sustainability Plan. This information will assist OFM in understanding the overall context and possibilities for the Bidders plans for the WA-APCD.

Question #25

SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

- a. Project Objectives 1.1 - please elaborate on the requirement to “longitudinalize” health care claims; would it require member centric data structures to be created?

OFM’s Response:

Claims data must be matched by individual, provider and payer across all years of data. OFM expects the Bidder to provide its solution for implementing the requirements for WA-APCD.

Question #26

SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

- b. Project Objectives 1.6 – how much data history is required in SOW1, or what is the “from to” period?

OFM’s Response:

The RFP, SOW #1, Deliverable 4. Collect and Load Phase I Historical Claims Data from Submitters states:

The data collected shall cover calendar years 2011 up to the most recent reporting period, or as otherwise required by OFM rule.

Question #27

SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

- c. Project Objectives 1.6 – approximately how many payers / payer feeds will be managed in SOW 1?

OFM’s Response:

The RFP, SOW #1, Deliverable 4. Collect and Load Phase I Historical Claims Data from Submitters states:

The data to be collected shall include the following Phase 1 submitters:

- a. Public Claims Data
 - o Medicaid Data will be shared consistent with federal and state law (<http://www.hca.wa.gov/medicaid/healthyoptions/pages/planlinks.aspx>)
 - o Public Employees Benefits (health care) (<http://www.hca.wa.gov/pebb/Pages/counties.aspx>)
 - o Public Employees Benefits (dental) (<http://www.hca.wa.gov/pebb/Pages/dental.aspx>)
- b. Commercial Claims (health care, pharmacy and dental) (Attachment 1, 2011 Insurance Commissioner’s Annual Report Appendix E: Top 40 Companies by Line of Business to this SOW)

Question #28

SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

d. Project Objectives 1.6 – approximately how many covered lives will be managed in SOW 1?

OFM’s Response:

- Medicaid enrollment figures (includes all enrollees):
 - 2011 1,489,086
 - 2012 1,491,073
 - 2013 1,515,186
 - 2014 1,982,426
 - 2015 2,065,137 (as of June 30, 2105)
- Public Employees Benefits Board (PEBB) enrollment figures:
 - Please see the PEBB website for enrollment reports here:
http://www.hca.wa.gov/pebb/Pages/about_pebb.aspx
- Commercial:
 - SOW #1, Attachment 1 provides an extract of the state Washington’s Office of the Insurance Commissioner’s *Annual Report Appendix E: Top 40 Companies by Line of Business*, for each of the years 2011 – 2014, with the enrollment figures for each of the top 40 Accident and Health companies.
 - There is overlap between the enrollment figures listed in the OIC’s report and the number of caseloads/enrollees for Medicaid (managed care caseload) and PEBB (non-Uniform Plan enrollees).

Question #29

SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

e. Project Objectives 1.6 – what is the data latency for incremental refresh (quarterly/monthly) or is this a onetime collection and load in phase 1?

OFM’s Response:

SOW#1 is the one-time load of historical health care claims data.

Question #30

SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

f. Project Objectives 1.9 – what are the cost and quality reporting requirements mentioned in 1.9 for SOW 1?

OFM’s Response:

This is discussed in SOW #1, Deliverable 7. Publish Health Care Price Schedule and Quality Data Set on the WA-APCD Website.

Question #31

SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

g. Deliverables 2 – will the claims data files include finalized claims only or will adjustments be included as well? What is the run out criteria?

OFM’s Response:

Currently, OFM’s draft rule WAC 82-75-020

http://www.ofm.wa.gov/rulemaking/rules_dev/WSR_15-22-101_OTIS-7546_2Final.pdf

defines a “Claim file” to mean

...a data set composed of health care service level remittance information for all nondenied adjudicated claims under the terms of an insurance policy, health benefits plan or state labor and industries program including, but not limited to, covered medical services files, pharmacy files and dental files.

Currently OFM's draft rule WAC 82-75-050 (5)

(http://www.ofm.wa.gov/rulemaking/rules_dev/WSR_15-22-101_OTIS-7546_2Final.pdf)

defines the "Claims run-out file" to mean

If health care coverage is terminated for a Washington covered person, the data suppliers shall submit data for a six month period following the health care coverage termination date.

Question #32

SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

- h. Deliverables 2 a/b/c – are there claim versioning criteria in the rule making process (identify last image of the claim)?

OFM's Response:

The Data Vendor is expected to use best practices for storing health care claims records in the WA-APCD so that accurate data may be pulled from the system.

Question #33

SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

- i. 3ei – please elaborate on the requirement "demonstrate affiliations with separated organizations to ensure ..."

OFM's Response:

This requirement is from the law Chapter 43.371 RCW as amended by Chapter 246, Laws of 2005, Section 2 (3) (g)..

Question #34

SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

- j. 3gi – does the office of insurance commissioner provider data include Billing and Servicing Provider NPI IDs?

OFM's Response:

Data field descriptions for the OIC's Provider Network Form A are located here:

<http://www.insurance.wa.gov/for-insurers/filing-instructions/file-network-access/enrollment-form-a/documents/ProviderNetworkFormA.pdf>.

Question #35

SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

- k. 3h – please elaborate on the requirement to "conduct business intelligence on WA APCD data". It appears the text refers to claim groupings and episodes of care which are part of the ETL data enrichment process. Are there any business intelligence reporting expectations?

OFM's Response:

Claim groupings and episodes of care are included. Additional business intelligence reporting depends upon OFM's reporting requirements and the Bidder's proposed sustainability products.

Question #36SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

- l. 3h – Due to the fact that some algorithms are proprietary (ex: Episode of Care), to what extent should the methodologies be made public, detail level for researchers or high level for consumers?

OFM’s Response:

Methodologies and algorithms used to produce data outcomes must be published so there is no “black box” around how an outcome was calculated. OFM’s CMS Rate Review Cycle III and Cycle IV grants require that APCD data centers (the Lead Organization) funded with grant money must make public all reporting methodologies as per the grants’ Funding Opportunity Announcements.

Question #37SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

- m. 5cii1a – Please elaborate on the requirement that “the claims data does not contain proprietary financial information” (ex: charges, paid amount, allowed amount, copayment, etc.).

OFM’s Response:

Regarding charges, paid amount, allowed amount, copayment, etc., please see the definitions in the current proposed OFM rule for Chapter 82-75 WAC here:

http://www.ofm.wa.gov/rulemaking/rules_dev/WSR_15-22-101_OTIS-7546_2Final.pdf.

Regarding the release of proprietary financial information, please see Chapter 43.371 RCW {as amended by Chapter 246, Laws of 2015, Section 5 (3) (a).} OFM rule-making will be addressing “proprietary financial information,” in Phase II of the Chapter 246, Laws of 2015 (ESSB 5084) rule making (http://www.ofm.wa.gov/healthcare/pricetransparency/pdf/rulemaking_timeline.pdf).

Question #38SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

- n. 5dv – “Reasonable Time”, if the data submitted is of good quality, is there an expected threshold for timely data releases?

OFM’s Response:

The Lead Organization will address this with the Data Release Advisory Committee when establishing the Data Release Process.

Question #39SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

- o. 5e – Is the comparison report envisioned as a data quality tool to verify that the data is in the expected range by comparing data elements from different submitters?

OFM’s Response:

No. This is specific to when the Lead Organization intends to release reports that compare and identify providers, hospitals or data suppliers that they be allowed to verify the accuracy of the information submitted to the Data Vendor. This requirement is from Chapter 43.371 RCW {as amended by Chapter 246, Laws of 2015 Section 6. (4) (a)}:

The lead organization may not release a report that compares and identifies providers, hospitals, or data suppliers unless:

- (a) *It allows the data supplier, the hospital, or the provider to verify the accuracy of the*

information submitted to the data vendor, comment on the reasonableness of conclusions reached, and submit to the lead organization and data vendor any corrections of errors with supporting evidence and comments within thirty days of receipt of the report;

Question #40

SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

- p. To what extent should the APCD Web Site be implemented in SOW1? Does 6 II refer to publishing information about APCD and supported processes?

OFM's Response:

The successful bidder shall implement the WA-APCD website with the requirements listed under SOW #1, Deliverable 6. Establish and maintain the WA-APCD website.

Question #41

SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

- q. 7 – “Health Care Price Schedule and Quality Data Set” – does this phase imply web site design only or design and development only, but not implementation?

OFM's Response:

This includes design, development and implementation of the website for the data set.

Question #42

SOW 1 (Implement WA APCD):

- r. 3 Timeline - Given the SOW needs be completed by Sept 30, 2016 and the entire work needs to be executed in 9 months, has the state considered the external risks such as data submitters not being ready for data submission on time

OFM's Response:

Yes.

Question #43

SOW 2: (Phase 2):

- a. Deliverables 1 “Voluntary” – should historical data requirements for self-insured be same as the entities in phase 1?

OFM's Response:

Yes.

Question #44

SOW 2: (Phase 2):

- b. 4 “Two Additional Transparency products” – the term product refers to “episode”, two additional episodes?

OFM's Response:

SOW #2, Deliverable #4 Two Additional Health Care Claims Price Transparency Products refers to two additional health care claims related products that will be made available for free public consumption.

Question #45SOW 2: (Phase 2):

- c. 5 – Please elaborate the vision around Price Transparency Products for Sale, will these be two software products or reports?

OFM's Response:

See the descriptions of the two potential products that OFM included in its Cycle IV Grant application, as described under SOW #2, Deliverable 5. Two Health Care Claims Data Price Transparency Products Available for Sale.

Question #46SOW 2: (Phase 2):

- d. The Timeline for SOW 2 is the same as SOW 1. It appears these SOWs will require parallel work streams (teams); however there are dependencies among these. Can you confirm both SOW 1 and 2 ETA is Sept 30, 2016?

OFM's Response:

Both SOW #1 and SOW #2 end on September 30, 2016 due to the current grant-funding time periods.

Question #47SOW 3:

- a. Should the Common Measure Set for Quality and Cost Performance Dashboard be part of the APCD Web Site via login / SSO?

OFM's Response:

The Common Measure Set for Quality and Cost Performance Dashboard shall be published to the WA-APCD website and made visible to the general public, as well as allow for specific results to be available only to those with specific security roles.

Question #48SOW 3:

- b. 2b – Does the requirement for “sortable and searchable” refer to separated reports or within the same report? For instance sortable may include tabular representations of all entities and related metrics and users can sort ascendant / descendent by kpi, but searchable may refer to a different workflow, select a practice and show the cost and quality profile of that practice.

OFM's Response:

OFM will work with the Lead Organization on the design of the web site and its sort and search functions through the Design process of the project.

Question #49SOW 3:

- c. 2d – “general public, groups, ACH etc” implies security by user group, some information will be displayed in the public zone, but other info will be secured and display via login. Is this correct?

OFM's Response:

Correct.

Question #50

- Page 5, 1.1.3. Scope of RFP

Is it the State's assumption that reporting will be done based solely on claims data collected in the APCD (as opposed to clinical data or other data outside of the APCD)? If not, what will the source be for the underlying data and how much of that data currently exists?

OFM's Response:

Reporting on the Washington State Common Measure Set for Health Care Quality and Cost does require the inclusion of information in addition to WA-APCD claims data. The required data and its sources for this reporting are identified in SOW #3, Attachment 1.

Question #51

- Page 7, 1.4.3. Additional Funding

Are there currently any open Grant, or other funding requests, that could be awarded in the next 2 years?

OFM's Response:

There are currently no open grant or other funding requests that OFM may be awarded.

Question #52

- Page 7, 1.5. Contract

Will the contract be solely between OMF and the Lead Organization or will the Data Vendor be included in this contracting?

OFM's Response:

OFM will contract with the Lead Organization as the prime contractor. The Lead Organization is expected to contract with the Data Vendor, as per the law, Chapter 43.371 RCW {as amended by Chapter 246, Laws of 2015, Section 2 (3)}.

Question #53

- Page 11, 2.2. Proposals Due

The RFP calls for proposal submissions on 12/21/15 and the MEDS System calls for submission on 12/22/15. Could you please clarify the due date?

OFM's Response:

The proposal is due to OFM on 12/21/2015 as per the RFP 2.2 ESTIMATED SCHEDULE OF PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES.

Question #54

- Page 17, Cyber Liability Insurance

Could you clarify whether "Vendor" here means "Data vendor" or "Contractor"?

OFM's Response:

The Prime Contractor is responsible for ensuring that all insurance is provided.

Question #55

- Page 19, "Points Awarded for Responses: The number in parentheses after each question or requirements represents the maximum number of points that may be awarded for the Bidder's response to that requirement."

Will these points/weights of individual questions and requirements be communicated later?

OFM's Response:

No.

Question #56

- Page 29, "Complete for each of the four SOWs"

Can you confirm that the intended meaning is "three" instead of "four"?

OFM's Response:

There are 4 SOWs, but only deliverables costs for SOWs #1, #2 and #3 require completion in the RFP Section 3.4 Cost Proposal.

Question #57

- Page 29, 3.4 Cost Proposal

Are there any restrictions on the amount of overhead (or facilities and administration) costs that can be included as part of the cost proposal?

OFM's Response:

These are deliverable-based SOWs. OFM requires the bidder to provide a cost for each deliverable and that the total cost for all deliverables under each SOW be at or under the not to exceed cost. OFM does not require the Bidders to provide the components of the cost (such as overhead) for each deliverable.

Question #58

General:

- 1.) What is the purpose of having non-profit or academic institutions as the Lead Organization?

OFM's Response:

This is a requirement of the federal grant funding that OFM received from CMS for the establishment of the WA-APCD. Please see the Health Insurance Rate Review grant Program Cycle III and Cycle IV Funding Opportunity Announcements appended to the RFP (Appendix D and Appendix F.)

Question #59

General:

- 2.) Is there a list of preferred Lead Organizations that you have worked with in the past?

OFM's Response:

No, there is not a preferred Lead Organization that OFM has worked with in the past, as this RFP is for the procurement of the first Lead Organization for the state's WA-APCD.

Question #60

General:

- 3.) Can a company just bid on to be the Lead Organization or the Data Vendor?

OFM's Response:

No.

Question #61

General:

- 4.) Will we be able to see all the questions submitted by other proposal teams or just ours?

OFM's Response:

Yes, you will be able to see all the questions submitted by other proposal teams (which is this document.)

Question #62

Technical:

- 1.) How many personas (i.e. doctors, healthcare suppliers, patience, etc...) will be using the system?

OFM's Response:

Only the Data Vendor uses the system to fulfill claims data requests, as per the WA-APCD law, Chapter 43.371 RCW (as amended by Chapter 246, Laws of 2015.)

Question #63

Technical:

- 2.) How many different roles are there that will be entering data? Who are they?

OFM's Response:

Only the Data Vendor staff will process the health care claims data submitted by health care claims payers into the WA-APCD.

Question #64

Technical:

- 3.) How many mandated and voluntary suppliers provide data?

OFM's Response:

The RFP, SOW #1, Deliverable 4. Collect and Load Phase I Historical Claims Data from Submitters states:

The data to be collected shall include the following Phase 1 submitters:

- c. Public Claims Data
 - o Medicaid Data will be shared consistent with federal and state law (<http://www.hca.wa.gov/medicaid/healthyoptions/pages/planlinks.aspx>)
 - o Public Employees Benefits (health care) (<http://www.hca.wa.gov/pebb/Pages/counties.aspx>)
 - o Public Employees Benefits (dental) (<http://www.hca.wa.gov/pebb/Pages/dental.aspx>)
- d. Commercial Claims (health care, pharmacy and dental) (Attachment 1, 2011 Insurance Commissioner's Annual Report Appendix E: Top 40 Companies by Line of Business to this SOW)

Phase II data collection under SOW #2 includes voluntary submitters. It is up to the Lead Organization to obtain self-funded insurance businesses and organizations to voluntarily submit.

Question #65

Technical:

- 4.) Is there a road map to increase the suppliers?

OFM's Response:

No.

Question #66

Technical:

- 5.) How much historical data is there (i.e. 10 years back)?

OFM's Response:

OFM requires historical health care claims data beginning January 1, 2011, unless otherwise determined by OFM rule.

Question #67

Technical:

- 6.) What is the size of data that needs to be housed and consumed?

OFM's Response:

The Bidder shall determine its own estimates based off of the information supplied in SOW #1 and these Responses to Bidder Questions.

Question #68

Technical:

- 7.) Is all the historical data in electronic format? If yes, what is the format?

OFM's Response:

Yes. Format will be determined through the development of the Data Submission Process and Guide. (See SOW #1, Deliverable 2. Establish the Data Submission Process.)

Question #69

Technical:

- 8.) What is the policy about storing the data in the cloud?

OFM's Response: PENDING

Question #70

Technical:

- 9.) Is the Data Vendor responsible for the data hosting hardware? Is there any existing infrastructure in place?

OFM's Response:

Yes, the Data Vendor is responsible for the data hosting hardware. And no, there is no existing WA-APCD infrastructure in place. This is a new system for the state.

Question #71

Technical:

- 10.) How many systems or tools does APCD need pull data from or get connected to?

OFM's Response:

The Bidder shall provide the WA-APCD solution to meet OFM's requirements.

Question #72

Technical:

- 11.) Is there any existing UI that can be shared?

OFM's Response:

There is no existing UI, as there is no existing WA-APCD.

Question #73

Technical:

12.) Is there any existing work-flow can be shared?

OFM's Response:

No, there is no existing work-flow, as there is no existing WA-APCD.

Question #74

1. Section 2.2 indicates that a pre-proposal conference will be held on November 12, 2015. The RFP does not include details on the time or location of this conference and whether prospective bidders will be allowed to call into this conference along with a conference number and/or webex site. Can this information be shared?

OFM's Response:

Yes, this was shared with Amendment #1 to the RFP.

Question #75

2. Section 3.2.4.2 states: "The lead organization governance structure and advisory committees must include representation of the third-party administrator of the uniform medical plan." If a prospective Lead Agency governance structure and advisory committee does not currently include the third party administrator of the uniform medical plan, can a prospective Lead Agency propose to include this representation if selected as the Lead Organization or does the state require such representation at the time of proposal submission. If yes, this will likely materially impact the number of potential respondents.

Additionally, what role in the governance structure and advisory committee must the third-party administrator of the uniform medical plan have?

OFM's Response:

The Bidder is not required to have representation of the third-party administrator of the Uniform Medical Plan in its current governance and may propose such representation.

The role of the third-party administrator of the uniform medical plan in the governance structure and advisory committees may be proposed by the Bidder.

Question #76

3. Please clarify the expected "go-live" date for the WA-APCD as outlined in SOW #4. Is that 10/1/2016?

OFM's Response:

The "go-live" date of the WA-APCD is by the end of SOW #1, 9/30/2016.

Question #77

4. SOW #1 and #2 includes the requirement of the Lead Organization to load historical claims data however does not indicate the number of submitters data that is anticipated to be loaded. Can the state please clarify the volume of data that is expected to be loaded?

In addition, do these data sets come with either a standard data set or at a minimum a data dictionary?

Additionally, are the data files already in the possession of the state or will the Lead Organization be required to reach out to submitters to obtain this data?

OFM's Response:

The bidder may calculate its own estimate of the volume of data expected to be loaded from the information provided in SOW #1 and these Responses to Bidder's Questions.

Data definitions will be determined through the development of the Data Submission Process and Guide. (See SOW #1, Deliverable 2. Establish the Data Submission Process.)

Data files are not in the possession of the state. The Lead Organization will be required to obtain them directly from the submitters.

Questions from the November 12, 2015 Pre-Proposal Conference:

Question #1

What are you expecting to see under 3.2.1.2.3 and 3.2.1.3.3 "Entity Formation", i.e. what information should be provided here?

OFM's Response:

The purpose of the question is for the Bidder to inform OFM the type of company/organization of both the proposed Lead Organization and Data Vendor.

Question #2

What are you expecting to see under 3.2.2 "Subcontractor information"?

Are you just expecting the statement "(Bidder name) has read, understands, and fully complies with this requirement", or are you expecting something more?

OFM's Response:

An affirmative statement as presented in the above question is what is being asked for.

Question #3

Who are the Lead and Data incumbent organizations?

OFM's Response:

The WA-APCD is a new system for the state, so there are no incumbent organizations.

Question #4

1. Are there detailed specifications that outline the criteria for an acceptable Lead Vendor?

OFM's Response:

In addition to the requirements in the RFP, there are specific specifications for the Lead Organization and Data Vendor in the law, Chapter 43.371 RCW (as amended by Chapter 246, Laws of 2015.)

Question #5

2. Will you "vet" an acceptable lead vendor in advance or just leave it to us to interpret the criteria outlined in the law and the RFP?

OFM's Response:

No, OFM will not vet a Lead Organization or Data Vendor in advance of the proposal evaluation process.

Question #6

3. Also, along with the vendor list can you also publish the name of the individual who joined late from Univ. of Washington Tacoma?

OFM's Response:

No, we did not publish the name of the individual who joined the Pre-Proposal Bidder's Conference call late from the University of Washington, Tacoma. However, OFM did publish the name of one of the individuals who was already on the call from the University of Washington, Tacoma in Amendment #2.

Question #7

1. It was mentioned during the Rules comment meeting on October 22, that the Attorney General's Office will need to review and approve the data submission guide. Once the Lead Organization has developed the guide, how much time does OFM anticipate needing to obtain necessary approvals?

OFM's Response:

At this time, OFM has no expectation of an Attorney General's office review of the Data Submission Guide.

Question #8

2. Please provide insight on the types of reports you expect to create by September 30, 2016 under SOW #1 given the various time frames included in Rules for lead organization notification to data suppliers about obligation to file, data suppliers submission of test and final files, and the legislative requirement that doctors and hospitals review and validate data before it can be released publicly.

OFM's Response:

As per the deliverables under SOW #1, no reports with data from the WA-APCD are expected to be created by September 30, 2016 under SOW #1.