All Payer Database Project: Data Warehouse and Data Analytics
Request for Proposals (RFP) Number 15809

Responses to Written Questions (Round 2)

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
1	II.	7	Please clarify the data volume estimates in Part II of the RFP (page 7): a) Does "Large Group" refer to a single insurer or to all commercial claims? How many "large groups" are there? b) Please define QHP. c) Is there any estimate for Medicare claim/encounter volume beyond the estimate of 3.1 million covered lives? Can you provide an average/estimate of transactions PMPM?	a.) Large Group refers to all commercial claims. The number of commercial issuers is estimated at between 50-60. b.) QHP stands for Qualified Health Plan and refers to issuers that participate in the New York State of Health, New York's Official Health Plan Marketplace. c.) Medicare volume was clarified in the amended RFP (see page 7) and includes the same estimated five (5) transactions PMPM as the other encounter volume estimates.
2	V.V.	44	(We are) preparing a bid for the All Payer Database Project (RFP Number 15809) and (are) seeking qualified MWBE partners who have technical skills to match the needs of this proposal. I understand that you operate an email list that is already filtered by product code and which could help us to target those companies which are most likely to be interested in this opportunity. Would it be possible to provide us with access to this email list? If not, would you be willing to forward an email on our behalf to this distro list? We could draft a message with a general outline of our needs, then forward it through your office for approval and submission to MWBE companies	The RFP web site includes a list of New York State certified Minority and Women-owned Business Enterprises interested in subcontracting opportunities from the resulting contract; the list includes those who responded to the RFP with their contact information by July 17, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. ET. Additionally, the RFP web site includes a link to a list of "Potential MWBE Vendors," taken from the New York State M/WBE Directory at http://ny.newnycontracts.com. Potential bidders may search the New York State M/WBE Directory by

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
			with the targeted product codes. Also, is your office hosting any upcoming seminars or meetings that cater to MWBEs who may want to partner on this project? If so, would you please provide information about how to attend either in person or via WebEx? Of course, we would be happy to receive any other advice you have on how best to contact these firms in order to build a partnership. As a follow-up question, is the NYS DOH planning to host any pre-bid or pre-award meetings with certified MWBEs? If so, do you have dates and times for those meetings, so that we can schedule our attendance?	categories such as business description, commodity code, location, industry and business size. We are not able to communicate with potential M/WBEs on behalf of a potential bidder. The Office of Quality and Patient Safety is not hosting seminars/meetings, pre-bid or pre-award meetings for M/WBEs.
3	Procurement Library		Re "APD Data Analytics and warehousing solutions" presentation on 6/18/14, stated "A single RFP for Data Analytics and Data warehousing solutions is in development" Vendor selection in October 2014. Also posted several Milestones for APD Data intake. Is this different from "All payer Database project"; RFP #15809. If it is different, do we access all the data available and work with or is it too late for newcomers to respond to RFP #15809?	There are two PowerPoint presentations in the Procurement Library that provide historical information on the project. The RFP referenced as under development is the current RFP #15809. The milestones referenced were for the data intake portion of the project, which is a different contract that is already in place.
4	V.C.	33	I noticed the Letter of Intent is not required but requested, will this impair our chances and could we still submit LOI? Given the answers to the questions weren't posted yet, was the date of the Letter of Intent postponed?	Submission of a Letter of Intent is optional and not mandatory. Therefore, not submitting the Letter will not impair bidders' chances of successfully bidding on the procurement. Yes, the Letter of Intent to Bid due date was postponed to August 20, 2015.

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
5	V.V.	44	I am a New York based small business, and a MBE certified both by NYS and NYC. I have been approached by a company that will be a sub-contractor on this RFP. Neither this sub-contractor nor the prime is an MBE. If I sign a sub-contracting agreement with the sub-contractor (sub of a sub), will my company's MBE certification count towards the 15% minority requirement on this RFP? Or, do I need to sign a sub-contracting agreement directly with the prime for my company's MBE status to count towards the 15% participation.	Work/products provided by a New York State certified Minority and/or Women-owned Business Enterprise (including subcontractors' subcontracts) that directly support the contract will count toward the goal for M/WBE participation.
6	"Interested MWBEs" and "Potential MWBEs"		There are two lists on the RFP website, interested MWBEs and Potential MWBE Vendors. 1) The "Interested MWBEs" represent a list of MWBEs that have affirmatively responded by indicating that they are available to work as a Subcontractor for this RFP. Is this correct? If not, please explain. 2) The "Potential MWBE Vendors" is a list of MWBEs that are certified by NY State - they have not indicated that they are interested in working on this RFP - this correct? If not, please explain. 3) Does NYSDOH have a "Prime Vendor List" of companies that satisfy a criterion that is necessary to do business with NYSDOH? Is so, then can you provide us with the Prime Vendor List?	1) Yes, the "Interested MWBEs" list includes New York State certified M/WBEs who responded to the RFP with their contact information by July 17, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. ET. 2) The "Potential MWBE Vendors" have not formally indicated that they are interested in working on this RFP, aside from those vendors appearing on both lists. The "Potential MWBE Vendors" list was supplied by Empire State Development as a helpful resource for finding possible New York State certified M/WBEs to work with. 3) No.
7	I.E.	4	We have a solution that is highly specialized, and it can address specific requirements in your RFP in a cost-effective manner. However, certain requirements (e.g., Hosting) are not our	No. The Department of Health intends to award one contract for all of the components specified in the RFP. However, bidders may propose to

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
			forte. A) Can we submit a compartmentalized Proposal that addresses specific requirements (with a Traceability Matrix)? b) If so, please answer the following: If you discover that a submitted methodology/solution for the RFP Use Cases is superior to other submissions, will NYSDOH consider issuing multiple awards for this contract? For example, awards are issued to two companies - one company has the best response to the Use Case requirements, and the other company has the best response to the Hosting requirements.	employ (and manage) one or more subcontractors to carry out specific parts of the contract.
8	Price Proposal		The current deliverables-based pricing model does not align to vendors' cost structures, and the combination of the cost misalignment and infrequency of payments is creating a significant pricing issue for vendors, which will either discourage vendor participation or require significant higher pricing to the State. Will the State be willing to accept the following alternative pricing proposal: 1) Allow the vendors to propose reimbursement percentages for each deliverable to better align to their cost structure. 2) Continue with payment being tied to approved deliverables but increase the frequency of the payments so that payments are at least monthly. 3) Adopt a strategy of retainage in place of the quarterly payments with dictated percentages. Retainage is withheld from monthly payments and released at certain critical milestones such as	NYSDOH will not accept alternative price proposals.

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
			interim solution go-live and permanent go-live. Industry standard for retainage is 10%.	
9	IV.D.	26	We want to make sure we provide a financially effective solution within your budget. So any budget guidelines will help. What is approximate annual budget for this project?	We are unable to provide the total dollar amount budgeted for this contract. Bidders should submit a price proposal based on the information in the RFP, ensuring reasonableness of cost and a best value to New York State.
10	III.E.	12	RFP mentions that solution must include Hosting. Do you have a preference of the Hosting environment? Do you prefer cloud environment: Amazon Web Services, Microsoft Cloud, Rackspace?	There is no preferred hosting solution. Bidders should present their solution that best meets the needs and requirements of the State as detailed in the RFP.
11	III.E.	12	Are you open for public cloud based system?	A public cloud based system will be allowed if it meets the State's business requirements as stated in the RFP and if New York State security practices, policies and technologies can be extended to it. RFP Section III. E., Hosting Solution, provides details on Hosting.
12	Questions and Answers (Round 1), #12, 99, 315, 467, 473 and 484.	5, 28, 68, 117, 118 and 120	How many maximum concurrent users do you expect?	Refer to answers in the Questions and Answers (Round 1), #12, 99, 315, 467, 473 and 484. Specifically, within the scope of the RFP, the contractor will need to support up to 200 users. It is estimated that up to 25% of users (50 users) may access the Data Warehouse concurrently.

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
13	Various		What are the different formats of data that is being captured in the source systems (OLTP applications)?	Claims are submitted in an X12 format and stored in an Oracle database.
14	Various		What are the different types of technologies/applications used to capture the source systems?	Technologies vary. The process for receiving data from each of the DPEs will be determined during the requirements and design sessions with the selected vendor.
15	Questions and Answers (Round 1), #109, 242 and 299.	30, 54 and 64	How often should we extract the data from source systems in the Data warehouse? Will it be on Daily basis or Weekly basis or monthly basis or Real time basis?	Refer to answers in the Questions and Answers (Round 1), #109, 242 and 299. Specifically, data submission will occur at different frequencies, depending upon the DPE, and can range from daily (potentially EIS) to annually (potentially Medicare). The APD will need to be refreshed daily.
16	Questions and Answers (Round 1), #471	118	What will be the expected volume of data (Sizing of data) that will be extracted in the Data warehouse on daily basis?	Refer to the answer in Questions and Answers, Round 1, #471. Specifically, actual daily volume is not known. RFP Section II lists annual volume estimates and bidders can estimate daily/weekly volumes accordingly. There are no specific peak periods to highlight.
17	Questions and Answers (Round 1), #5, 472 and 503	1, 118 and 127	What will be the expected growth of the Data warehouse for the next three years - in terms of the volumes of data?	Refer to the answers in the Questions and Answers, Round 1, #'s 5, 472 and 503. Specifically, annual volume is estimated at 10 terabytes per year.
18	Various		Do you have any preference to technologies? Do you prefer to use only open source and proprietary tools for this solution?	There are no preferred technology solutions. Bidders should present their solution that best meets the needs and requirements of the State as detailed in the RFP.

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
19	Various		Have you identified any products/technologies that suites your requirement during the discovery phase?	There are no preferred technology solutions. Bidders should present their solution that best meets the needs and requirements of the State as detailed in the RFP.
20	Questions and Answers (Round 1), #468	117	In the answer to question 468, the state references a graphic in Section II of the RFP for data inputs to the data intake solution (EIS). However, when one goes to Section II the two graphics in the section are for the interim and permanent solution with neither referencing the EIS data intake solution. We believe it would be helpful to add to the graphic representing the permanent solution a call out or description that describes the data sources in the far left of the graphic encircled by dashes as the data inputs to the EIS.	The graphic has not been revised. However, bidders should refer to the Questions and Answers, Round 1 #232 for clarification on the EIS and other DPEs. Specifically, QHP, Medicaid Managed Care and Commercial encounters will be part of the EIS DPE, with Medicaid FFS and Medicare potentially part of the EIS and potentially as separate DPEs. SPARCS will be a separate DPE. The total number and type of DPEs over the life of the project is undetermined at this time.
21	Questions and Answers (Round 1), #137	36	The response to question 137 (page 36) states: "The APD Data Warehouse will receive a data feed from the OHIP Data Mart;" the response to question 247 (page 255) states: "There are no data warehousing components to the interim solution. The analytics solution must sufficiently fulfill user stories against the OHIP Data Mart." Which is the correct understanding, will the vendor receive a feed or access the OHIP Data Mart directly?	See the answer to Question #59 in this document. There is no warehousing requirement in the interim solution; however, there will be a data extract feed from the OHIP Data Mart to the contractor and the contractor must have a way to accept the extract so that analytics can be performed against the data.
22	Questions and Answers (Round 1); #131	34	The response to question 131 (page 34) states: "The selected vendor will be required to fulfill all user stories identified by designations of	No change will be made to this requirement.

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
			"OB" or "C" on their proposal…" "C" contains: CNF (Configuration); INT (Integration); CST (Customization); PFF (Planned Future Functionality); SWK (System Work Around); PWK (Process Work Around); Will the state remove "CST" from the requirements for Phase 1?	
23	Schedule of Key Events	i.	Due to significant changes in the reissued RFP, including the option to use State provided facilities for some of the services, we are requesting that the State grant an extension to the due date for proposal responses, for an additional 30 days, beyond the current September 3 date. This extension will allow the bidders to more thoroughly address the RFP changes and the potential use of State Data Center facilities.	No further extensions to the Proposals Due Date will be provided.
24	Questions and Answers (Round 1); #468	117	Reviewing the Q&A for the above referenced RFP, we ran across an inconsistency in one of the questions. We believe it would be helpful to all bidders who are responding to this RFP to have this information and wanted to bring our suggestion to your attention. In the answer to question 468, the state references a graphic in Section II of the RFP for data inputs to the data intake solution (EIS). However, when one goes to Section II the two graphics in the section are for the interim and permanent solution with neither referencing the EIS data intake solution. We believe it would be helpful to add to the graphic representing the permanent solution a call out or description	The graphic has not been revised. However, bidders should refer to the Questions and Answers, Round 1 #232 for clarification on the EIS and other DPEs. Specifically, QHP, Medicaid Managed Care and Commercial encounters will be part of the EIS DPE, with Medicaid FFS and Medicare potentially part of the EIS and potentially as separate DPEs. SPARCS will be a separate DPE. The total number and type of DPEs over the life of the project is undetermined at this time. There were numerous questions, as reflected in the Questions and

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
			that describes the data sources in the far left of the graphic encircled by dashes as the data inputs to the EIS. Please advise if this request can be accommodated.	Answers, Round 1, requesting clarification of what data sources will be captured by the EIS and what data sources will be other DPEs (including # 106, 232, 251, 293, 300, 413, 415 and 419). These questions were answered consistently.
25	IV., D, Software Itemization	27	Per the Amended RFP, "In the event the best value (selected) bidder's software pricing is higher than NYS pricing for the same software, NYSDOH reserves the right to remove the bidder's software pricing from the bid and provide the software directly." With the State reserving the right to remove the bidder's software pricing from the bid and provide the software directly, is the State willing to accept title and pay for all of the software outside of the milestone payment schedule?	If NYSDOH exercises the right to remove software pricing from the bid and provide software directly, there will be no payments or transactions processed through the contractor. The State would purchase software directly.
26	V., J., Payment, #1 and 2	39	The current payment schedule does not match the incurred cost during the DDI period, and the combination of the cost misalignment and infrequency of payments is creating a significant pricing issue for vendors, which will either discourage vendor participation or require significantly higher pricing to the State. Is the State willing to accept the following changes to the pricing response template: 1) Allow vendors to propose reimbursement percentages for each deliverable to better align to their cost structure. 2) Continue with payment being tied to approved deliverables, but increase the	NYSDOH will not accept alternative price proposals.

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
			frequency of payments so that payments are at least monthly. 3) Adopt a strategy of retainage in place of the quarterly payments with dictated percentages. Retainage is withheld from monthly payments and released at certain critical milestones such as interim solution go-live and permanent go-live. Industry standard for retainage is 10%. If not, will the State elaborate on what changes to these areas it would accept?	
27	E.	13	Will the State give special consideration to the use of the State Data Center or is it purely an option that is otherwise on equal footing with hosting services provided by the Bidder itself or their subcontractor?	There is no preferred hosting solution. Bidders may propose to provide hosting services itself, to use a subcontractor or to utilize the State Data Center. Bidders should indicate appropriate details regarding their hosting solution in the Technical Proposal, in accordance with the Proposal Requirements outlined in the RFP.
28	Attachment 4, Hosting Solution Agreement	5	Under Disaster Recovery it states "Options for restoration of the production environment within a data center with equal or greater facilities, on equipment with equal or greater capacity, should include:" Would the State accept a Disaster Recovery environment that is installed in a facility that is equal or greater than the Production facility with the capacity to house all of the production APD data and a scaled down version of the Production environment based on the same architectural components, O/S, etc., that through its modular design can be quickly extended to	As stated in Attachment 4, the disaster recovery site must include a data center with equal or greater facilities and must include equipment with equal or greater capacity. The Disaster Recovery solution should be architected and designed to be identical to the Production environment. The State would accept a proposal that included a scaled down version that can be quickly scaled out to full capacity that meets the business continuity requirements stated in the RFP. All applicable system

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
			provide equal or greater processing capacity to Production in the event of an extended interruption in Production?	requirements must be able to be met in the disaster recovery environment, however, as they are in the production environment.
29	Attachment 1, Data Warehouse Solution Requirements; DW-88	9	Revised DW-88 requires "a Data Dictionary that conforms with New York State Standards." Could you provide information of these NYS Standards?	New York State Standards include applicable policies, procedures and guidance from the NYS Office of Information Technology Services (ITS). Specific guidance on development of the data dictionary can be found in Section III., 2. (Systems Requirements Analysis) of the NYS Project Management Guidebook Release 2, found at http://www.its.ny.gov/nys-project-management-guidebook-release-2. To be accepted, the data dictionary must be reviewed and approved by NYSDOH and ITS. Appropriate additional guidance and direction will be provided to the contractor during system requirements and design sessions.
30	Attachment 2, Data Analytics Solution User Stories Matrix; US-28	5	In the revised RFP, user story 28 was deleted (requiring a consumer portal allowing individual consumers to look at their own claims). However, the answer to Question 18 about a consumer portal says (in part): "Specific parameters for access to APD data are still under development…The selected vendor is also required to develop mechanisms for designated users to access various levels of data of partially identifiable and identifiable	To clarify the answer to #18 in the Questions and Answers, Round 1 document, the required consumer facing portal consisting of a publicly accessible website, containing data of a public use nature and that includes interactivity to allow for queries and reports, is specific to the general public. The mechanisms for designated users to potentially access various levels of

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
			natures." Can we assume that once the consumer portal requirements are determined, the resulting work will go through the change management process and the potential access of identifiable information by individual user accounts?	data of partially identifiable and identifiable natures is specific to the end users identified in Section III., G. of the RFP (estimated at 200 and internal to NYSDOH). Both of these are within the scope of the RFP deliverables. Any additional data access mechanisms for users beyond those identified in the RFP would be addressed through the systems change management process.
31	Appendix F, Technology Provisions, 2(b), Title to Project Deliverables	Appendix F	Appendix F, Section 2(b) of the RFP specifies that "Title and ownership of Existing Hardware Products shall pass to NYSDOH upon acceptance." A "Product" (including any Existing Hardware Product") is defined in Section 2(a)(i) of the RFP as being "Deliverables furnished under this Contract." Yet, none of the items that fall within the definition of "Deliverables" under Section III(I) of the base RFP (pages 16 and 17) include hardware. In addition, NYSDOH is asking bidders for a hosted solution, where the hosted solution might involve a hardware platform used by multiple customers. In order to resolve both the inconsistency while also enabling NYSDOH to enjoy potentially lower pricing from bidders, would NYSDOH consider amending the RFP to clarify that hardware may be owned by the vendor, such as in a multi-tenant, Vendor hosted solution and need not be owned by NYSDOH?	Yes. Since this contract will be hosted, there is no requirement of hardware as a deliverable. Attachment 4, Hosting Solution Agreement, further specifies that hardware is not to be owned by either NYSDOH or ITS.

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
32	Appendix F- Technology Provisions, Section 2(b), Title to Project Deliverables, Section III(I), Summary of Deliverables	Appendix F	If the hardware platform on which the APD software applications and databases are implemented must be owned by NYSDOH, would NYSDOH clarify whether such hardware should be added to the list of Deliverables for which the parties must agree upon acceptance criteria and obtain State acceptance as is envisioned by Section III(I) of the RFP, Subsection 2(a)(i)?	This contract will not require hardware as a deliverable.
33	Appendix F- Technology Provisions, Section 2(b), Title to Project Deliverables, and Section III. B. 2., PM-43 through PM-49	Appendix F and pages 10-11	If the hardware platform on which the APD software applications and databases are implemented must be owned by NYSDOH, would NYSDOH clarify whether such hardware must be shipped to NYSDOH as part of Contract Transition under Section III(B)(2), PM-43 through PM-49?	Since this contract will be hosted, there is no requirement of hardware as a deliverable. Attachment 4, Hosting Solution Agreement, further specifies that hardware is not to be owned by either NYSDOH or ITS. As such, there is no transition of hardware under Section III(B)(2), PM-43 through PM-49.
34	Appendix F- Technology Provisions, Section 2(a)(ii), Definitions, Existing Products	Appendix F	Appendix F, Section 2(a)(ii) of the RFP defines an "Existing Product" to include "intangible licensed Products that exist prior to the commencement of work under the Contract." Appendix F, Section 2(b)(i)(2) permits title and ownership to "Existing Software Products" to remain with the Contractor or ISV, subject to a license in NYSDOH's name. Contractors and ISVs will develop enhancements, updates and new releases to intangible licensed Products that exist prior to the commencement of work. If they are made available to the public as part of software support, those Contractors and ISV require that ownership remain with the Contractor or ISV. The definition of an "Existing	Yes. Specifically, any enhancements, updates and new versions and releases to existing software products that are normally commercially distributed on a license basis by the Contractor or ISV, and are not paid for through the APD contract, would be considered part of the existing software products and would not be considered custom software products.

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
			Product" however, means that such enhancements, updates and new releases would not be owned by the Contractor or ISV. Would NYSDOH amend the definition of Existing Products" to include "intangible licensed Products that exist prior to the commencement of the work under the Contract and enhancements, updates, new versions and releases to the same that are part of the Contractor or ISV's standard product or whose development costs are not passed on to NYSDOH."?	
35	Appendix F-Technology Provisions, Section 2(b), Title to Project Deliverables; III. I., Summary of Deliverables	Appendix F and page 16	If software applications and operating system that form part of the hosted APD platform must be either licensed to NYSDOH under Appendix J, Section 2(b)(i)(2) or owned by NYSDOH under Section 2(b)(ii) since they are considered "Project Deliverables", would NYSDOH clarify whether such software should be added to the list of Deliverables for which the parties must agree upon acceptance criteria and obtain State acceptance as is envisioned by Section III(I) of the RFP, Subsection 2(a)(i)?	Yes. The software is a component of the deliverables and all deliverable requirements must be fully received before payment can be authorized.
36	Appendix F-Technology Provisions, Section 2(b), Title to Project Deliverables; III. B. 2., PM-43 through PM-49	Appendix F and pages 10-11	If Existing Software Products must be licensed to NYSDOH on a perpetual basis and if the Custom Products must either be owned by NYSDOH or licensed to NYSDOH on a perpetual basis, as Section 2(b) of Appendix F implies, would NYSDOH clarify whether such Software must be shipped to NYSDOH as part of Contract Transition under Section III(B)(2), PM-43 through PM-49?	Yes. All custom software products and source code will need to be transitioned to NYSDOH in accordance with Section III(B)(2), PM-43 through PM-49, regardless of whether owned by or perpetually licensed to NYSDOH. In addition, refer to Amendment 5 regarding requirements to escrow

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
				custom software source code and documentation.
37	Appendix F- Technology Provisions, Section 2(b)(ii), Custom Products	Appendix F	Appendix F, Section 2(b)(ii), Custom Products permits NYSDOH, at its option, to either own Custom Products or, upon written notice to Contractor, take a non-exclusive, perpetual license to Custom Products. Bidders might be willing to provide a lower price to NYSDOH if NYSDOH only requires a non-exclusive license rather than ownership. If NYSDOH does not tell bidders whether ownership or licensure is required at time of bid submission, bidders will not be able to provide the lower price since there is no guarantee that NYSDOH won't require ownership. Could NYSDOH amend the RFP so that NYSDOH owns the Custom Product but grants back to the Contractor a fully paid up, license to use, copy, modify, prepare derivative works, license, distribute, support and implement as part of Contractor's business, including outside of NYSDOH?	No changes will be made to the RFP language. Within the RFP, NYSDOH reserves the right to choose to either own custom software products, or to instead opt for perpetual license, and will make that decision based upon the best interests of the State. NYSDOH is unable to commit to a specific option at this time and bidders should prepare their proposal with that understanding. Per the RFP, bidders may only submit a single proposal, however, and no alternative proposals will be accepted.
38	Appendix F- Technology Provisions, Section 2(c), Contractor's Obligation with Regard to ISV (Third Party) Product	Appendix F	Appendix F, Section 2 (c) requires the Contractor to obtain from the ISV third party developer a non-exclusive, perpetual license to use, execute, reproduce, display, perform and adapt for any Existing Software Product if the ISV/developer's standard license does not contain such terms. Many Existing Software Products are commercial, off the shelf software where the COTS vendor is not willing to negotiate any differences with respect to its license terms and conditions by the very fact	No changes will be made to the RFP language. However, existing language does provide accommodations for this type of situation. Appendix F, Section 2. b. 2., states that if the Contractor or ISV owner's standard license agreement does not grant the State a non-exclusive, perpetual license to use, execute, reproduce, display, perform and adapt the existing licensed product, the Contractor must advise the State as

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
			that it is a COTS product and by doing so, both the ISV vendor and Contractor can offer a market price to NYSDOH. For Existing Software Products that are COTS products and where the ISV (Third Party) proprietary owner/developer has standard license terms whose scope is not the same as described in the RFP, in order for NYSDOH to benefit from both the lower pricing and project efficiencies that can be gained from the use of such COTS software, would NYSDOH amend the RFP such that Appendix J, Section 2(c) would not apply to COTS software?	part of their proposal that adaptation will violate existing agreements or statutes and must demonstrate such to the State's satisfaction. Per this language, bidders should clearly state in their proposal where such a situation exists, should provide detailed information regarding the specific software in question and the limitations of the standard license agreement. See Amendment 5 for additional information.
39	Attachment 8, Price Proposal Workbook, Pricing Summary Tab		Under instructions in Cell A24 the text states "Enter Annual Fixed Ongoing Support Prices in Rows 12-14". Should "Annual" be "Monthly" to be consistent with text in Cell F11?	Yes. The instructions should read "Enter Monthly Fixed Ongoing Support Prices in Rows 12-14." Attachment 8 will be revised and re-posted on the RFP website.
40	Attachment 8, Price Proposal Workbook, Software Itemization Tab		For both the Deployment section and Ongoing sections, there are only 10 lines entering software products and the spreadsheet is protected such that additional lines cannot be inserted. Will NYSDOH either add more lines in each section or unprotect this tab?	This worksheet tab will be unprotected and the file will re-posted on the RFP website so that bidders can insert additional rows as needed.
41			In the Deployment Software section, should the price include the license cost and the maintenance cost incurred during deployment or just the license costs?	If applicable, bidders should include both costs but should itemize them separately.
42	Attachment 8, Price Proposal Workbook, Software Itemization Tab		In the Ongoing Software section, should the price include the license cost and the maintenance cost incurred during deployment or just the license costs? If maintenance is to	The Ongoing Software section of the tab should be used for operations costs only and should not include costs during deployment. Software costs during deployment should be recorded

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
			be included, over what time period (36 months or longer)?	in the Deployment Software section. If applicable, bidders should include both license and maintenance costs in both sections, but should itemize them separately. Maintenance costs should be for 36 months.
43	Questions and Answers (Round 1), #12	5	In the response to a bidder question, NYSDOH responded as follows: "None of the stated 200 users will require SQL or SQL-like access to the data warehouse." Please reconcile this statement in light of the fact that US-8, US-10, and especially US-9 seem to require the use of SQL access to the data warehouse and underlying tables.	The following is the revision to the information provided in the Questions and Answers (Round 1), #12: page 15 of the RFP (Section III., G.) provides a table with a breakdown of anticipated end users (200 total). Approximately 15% (or 30 users) are expected to require the File Extract/Manipulation role, which would include SQL-like access to the data warehouse.
44	Questions and Answers (Round 1), #12	5	How many users will require direct access to the database using SQL-like tools? On RFP Page 15 of 49, it states 30 users for file extract/manipulation, but in Q&A #12, it states: "None of the stated 200 users will require SQL or SQL-like access to the data warehouse." Should this be interpreted to mean that these users require direct SQL access as well as the ability to create tables in the underlying database?	See the answer to Question #43 in this document. Page 15 of the RFP (Section III., G.) provides a table with a breakdown of anticipated end users (200 total). Approximately 15% (or 30 users) are expected to require the File Extract/Manipulation role, which would include SQL-like access to the data warehouse.
45	Questions and Answers (Round 1), #5 and Attachment 1, DW-198	Questions and Answers (Round 1), page 1 and	Database sizing estimates state that a 10TB estimate retained in the solution repository year over year. Does NYSDOH expect an average of 10 Tb per year over the life of the contract, or is NYSDOH estimating a cap of 10 Tb per year?	There is no cap on database size. The 10 terabyte figure is an estimate of annual volume.

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
		Attachment 1, page 16		
46	Questions and Answers (Round 1), #18 and Attachment 2, US-24–33	Questions and Answers (Round 1), page 7 and Attachment 2, pages 4-5	Currently, we assume that ALL data exposed from the data warehouse to a designated NYSDOH user is has completed de-identification. However, a clarifying response to Question 18 from NYSDOH states that the selected vendor is also required to develop mechanisms for designated users to access various levels of data of partially identifiable and identifiable natures. 1) Could the State clarify whether it intends to ask the vendor to store identifiable information in the data warehouse outside of the enclave where de-identification and grouping takes place? 2) Does the State intend to set up a data governance mechanism to allow end-user access to identifiable information in the solution?	Pending finalization of the data release policy, there may be specific users granted access to identifiable data and extracts with identifiable data may be released to certain requestors. If applicable, a data governance system will be developed to manage these activities.
47	Questions and Answers (Round 1), #5 and Attachment 1, DW-198	Questions and Answers (Round 1), page 1 and Attachment 1, page 16	Does the 10 Tb per year estimate applied to converted historical data. If not, what is the estimate of converted data size?	Refer to the Questions and Answers, Round 1, #16. Specifically, exact sizing details are unknown at this time and will be determined during DDI activities. An estimated current volume of SPARCS history is 350GB. There are currently five (5) terabytes of Medicaid data. Initial estimates of total historical data are 10 terabytes per year.
48	Questions and Answers (Round 1), #18 and Attachment 2, 2.1 Consumer	Questions and Answers (Round 1),	NYSDOH envisions an external-facing portal for the APD. Who is expected to provide Level 1 helpdesk support for external users?	Helpdesk support for users beyond the estimated 200 specified in the RFP, Section III., G., is not within the scope of the RFP. External users of the

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
		page 7 and Attachment 2, page 4		consumer facing portal are not included in the estimated 200 users in the scope of the RFP. The contractor will be responsible, however, for maintaining the external facing website and ensuring that it works properly.
49	Questions and Answers (Round 1), # 55 and 56 and II.	Questions and Answers (Round 1), page 15 and II., page 7	For the phase one (first 9 mo), would the state be able to provide historical claims data for all existing payers (from OHIP data mart) in a blended format? How is this data stored & organized now in OHIP - by payer/LOB (line of business, e.g., Medicaid, commercial HMO, commercial PPO, etc.) or blended?	Formats for the historical data load will be fully defined during the requirements and design sessions with the contractor.
50	Questions and Answers (Round 1), #55 and 56 and II.	Questions and Answers (Round 1), page 15 and II., page 7	Would the state be able to provide eligibility/enrollment data for all existing payers from OHIP data mart in a blended format?	Formats for the data extract feeds from the OHIP Data Mart will be fully defined during the requirements and design sessions with the contractor.
51	Questions and Answers (Round 1), # 52 and 58	12 and 16	Do references to claims data include fee-for-service and capitation encounters combined?	Yes, the APD will store all post adjudicated claims data, inclusive of fee-for-service and managed care claims/encounters.
52	Questions and Answers (Round 1), # 175, 448, 456 and 487	46, 114, 115 and 121	Does the State require payers to report quality measures other than HEDIS measures?	HEDIS is currently the core mechanism for quality metric reporting. There are multiple new programs, federal requirements and insurance products, however, that are expected to expand upon what is reported with HEDIS measures. As appropriate, any

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
				additional collected quality measures would be incorporated into the APD.
53	Questions and Answers (Round 1); # 55 and 56	15	Will the historical data contain only finalized adjudicated claims data?	The format and content of historical data loads will vary with the DPE and could be either transactional or finalized. How the historical data loads are addressed will depend on the solution of the selected vendor and what best meets the needs of the project, and will be detailed in the requirements and design sessions with the contractor.
54	Questions and Answers (Round 1); #36 and 425	10 and 109	Would the membership data (if provided) include assign PCP information (if HMO like system)?	Yes.
55	Questions and Answers (Round 1); #24 and 425	8 and 109	Would membership data (if provided) include separated files on retroactive changes?	Membership information will be date segmented. Retroactive actives should be recognized as the date segments change.
56	Questions and Answers (Round 1); #490	122	Since Q&A 490 states there will be transactional claims data involving adjustments, would the state be able to provide logic on how to derive the "last image of the claim" for each payer? Will logic varies on how to deal with adjustments by payer?	The ideal logic for addressing this is not fully defined and will be addressed during the requirements and design sessions with the contractor.
57	Questions and Answers (Round 1); #17, 34, 70, 71, 486 and 496	7, 10, 20, 21, 121 and 124	Would there be a need for separate risk adjustment by type of population / line of business such as CDPS for Medicaid, or HCC for Medicare or CRG/ACG for commercial populations?	There may be a need for separate risk adjustment, which will be addressed during the requirements and design sessions with the contractor.

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
58	Questions and Answers (Round 1); #425	109	Would the provider data include all possible identifiers such as NPI, DEA, internal Provider IDs, TaxID?	It is expected that it will. However, this is not known at this time.
59	Questions and Answers (Round 1); #403	104	Q&A 403 states that the "interim solution provides for the OHIP Data Mart to serve as the data repository to deploy the analytics solution against," indicating that there is no transfer of data to the warehousing vendor for the interim solution due within 9 months. This is corroborated by Q&A-247, which states that "there are no data warehousing components to the interim solution." Q&A-420, however, indicates the reverse, stating that "For the interim solution, the selected vendor will take data extract files from the OHIP Data Mart and Medicaid Data Warehouse. These extracts have already been converted from X12 and NCPDP formats to database tables." This contradiction is reiterated in Q&A-137, which focuses on the interim solution and notes that "the APD Data Warehouse will receive a data feed from the OHIP Data Mart." Please clarify: a) If the warehousing/analytics vendor will be intaking any OHIP data for the interim solution; b) If the answer is affirmative, please clarify the extent of data (i.e., types, dates, and volume) that must be received from OHIP and subjected to mapping, ETL, and QA prior to reliable use in the delivery of required user stories. C) If the state will be able to provide historical claims data for all existing payers (from OHIP data mart) in a blended format.	A.) To further clarify, APD data will be stored in the OHIP Data Mart from the start of the contract until the development of the APD Data Warehouse component of the project (which is part of the permanent solution and must be complete within 24 months). There is no warehousing requirement in the interim solution; however, there will be a data extract feed from the OHIP Data Mart to the contractor and the contractor must have a way to accept the extract so that analytics can be performed against the data. B.) The data will be fully inclusive as defined in the RFP. They will not be a subset of any permanent solution data, but a full complement, and are expected to conform to the projected volumes and specifications detailed in the RFP. The only difference between the interim and permanent solutions is where the source data will be warehoused (i.e., OHIP Data Mart vs. APD Data Warehouse). C.) Formats for the historical data load will be fully defined during the requirements and design sessions with the contractor.

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
60	Questions and Answers (Round 1); #216	51	Q&A 216 discusses "original source submissions to the APD Data Warehouse." Our understanding is that OSS data is provided to DPEs (such as the EIS being built by CSC) for subsequent transfer to the APD warehousing/analytics vendor, not provided directly. Please confirm whether all OSS data is provided first to DPEs or whether there will be direct transfers from any OSSs to the APD warehouse.	All data to the APD Data Warehouse will come via DPE. The primary DPE is the EIS and other DPEs may include SPARCS, SHIN-NY and public health registries, as well as Medicare and the MDW (Medicaid fee-for-service) if not incorporated into the EIS. The EIS is not an original source submitter (original source submitters to the EIS are individual issuers/payers). Depending on how they are ultimately defined, some of the other DPEs may be also considered original source submitters. Regardless, the APD Data Warehouse will not receive any data directly from providers or payers. All data will come from a designated DPE.
61	Questions and Answers (Round 1); #216	51	Q&A 216 also discusses OSS files remaining "intact in a pre-staging environment." This appears to contradict Q&A-230(e) (Q: "Will the Data Intake Solution vendor provide separate files to the Data Warehousing Solution from each of the data suppliers, or will it be a single, consolidated file?" A. "Consolidated File."), Q&A-420 ("For the interim solution, the selected vendor will take data extract files from the OHIP Data Mart and Medicaid Data Warehouse. These extracts have already been converted from X12 and NCPDP formats to database tables."), and Q&A-330 ("the EIS provides data tables ... to the APD Data Warehouse"). Additional Q&As note that DPEs	To clarify, in the permanent solution, data submissions from original source submitters to DPEs will be in various file formats as dictated by the relationship between the respective original source submitter and DPE. Subsequent data submission from DPEs to the APD Data Warehouse will be in a consolidated file. These individual consolidated DPE submissions to the APD Data Warehouse will remain intact in a pre-staging environment. To address the specific question asked, in the interim solution, there is flexibility in how the data extracts will be prepared and fed

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
			will engage in requirements sessions with the warehousing vendor to design file feed layouts, indicating that mapping by the warehousing vendor may not be necessary. Please confirm: a) Whether or not data provided by OHIP will be transferred in a single, mapped layout or whether OHIP data will be segregated by "intact" data type, requiring mapping and integration by the warehousing vendor; b) If the latter, please specify the number of different formats that will be supplied	from the OHIP Data Mart to the vendor's analytic solution. How the extracts are addressed will depend on the solution of the selected vendor and what best meets the needs of the project, and will be detailed in the requirements and design sessions with the contractor.
62	Questions and Answers (Round 1); #407	104	While the RFP notes that all extracts and user stories will be supported exclusively by de-identified data, Q&A 407 introduces the possibility of extracting/displaying PII and/or PHI (A: "There will be need for certain users to be granted access to sensitive and/or identifying data. Any such access will need to comply with appropriate security and privacy laws, rules and standards.") Please confirm: a) Whether live identifiers will indeed be exposed to authorized users; b) Which of the identified user types may need access to this sensitive data; c) What avenue(s) of access (i.e., BI display, standard reports, and/or extracts) will be required	Yes, pending finalization of the data release policy, there may be specific users granted access to identifiable data and extracts with identifiable data may be released to certain requestors. If applicable, a data governance system will be developed to manage these activities. The specific users granted access to identifiable data, and the specific data formats, are to be determined.
63	Questions and Answers (Round 1); # 64, 123, 207 and 304	18, 32, 49 and 66	Will the state consider providing additional time (beyond the two weeks considered) for selected vendors to receive data for the demonstration? Alternatively, will the state consider providing additional details on the required user stories for the presentation?	No changes to the current timelines will be made. Bidders will have approximately four weeks between transmittal of product demonstration data and identification of user stories, and the actual product demonstrations.

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
				User stories will be identified with this transmittal, with no additional detail or mechanism to seek clarification. The two week period stated in the Questions and Answers, Round 1 refers to the time between bidders susceptible to award (short-list bidders) being notified of their short-list status and being scheduled for a specific time slot, and the actual product demonstrations. Transmittal of data and identification of user stories will already have been made approximately two weeks prior to this, however.
64	Questions and Answers (Round 1); #502	126	Q&A 502 states that "The contractor's office location must be within 15 miles of the Capitol Building. It is expected that key staff (see Section IV, C.a.) will be based out of this office." Does the State have a standard definition for what constitutes being "based out of" the Capital District (e.g., minimum days per week in the Capital District office, ability to be present in Capital District office any given business day based on NYS needs, etc.)?	There is no formally stated definition. However, to meet this requirement, identified key staff should have their primary office located in the designated location for the duration of the contract, should conduct the majority of their work from this office and should be reasonably available at either this office or NYSDOH offices on any given business day as project needs dictate.
65	IV., E.	28	When the selected User Stories for the demonstration are revealed and data provided, will there be a mechanism for vendors to seek clarifications in reference to the User Stories?	No. There will be no mechanism to seek clarification on the user stories or product demonstrations.
66	IV., E.	28	Will the data provided for demonstrations be comprised of private payer claims, Medicare claims, Medicaid claims, inpatient, outpatient,	The data provided for the product demonstration will be a de-identified health care payer data set that will be

Question Number	Section	Page Number	Question	Response
			professional, and Rx data, with at least one year of longevity across a population of 50,000 members?	representative of the type of data to be contained in the APD Data Warehouse and will be appropriate for demonstration of the selected user stories.
67	Questions and Answers (Round 1); #6	2	Mainframe Connectivity: Will the state need direct connectivity between a mainframe or mainframe and this solution? If yes, then for each mainframe: a) Please stipulate that it should be with either FICON or ESCON? b) If the state is planning to host the solution, what is the approximate distance between each mainframe and the intended solution platform's location? If the state won't be hosting this solution, please provide the approximate location (city will be fine) so we can plan telecommunications. c) What are the manufacturer and model of the mainframe?	Refer to Questions and Answers, Round 1, #6. Specifically, details of mainframe connectivity associated with applicable DPEs will be provided during requirements and design sessions with the contractor. Potential locations of mainframes that may require connectivity are undefined at this time. As a hosted system, the APD data warehouse will be maintained by the vendor and the vendor must provide all applicable infrastructure, whether hosted via a cloud solution, at the vendor's data center, or at the State Data Center (see RFP Section III., E., 1, and Attachments 17 and 18 for information on use of the State Data Center).