



Vendor Questions and Answers

ID	Questions	Answer
1.	Amendment 3 – Statement of Work, Section 5.1 – Services Required Centralized provider enrollment and credentialing (CPEC) is listed as an area within the SOW, but in Section 5.2 – Support Services Areas, CPEC is not included. In Section 5.2.12 - The Commonwealth Health Information Exchange (HIE) is listed, however there is no mention of the HIE in Section 5.1. Should CPEC and HIE be included in both Section 5.1 and Section 5.2? If so, will another Amendment be issued?	Included in Amendment #4
2.	Amendment 5 – Attachment A Cost Proposal In Tab 4, CPEC has been added as an EOMC Service Area, however, the HIE has not been added as a Service Area. Should the HIE Service Area be added to Tab 2 and Tab 4? If so, will another Amendment be issued?	See Amendment 8 - Attachment A - Cost Proposal
3.	Section 9.6 Response to Statement of Work Response Prompt #2 does not have HIE, OCM, and EDW listed; however, HIE, OCM, and EDW are considered in-scope within Amendment 3 SOW. Should HIE, OCM, and EDW be considered ‘in-scope’ service areas for response prompt #2? If so, can PRMP please update the Response to Statement of Work document?	See Amendment 8 - Attachment A - Cost Proposal
4.	It appears as though OCM, EDW, and CPEC were added to Amendment 5 – Attachment A: Cost Proposal as stand-alone service areas for which costs should be provided; however, HIE is not included. HIE is listed as an in-scope service area in Amendment 3 - SOW. Should Amendment 5 Cost Proposal be amended to replace CPEC with HIE?	See Amendment 8 - Attachment A - Cost Proposal
5.	Amendment 4’s Section 8.6 Response to Statement of Work Response Prompt #2 does not have HIE, OCM, and EDW listed; however, HIE, OCM, and EDW are considered in-scope within Amendment 3 SOW. Should HIE, OCM, and EDW be considered ‘in-scope’ service areas for Amendment 4’s response prompt #2? If so, can PRMP please update Amendment #4 Response to Statement of Work document?	See Amendment 8 - Attachment A - Cost Proposal
6.	It appears as though OCM, EDW, and CPEC were added to Amendment 5 – Attachment A: Cost Proposal as stand-alone service areas for which costs should be provided; however, HIE is not included. HIE is listed as an in-scope service area in Amendment 3 - SOW. Should Amendment 5 Cost Proposal be amended to replace CPEC with HIE?	See Amendment 8 - Attachment A - Cost Proposal
7.	The EOMC Vendor Question and Answer (QA) Question #9 asked if PRMP would like the EOMC vendor to submit scope and costs associated with performing security assessment audits for PRMP’s MES as a part of their response to Section 5.2.4 MES Streamline Modular Certification (SMC) Support Service Area. PRMP replied ‘yes’ to this question. Although the focus for security audits/assessments have	See Amendment 7 – 2023-MES-EOMC-004 and Amendment 8 - Attachment A - Cost Proposal



Vendor Questions and Answers

	components that tie to SMC, typically SMA's request the scope and costs be separate from those proposed for an SMC effort. Does PRMP wish to have Security Assessment Audits as a separate section in Section 5.2 of the SOW and in Attachment F: Response to SOW? If so, can PRMP please update the RFP SOW (Section 5.2) and the response to the SOW (Attachment F, Question #3).	
8.	<p>Amendment 4 – Response to Statement of Work added the following language to prompt #1: <i>Describe the anticipated deliverables for each section and how your team will perform the work involved toward meeting the requirements in the following Areas:</i></p> <p>This language appears duplicative of the language assigned to response prompt #2 of Amendment 4 and not necessary given that the service areas support the business areas of the RFP. If left as is, there is the potential for unnecessary duplication in responses to both sections.</p> <p>Should Amendment 4 – Response to the SOW be updated to remove this language?</p>	See Amendment 7 – 2023-MES-EOMC-004
9.	<p>Section 7.2 Cost Scoring Formula states that a cost scoring formula will be applied to Attachment A: Cost Proposal's firm fixed fee (total cost) and average hourly cost. As written, the RFP lacks baseline detail for responding vendors to provide equivalent scope in their response in a manner that could allow for vendor costs to be compared. We understand that fully defining the scope of an EOMC services RFP may be challenging given many of the future's unknowns, and that as a result Section 5.0 and Attachment F's limited detail makes it challenging to fully scope and price EOMC services. This is typical of SMAs procuring these types of services.</p> <p>Given the need for a comparison of equivalent costs, regardless of scope, would PRMP consider having the cost formula only focus on the average hourly cost being proposed? Having the cost scoring formula focus only on the average hourly rate would give PRMP the ability to do an equivalent cost comparison of vendor's proposals.</p>	See Amendment 7 – 2023-MES-EOMC-004
10.	<p>Section 7.2 Cost Scoring Formula states that a cost scoring formula will be applied to Attachment A: Cost Proposal's firm fixed fee (total cost) and average hourly cost. As written, the RFP lacks baseline detail for responding vendors to scope their response in a manner that could allow for vendor costs to be compared. Would PRMP be willing to reassign the associated points assigned to total cost to other scoring criterion?</p>	See Amendment 7 – 2023-MES-EOMC-004