

Meaningful Use Related Questions

QN1. Are there other Meaningful Use requirements other than Department of Community Health reporting for Phase I?

A1. All the ONC HIE MU requirements will eventually be required. Phase I concentrates only on the Department of Community Health reporting for Phase I.

QN2. Is communication between certified EHRs a requirement for Phase I?

A2. In Phase I, interconnection among the State of Michigan and the Sub-state HIE's is the primary focus, therefore in Phase I, communication directly with EHRs will be via the Qualified Organizations.

Lightweight Services

QN3. Phase I requires a provider directory. Can you add some rationale as to why an MPI wasn't required?

A3. Phase I focuses on pushing results to and from known providers. Each sub-state HIE and the State of Michigan will have MPI functions. Solution Provider responses may include the use of an MPI, however, it must be designed so that it is populated through automated communication with each of the Qualified Organization's versus generated and maintained centrally. It is the intent that initially the Qualified Organizations will operate without dependency on a centralized MPI.

QN4. On page 34 in section 7.2.1.3: Please define what you mean by "lightweight" administration?

A4. Each sub-state HIE and the State of Michigan will have MPI functions. Solution Provider responses may include the use of an MPI, however, it must be designed so that it is populated through automated communication with each of the Qualified Organization's versus generated and maintained centrally. Lightweight, should be interpreted as the minimum necessary centralized maintenance and support.

Volume and Timing Questions

QN5. Overall, although not specified, what scale (i.e., number users, nodes, and providers) should the proposed solution be able to respond to? Please specify expected scale over time and by use case.

The volume metrics related to MCIR, MDSS, and pushing Lab results are still being formulated. We do know there are 25-30 labs statewide.

MiHIN Shared Services Answers to RFP Questions

QN6. Overall, is the MiHINSS expected to go live with all specified use case functionality at “go live” or will a phased approach be preferred?

A6. A phase approach is anticipated with some early adopter Sub-State HIEs connecting to the State of Michigan more aggressively than the others.

QN7. Please break down the number of lives by providers and patients.

A7. Michigan has approximately 10 million people. Given the nascent stage of HIE within the State of Michigan solution providers should utilize their prior experience to estimate adoption rates and volumes.

Physical Location Questions

QN8. On page 23, section 5.4 Hosting Experience. Is there a preference for the physical location of the hosting environment?

A8. There is some preference for the primary facility being hosted within Michigan; however, it is not a requirement. It is also recognized that highly robust and secure solutions may likely include disaster recovery facilities that are located outside the State of Michigan. All facilities are required to be within US jurisdiction.

QN9. Does MiHIN have a preference for hosting facilities within Michigan, or can an out of state facility be considered?

A9. See above statement of preference. Out of state facilities will be considered, especially as part of a disaster recovery plan.

QN10. On page 24, section 5.5 Personnel. Is there a preference for the physical location of staffing developing this solution?

A10. There is a preference to have the jobs located in Michigan, however, out of state personnel are acceptable. The quality of support shall dominate the evaluation. All personnel must operate within and be subject to US jurisdiction.

Cost Related Questions

QN11. On page 27, section 6 (Required Cost Proposal Section), reference is made later in the section to “...total costs used for cost scoring purposes.” Please clarify if or how costs for option years five through ten will be evaluated.

A11. The implications for the long range total cost of ownership will be factored in to the formal evaluation as a means to assess the overall comprehensiveness of the response.

MiHIN Shared Services Answers to RFP Questions

QN12. On pages 27-28, please clarify the definition of total cost to be used in evaluating the proposed solution. What is the relative weight of total cost in the overall evaluation of the proposed solution?

A12. MiHIN interprets the Total Costs to include the long-term view of all costs associated with this specific technology investment. Costs include that of acquiring, installing, using, maintaining, changing, and disposing of a technology during its useful life that MiHIN must pay for. Solution providers will be evaluated against their total cost for startup, year one, and year two in order to meet the Base requirements. They will be further evaluated in their number and costs for optional year support. Optional year estimates will be used to set expectations for sustainability planning.

QN13. Since this RFP is meant to address the implementation of the first phase of the technology as described on pg 11 and the initial use cases (section 1.7.2) described on page 12. Should pricing for all years of the contract be limited to the statement of work?

A13. Yes. However, prices for Optional Requirements or Value Added Services described in section 7.2.3 should be added in separate sheets.

QN14. In Appendix Three, Requirements Matrix, a number of requirements are listed as optional but desirable, please specify how the Solution Provider should provide cost information regarding the incremental costs of the optional requirements. Please clarify whether optional requirement services will be included in the tally of total costs and how these costs should be included in Appendix six, cost matrix.

A14. Solution Provider should detail optional requirements and value added services after the grand total in Appendix Six and as separate pricing sheets. Start up, year one, and year two costs should reflect all BASE requirements. Option year costs for years 1-6 should also be based on only BASE requirements.

QN15. On page 28, for section 6.2.3; deliverables states “If the Solution Provider would like to propose optional Value Added Services that could be implemented, the corresponding additional costs to implement and support should be highlighted and included in your response.” Please clarify how these services will be evaluated in the overall scoring of the proposal and how the cost of these services will be evaluated in the cost scoring.

A15. A solution provider must minimally be highly competitive on the specific BASE requirements. However, the MiHIN RFP evaluation team will be looking at both the cost and solution provider’s ability to execute the immediate requirements for Phase I balanced against the future cost and ability of the solution provider to fulfill the overall MiHIN strategic plan and vision.

QN16. On page 28, for sections 6.4, Hardware; 6.5 Software; and 6.6 Personnel Rate Card; please confirm that costs associated with these categories “will not be included in the total costs used for cost scoring purposes.”

MiHIN Shared Services Answers to RFP Questions

A16. MiHIN is purchasing a hosted solution with specific deliverables; hardware, software, and personnel rates will be embedded within the cost of these estimates within either the start-up or annual costs. Any hardware and software costs not included in these charges should be detailed and will be included in the costing totals.

QN17. On page 36 in section 7.2.3 regarding Value Added Services, please clarify the relationships, if any between value added services and “optional” or “future” services identified throughout Appendix Three, Requirements Matrix. For purposes of scoring and pricing how should value added services be documented in the proposal?

A17. See response to QN14.

QN18. Will participating systems, either private or State, be fully responsible for the costs associated with their portion of the integrations and operations, including software licenses from their own vendors and covering their own resource costs?

A18. If the solution provider is proposing edge servers, then the cost of these edge servers should be included as part of base costs. The cost to connect to the edge servers by the SSHIEs will be borne by the SSHIEs.

State of Michigan Related Questions

On pages 35-36, in section 7.2.2 regarding Use Cases: Electronic Public Health Reporting states “The State of Michigan is working to develop the detailed specifications and requirements for each of the use cases... in accordance with national standards and specifications.”

QN19. When does the state expect these specifications to be finalized?

A19. The current design work with the State of Michigan (SOM) HIE consultants is scheduled to be completed by mid- to late-August 2011. One of the design deliverables is the detailed messaging specification for SOMHIE, for accepting incoming traffic, and for transport.

QN20. What is the timeline for implementation of these capabilities?

A20. Based on current staffing and project timelines, they expect to begin testing and early production activities with SOMHIE transport by 3Q or 4Q 2011.

QN21. What will be the Solution Providers role in designing and testing these capabilities?

A21. As part of the SOMHIE design, the SOM will stand up a public interface and capabilities for external testing. The Solution Provider will need to design, test, validate, and affirm the MiHINSS interface components for this transport with SOMHIE. This is not a SOM responsibility; the SOM will assist with testing on their end, but the vast majority of the work will fall on the Solution Provider. Each Solution Provider will need to repeat this same task for each

MiHIN Shared Services Answers to RFP Questions

of the sub-state HIE partner connections, as well. It would be best if the MiHINSS solution designs and codifies a single, mandatory interface specification for all the sub-state HIE connections (other than SOM), so there is no need to maintain, troubleshoot, and support a mixture of different methods and components.

QN22. Or – Should the vendor’s proposal response include work in the design and implementation of these specifications.

A22. Yes, and given that Solution Providers will have (or should have) experience with this in other venues, and successful implementations for references, absolutely.

QN23. If there are State systems that are identified as key sources of data for the provider directory, will those integrations be covered by the State?

A23. No.. The Solution Provider should plan to do 100% of the work on this, with data provided by the State – and other sources – as available.

QN24. The RFP indicates that connections are need to the six existing sub-state HIE’s and various State systems; how many separate connections will be required to State systems? Please indicate these systems, and the estimated availability/readiness of the connection for both testing and production.

A24. The State (MDCH and DTMB) are currently in the design phase of a project to design, implement, and operate a State of Michigan Health Information Exchange (SOMHIE.) This Exchange will provide a single path for message transport access to all of the relevant State systems, with the first Use Cases focusing on MDCH systems. The systems involved in the initial Use Cases include MCIR, MDSS, MSSS, and Labs (StarLIMS.) They are already accepting HL7 traffic via SOAP & HTTPS for Meaningful Use Testing for MCIR VXU submissions, so the bare-bones messaging system for that function has been in Production since December 2010. They will be expanding the role of that component throughout the next six to twelve months. They are aiming for Production capacity for the initial systems by 2Q 2012, possibly early for some Use Cases.

Structure of Data and Use Case Adoption

QN25. On page 36, section 7.2.2 regarding use Cases, and section 7.2.2.3 regarding push of structured data, what structured data would the MiHIN like to see in the initial structured data? Structured lab data for the Michigan Disease Surveillance System (MDSS).

QN26. On page 36, section 7.2.2 regarding use Cases, and section 7.2.2.3 regarding push of structured data, what priorities are there for the “start simply and grow in complexity over time?”

The priorities are to enable the exchange of MDSS and MCIR data within the CCD.

MiHIN Shared Services Answers to RFP Questions

QN27. Should the Solution Provider assume responsibility for the process to partner with MiHINSS and other relevant data partners in the development of structured data?

A27. Yes, solution provider will play an active role in establishing specific functional, format, and conformance activities related to the exchange of structured data, within the context of current national standards and other relevant guidance.

QN28. On page 37 in section 7.2.3.2 regarding Eligibility Checking; in addition to MDCH can you provide data on other payer eligibility checking timelines and capabilities?

A28. This is a Value Added service not required within Phase I so no timelines have been established.

QN29. On page 39 in section 7.2.5.4 regarding Authentication; should the Solution Provider offer a preferred and optional authentication schemes?

A29. Yes.

QN30. Appendix Four Product Table Matrix lists clinical document types. Should the Proposed Solution limit products to the list provided or may additional products be listed if deemed relevant?

*_A30. No, Solution Providers can include additional products deemed to fit within the strategic vision for MiHIN.**

General

QN31. On page 26, section 5.8, emergency Preparedness states “MiHINSS needs a strategy for maintaining operations for an extended period of time.” Please clarify “extended period of time.”

A31. The extended period of time deals with a six month to a year time frame during some type of pandemic.

QN32. Beyond the implementation, what are the expectations for the vendor? Are there MiHIN workgroups, conferences, Michigan HIT commission meetings, etc.

A32. Very likely the service provider will be encouraged to participate in these types of events. This type of effort may be a very good area for in-kind contribution for matching.

QN33. Will the MiHIN shared services vendor have any responsibility related to the operations, oversight, or funding requests related to sub-state HIE's?

A33. No.

RFP Response and Process Questions

QN34. Is it possible for a vendor to bid on only a portion of the 3 phases required for this project? Or must the bidder respond to all 3 phases?

A34. One vendor is expected to respond as the prime solution provider for all phases.

QN35. In the “Guiding Principles” section, the RFP states the solution will be built from numerous vendor products which must interoperate," (page 6). I am trying to clarify if this means that vendors who may bring experience to one particular phase may apply just for that phase.

A35. One vendor is expected to respond as the prime solution provider for all phases.

QN36. Are there any page limits for the appendices?

A36. No

QN37. For items presented in Excel spreadsheet form, is it okay to add detail beyond Excel's cell limit for # of characters? (in appendix 3 for example)

A37. Yes, please add additional columns in Excel to accommodate.

QN38. On page 19 in section 3.1.3 regarding mandatory requirements; Offer a statewide solution that is in production for other states. Offer a broadly scaled solution that is in production for other states or within specific geographic regions or among widely dispersed partners, with significant inter organizational (outside the business entity) exchange successfully taking place among disparate Health Information Exchanges. This should be supported by at least three (3) unique letters of support (which must be submitted with the Solution Provider's technical submittal) from existing, current HIE clients. References should be submitted in Appendix One.....For purposes of meeting this requirement, please clarify and/or provide examples of “a statewide solution that is in production for other states.” It would be helpful to know what is not considered an HIE solution within the context of this requirement.

A38. If the equivalent of the HIT coordinator from the state of the example HIE does not recognize the solution as a production and scalable HIE, then likely neither will MiHIN. MiHIN can review each example on a case-by-case basis in advance. Please email your suspect examples to info@mihin.org with “RFP1101 HIE Examples” in the subject field by June 3rd if you feel confirmation of acceptance is required.

Qualified Organizations(Sub-State HIE)and Integration Questions

QN39. The RFP indicates that connections are need to the six existing sub-state HIE's and various State systems; are connections to all six expected to be operational in January 2013? If not, when will each of the connections need to be operational?

A39. All will be ready by January 2013, however, some may come on-line earlier. It is not yet known, when each sub-state HIE or State system will be fully available to connect with.

QN40. In Section 7.2.3, page 36: This section of the RFP positions value-add services as being accessed through Qualified Organizations. Does MiHIN anticipate the list of QOs to grow beyond the 7 RHIOs in the state?

A40. The architecture must be constructed to accommodate growth beyond the existing qualified organizations, for the Phase I scope of work, however, only the State of Michigan services, NWHIN, and the identified sub-state HIEs will be interconnected. All solution providers should include an incremental cost for each additional sub-state HIE that gets added.

QN41. In section 1.1.1 6, page 22: The preference states a solution that is “built from numerous vendor products with must interoperate,” but then an page 22 under Work Plan it states “MiHINSS prefers to implement Off the Shelf software.” This preference seem to be contradictory. The first typifies a systems integration approach, and the second implies an OTS approach. Which approach does MiHIN prefer?

A41. This requirement suggests a modular approach to using off the shelf technology. The greater emphasis will be placed on SPs that employ standards within their communication platform. The expectation is that given the rapid evolution in the HIE space, some modules may be replaced with new functions or a different vendor solution/open solution; and therefore, must be easy to change out major modules and integrate with in the future. For example, a highly proprietary tightly coupled solution may not score as well in this category.

QN42. Will the use cases / types of interfaces be stable as of go-live in January 2013, or will we need to address updates to either of these items?

A42. No, the service provider should anticipate updates and the potential for additional use cases by January 2013. The solution providers will also be required to provide the requisite updates and maintenance necessary to comply with all Federal and State security requirements that may evolve during this time period too.

MiHIN Shared Services Answers to RFP Questions

QN43. Beyond the sub-state HIE's, State systems, and a connection to the NWHIN, are there any additional integration points.

A43. In the long-term, yes, however, no for the initial scope of Phase I and costing purposes. Solution providers are encouraged to show the incremental cost to add additional integration points.

Misc

QN44. Will solution providers be expected to provide matching/in-kind as part of their response?

A44. Matching is not required, however, vendors are highly encouraged to include and identify in-kind matching.

QN45. Will there be any more RFPs released for the MiHIN project? For example, Quality Assurance, IV&V, testing, etc?

A45. MiHIN is an evolving organization chartered to enable health information exchange in the State of Michigan. As MiHIN grows, future RFPs are anticipated to help support that evolution.

QN46. In section 7.2.3.2, page 37: Does MiHIN intend to compete with existing clearinghouse vendors for delivering eligibility verification services?

A46. The primary emphasis for Phase I is the establishment of the initial shared services necessary to connect the qualifying organizations and the State of Michigan; eligibility verification is illustrative of a value-added service under consideration.

RFP Errata

QN47. Appendix 1 – Proposal cover sheet – Please explain the meaning of the numbers in parentheses under the section titled: Submittals Enclosed and Separately Sealed Technical Submittal (6), Cost Submittal (2), Full Proposals (CD ROM) (2)

A47. This should read "Submittals Enclosed and Separately Sealed Technical Submittal (15), Cost Submittal (15), Full Proposals (CD ROM) (2). Solution providers are expected to include 15 copies of the technical submittable, 15 for cost, and two electronic versions.

QN48. On page 5, general information references Section 3, "...provides a description of six non-waivable Qualifying Requirements." However (pg 19), Section 3.1 Qualifying Requirements lists "...following five requirements are Mandatory...." Please clarify.

A48. On page 5, general information references Section 3, should read "...provides a description of five non-waivable Qualifying Requirements."

MiHIN Shared Services Answers to RFP Questions

QN49. On page 22, section 5.3 regarding Tab C. is says " this section should not exceed twenty (10) pages.

A49. It should say "this section should not exceed twenty (20) pages."

QN50. On page 10, it says "The Letter of Intent must be received by MiHINSS no later than May 24, 2011."

A50. It should read, "The Letter of Intent must be received by MiHINSS no later than May 20, 2011."

QN51. On page 10 of the calendar of events – 1.4 Letter of Intent to Respond. States the "The letter of intent must be received by MiHINSS no later than May 24, 2011. However in the calendar itself the letter of intent response date is stipulated as Friday, May 20, 2011. Please clarify

A51. See above.

QN52. On page 22, section 5.3: Should tab C not exceed 10 or 20 pages?

A52. See above.