

## SOLICITATION ADDENDUM # 2

<b>DATE:</b>	<b>6/16/08</b>
<b>SOLICITATION NO:</b>	<b>RFP # 529-08-0180</b>
<b>DATE/TIME DUE:</b>	
<b>DESCRIPTION OF THE ADDENDUM:</b>	
This Addendum is issued to provide the following information/clarification:	
<b>Vendor Questions with HHSC Answers</b>	

No.	Question	Response
<b>Article 1.3. Procurement Schedule</b>		
1	What is the nature of the delay? Could an earlier start date be possible?	An earlier start date is possible, but not probable based on state and federal procurement approval timelines.
<b>Article 1.7.2 Contract Elements</b>		
2	States that one or more of the "Special Terms" located in Article 16 may apply to this contract. Please specify which of the Article 16 provisions will apply to this contract.	One or more may apply to a final contract. Since this is only the RFP stage, it is premature to state what terms may end up in a final contract document.
<b>Article 1.8 External Factors</b>		
3	Has the HHSC received the appropriation for this contract? What is the amount of this appropriation?	HHSC is not at liberty to give this information to the general public.
<b>Article 1.9.2 Conflict of Interest</b>		
4	Please clarify what future HHSC procurements would subsequently preclude a vendor from bidding in the future.	See answer to No. 63 below.
<b>Article 1.9.3 Former Employees Of a State Agency</b>		
5	This requires disclosure of any relevant past state employment of the respondent's or its subcontractor employees proposed for this contract or any employees within the company that have previous employment with the State?	Yes to both.
<b>Article 2.2 Project Schedule</b>		
6	The Project Schedule indicates a project close 40 weeks from contract execution. Section 1.7 indicates the contract is for an initial period of 18 months which would be 78 weeks. Please clarify this difference in time and confirm if the scope of work identified in this RFP is anticipated to be completed in accordance with the project schedule presented in Section 2.2, complete in 40 weeks. It would be most helpful for vendors preparing a response to the RFP to have the answer to this question sooner than the planned July 78, 2008 response to.	HHSC anticipates that if all goes exactly according to plan that the project would close in 40 weeks. However, project delays are possible especially since the project is dependent on state subject matter experts that have limited availability. HHSC wants to have the flexibility to retain Vendor services for the 78 month period to allow for an unforeseen project delay.
<b>Article 2.3.1 Project Scope, 1st bullet</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>MITA Project Training</b></li> </ul>		
7	Is it correct to assume from this requirement that the State is prepared to allocate staff to participate in elicitation activities for the MITA As-Is and To-Be-Self Assessment?	Yes, it is correct to assume that the State is prepared to allocate staff to participate in elicitation activities for the MITA As-Is and To-Be-Self Assessment.
8	Can the state provide an estimate of the number of state staff that will require MITA orientation training? Will this same number of staff members be available to assist with the MITA SS-A sessions? If not, can the state provide an estimate of the number of state	HHSC estimates that approximately 60 to 100 state staff would need to receive orientation training. The same staff who receive the training are the staff who will participate in the MITA SS-A elicitation sessions. In addition, the Vendor may be

No.	Question	Response
	staff that will be available to participate in the MITA SS-A sessions?	called upon to assist HHSC with MITA briefings for upper and executive level management.
9	Our assumption is that that this set of activities, and the subsequent deliverable, must take place in the beginning of the engagement to promote HHSC staff "buy-in" and to elicit their help. Is this an accurate assumption or was there another reason that this deliverable is not included in the project schedule? If not, what is the reason?	HHSC agrees that some of the MITA Project Training must take place at the beginning to promote buy-in. Although, depending how the project is rolled out, training sessions for state staff who will participate in the elicitation sessions need to take place relatively close to the persons participation in those elicitation sessions. Therefore, it is probable that training sessions would happen throughout the entire first half of the project.
<b>Article 2.3.1 Project Scope, 2nd bullet</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Texas MITA SS-A</b></li> </ul>		
10	Stating that TMHP has completed the business process self-assessment which will be combined with vendor-performance documentation to produce one combined document: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Does the State expect the Vendor to review or do anything otherwise with the completed business process assessment?</li> <li>b. Could you clarify the term "Vendor produce documentation"?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. HHSC does not expect "review" per se, but HHSC expects the Vendor to take the TMHP SS-A and the Vendor SS-A and ensure consistency, and combine the two efforts into one cohesive package that can be sent to CMS for approval.</li> <li>b. In this context the "Vendor produced documentation" means the SS-A documentation developed by the awarded Vendor.</li> </ol>
11	How many business functions were assessed by the TMHP? For purposes of planning and estimating, how many business areas will the awarded Vendor be responsible for assessing? Will the selected Vendor be responsible for the completion of a technical capabilities assessment as well as a business capabilities assessment?	Approximately 36 functions were assessed by TMHP with 30-40% of those needing additional input from HHS program areas. The awarded Vendor will be responsible for assessing all of the business areas for which the MITA Framework has a completed Business Capability Matrix. The technical capabilities assessment is not part of the SS-A, but HHSC does expect that this assessment will be used as a guideline for the "to-be" road map and the gap analysis.
12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Please clarify which business functions and which organizations the MITA SS-A applies to. Does the scope of the MITA SS-A extend beyond the Medicaid program itself, to include eligibility or other business processes?</li> <li>2) As part of the TMHP SS-A, was a visioning session held and if so would it be made available before the response is submitted? If not was the TMHP SS-A only an As-Is assessment?</li> <li>3) Which business functions have been assessed by TMHP?</li> <li>4) Was this work performed by TMHP or the State's MMIS Planning Vendor?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Please consult the CMS MITA web site <a href="http://www.cms.hhs.gov/MedicaidInfoTechArch/04_MITAFramework.asp">http://www.cms.hhs.gov/MedicaidInfoTechArch/04_MITAFramework.asp</a> In particular Chapter 5 contains the business functions and Chapter 6 outlines the requirements for the SS-A documentation. An integral part of the Medicaid program itself is member management including determining and maintaining eligibility. Please consult Chapter 5 of the MITA 2.0 framework for the business processes that will be included in the SS-A.</li> <li>2) No "visioning" session has been conducted and the TMHP SS-A was an As-Is Assessment.</li> <li>3) See answer to question #13</li> <li>4) TMHP</li> </ol>
13	This section states that for the <b>Texas MITA SS-A</b> , the vendor must complete the SS-A for all Medicaid business functions not assessed by the State's Claims Administrator - TMHP. Although it is clearly stated that the SS-A for the business processes performed by TMHP will be made available to the awarded vendor, for purposes of responding to this	The TMHP MITA SS-A has made available on the MITA RFP Procurement Library.

No.	Question	Response
	proposal and determination of scope of work can HHSC provide a list of those business functions <b>not</b> assessed by TMHP?	
14	For purpose of developing a thorough response to this RFP, it would be helpful for vendors who are responding to this RFP to have the completed TMHP MITA SS-A available now to properly scope their efforts. Would the HHSC make this information available to assist vendors in their preparation of their proposals? If not, would HHSC please provide more information on the SS-A completed by TMHP since its impacts the scope of what is required in this RFP. When was the SS-A completed? Provide a list of the business functions that have had the SS-A completed by the TMHP to avoid duplication of effort. Please describe the documentation included in the SS-A completed by TMHP (what application is it available in, what topics does it cover and is it completed and compliant with MITA Framework 2.0).	Please see response in No. 13.
15	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The TMHP has completed a MITA assessment of the business processes they address. Can the State provide us with the list of Business Areas and Business Processes that have been assessed by the TMHP?</li> <li>2. Would HHSC consider providing a copy of the TMHP portion of the SS-A to bidders through a bidders library? If not, would HHSC provide a listing of all Medicaid business functions that were included in the SS-A by TMHP and those that were not included in the SS-A by the TMHP. This information will be crucial for prospective bidders to accurately define the scope of this project.</li> <li>3. DID TMHP utilize the services of a subcontractor in performing the SS-A on their business processes performed? If so, who was the Vendor?</li> <li>4. Will TMHP or their subcontractors, if any, be permitted to bid on this project?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please see response in No. 13.</li> <li>2. Please see response in No. 13.</li> <li>3. No sub-contractor was used.</li> <li>4. Yes.</li> </ol>
16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is it correct to assume that the TMHP SS-A was completed for the "As-Is" TMHP Business Processes?</li> <li>2. Or, does their SS-A also include an assessment of Business processes in terms of the "As-Is" and To-Be?</li> <li>3. Does the TMHP SS-A includes an assessment of the Technical Architecture? If yes, is this limited to the "As-Is" or does it include the To-Be?</li> <li>4. Does the TMHP have a documented Conceptual and Logical Data Model?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Correct</li> <li>2. No, As-Is only</li> <li>3. No, limited to business processes</li> <li>4. Yes for the MMIS</li> </ol>
<b>Article 2.3.1, 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet</b> <b>"To-Be" Road Map</b>		
17	Is HHSC looking for a high level strategic plan for the short term (3-5 years) or long term (6-10 years) in accordance with MITA standards? Please clarify.	Yes. HHSC is looking for a "to-be" roadmap including plans for both short (3-5 years) and longer term implementation. HHSC is expecting

No.	Question	Response
		the Vendor to assist HHSC in assessing and prioritizing the road map to implement the strategic plan.
18	Please clarify the level of detail that HHSC expects from this deliverable.	Enough detail so that the strategic plan contains a project plan complete with high level tasks and milestone due dates.
19	Does the To-Be Road Map activity include a MITA To-Be assessment of the business processes? If yes, does this include all MITA business processes or just those business processes that are not completed by TMHP?	Yes, for all business processes, although the to-be modeling could be done at the Tier 2 or Tier 3 level (see Chapter 4 page 4) of the MITA 2.0 Framework.
<b>Article 2.3.2 State Responsibilities</b>		
20	<p>No mention is made of the state's responsibility to provide access to HHSC staff, including Subject Matter Experts and process owners, although references is made to subject matter experts in MITA-18.</p> <p>Please provide additional information regarding the Project Team. How will they be selected? What will their availability be during the project duration?</p>	<p>HHSC is responsible for providing access to HHSC staff subject matter experts. The project schedule, however, allows for additional time (78 weeks) because the project will have to be planned around the availability of key state subject matter experts.</p> <p>The State will provide a dedicated Project Manager and project staff will be made available to the awarded Vendor.</p>
<b>Article 2.3.2 State Responsibilities – MITAS-1</b>		
21	The State is planning to appoint a project team. Will this project team comprise the participants in the SS-A sessions? If not, can the State describe the composition of the Project Team?	The participants in the SS-A will not be limited to the Project Team, but will include state subject matter experts from the appropriate business area. HHSC has not yet finalized the composition of the Project Team.
<b>Article 2.3.2 State Responsibilities – MITAS-2</b>		
22	MITA-2 indicated the Vendor must provide access to Vendor staff from 8:00 a.m. through 5:00 p.m., Central Time, Monday through Friday and otherwise on an "on call" basis. Does this provision apply to key personnel or all Vendor staff?	Key Personnel only.
<b>Article 2.3.2 State Responsibilities – MITAS-3</b>		
23	In order to plan for this project schedule, is it correct to assume the State will complete a draft deliverable review and provide consolidated comments to the vendor within five business days of draft deliverable delivery in order to allow for vendor updating for final delivery of deliverable? Would this assumption be correct for final deliverables also?	Yes, although HHSC will probably need more than 5 business days, depending on the size of the deliverable.
24	Are key personnel to be identified in the proposal or are representative resumes acceptable?	Key personnel must be identified.
<b>Article 2.3.3.2 Project Staffing – MITA-4</b>		
25	In reference to <b>MITA-4</b> , how many days does vendor have to replace Key Personnel after their departure?	The awarded vendor will have 15 business days to replace Key Personnel.
<b>Article 2.3.3.3 Contract Communications – MITA-8</b>		
26	It is indicated that there will be status meeting conducted by the State with the Vendor. We can not find a requirement in Section 2.3.3, Vendor Responsibility detailing these meetings. What is the frequency of the status meetings indicated in MITAS-8? Who will be responsible for agenda's, minutes, etc.?	Status meetings are envisioned to take place every other week. The Vendor will be responsible for the agenda, keeping an issue log and minutes.
27	In reference to <b>MITA-8</b> , how many State staff will be educated in training sessions?	See answer to question number 13 above.
<b>Article 2.3.3.3 Contract Communications – MITA-9</b>		
28	The contractor is responsible for assisting the State in preparing briefings, presentations and other materials. Can the State describe the anticipated audience for these materials?	Upper level and executive management.

No.	Question	Response
<b>Article 2.3.3.3 Contract Communications – MITA-10</b>		
29	The MITA SS-A is required as part of the submittal of an Implementation Advances Planning Document (IAPD) to CMS. This RFP does not include development and preparation of an IAPD. We are not aware of any CMS process for providing MITA SS-A other than as part of the IAPD. Please clarify the timing of the Federal approval this requirement is referring to.	HHSC expects to follow IAPD guidelines set forth in the CMS MITA Framework 2.0 Appendix E - MITA State-Self Assessment Details. HHSC will follow the guidelines for submission of the SS-A to CMS (as explained in Appendix E) and in that context, the IAPD would be required as part of this RFP although it is not spelled out as a separate deliverable.
<b>Article 2.3.3.3 Contract Communications – MITA-14</b>		
30	<b>MITA-14</b> requires the vendor to prepare and distribute meeting agendas and minutes within "State-approved time frames." Are these time frames already established or will they be established jointly with the vendor? If already, established what are the timeframes?	Timeframes would be jointly established.
31	Vendor's responsibilities include the preparation of agendas for the monthly Steering Committee meetings, facilitation of the meetings and distribution of meeting minutes within State-approved time frames. What are the State-approved time frames?	Timeframes would be jointly established between the Vendor and HHSC.
<b>Article 2.3.3.3 Contract Communications – MITA-17</b>		
32	Discusses providing a fixed hourly rate for potential additional MITA-related work. Page 34, section 6, Attachment A only allows for one entry. Depending on the additional work request, the roles for completing different aspects of the work would vary and thus the hourly rate would vary by role. Would HHSC consider modifying Attachment A to allow for the entry of an hourly rate for each potential role or does HHSC expect the Vendor to provide a single blended rate?	No, HHSC will not modify "Attachment A" because we wanted the Vendors to provide a single blended rate, but a vendor can include such details in their proposal if they desire too.
33	Should the fixed hourly rates for MITA-17 be inclusive of expenses, or will expenses be determined at the point that additional work is being defined?	Fixed rate should be inclusive of expenses.
<b>Article 2.3.3.5 Document Retention – MITA-20</b>		
34	Would it be acceptable to only retain paper records for which there is not a corresponding electronic file?	HHSC would like electronic copies of all documents; documents can be scanned into electronic format.
<b>Article 2.3.3.6 Document Access – MITA-22</b>		
35	"Provide access to these items at the Vendor's office facility in Austin, Texas..." Is it mandatory requirements that the Vendor has an office in Austin, Texas?	No, the Vendor is not required to have an office in Austin, Texas. Please refer to MITA-19.
36	MITA-22 refers to the "Vendor's office facility in Austin, Texas." Is it expected that the selected Vendor will have an office in Austin throughout the course of the project?	Please see response to No. 35.
<b>Article 2.5 Performance Measures and Associated Remedies</b>		
37	Are the days referenced in the <b>Performance Measures</b> working days or calendar days?	Working days.
38	Performance Measures and Associated Remedies, please provide additional information regarding how Performance Standards are measured (specifically in Task 2 and 3)?	Performance Standards will be discussed in negotiations.
<b>Article 2.5 Performance Measures and Associated Remedies – No. 1, GOC - 4</b>		
39	<b>Task No. 1</b> assesses liquidated damages for each day a replacement of key personnel is not provided. How long does the vendor have to replace key personnel before this penalty is imposed?	Please see response in No. 25.
40	Where are these requirements discussed in the RFP?	The requirements are in the table contained in Section 2.5

No.	Question	Response
41	There is a \$100/day penalty for each day a replacement Key Personnel subject to HHSC approval is not provided. Vendors understand the need for the retention of Key Personnel on a project. However, there are times that Key Personnel need to be replaced for reasons often beyond the control of the Vendor (death, medical illness, military/civic duty, etc.) Generally, States have allowed some period of time, such as 10 – 15 business days to replace Key Personnel before imposing a penalty. Would HHSC consider allowing some acceptable timeframe for the replacement of key Personnel before imposing a penalty?	Please see response in No. 25
<b>Article 2.5 Performance Measures and Associated Remedies – No. 2, GOC - 12</b>		
42	<b>Task No. 2</b> requires a performance standard of 98%. Please clarify the performance standard is 98% of what?	The requirement for Task 2 must be meet 98% of the time.
<b>Article 2.5 Performance Measures and Associated Remedies – No. 3, GOC - 20</b>		
43	<b>Task No. 3</b> requires a performance standard of 98%. Please clarify the performance standard is 98% of what?	The requirement for Task 3 must be meet 98% of the time.
44	There is a \$100/day penalty when a training event is not performed in accordance with the established project plan due dates. Is our assumption correct that this penalty would not be imposed if the reason(s) that the planned training event did not occur according to plan was the lack of availability of the HHSC designated staff and other HHSC identified participants?	HHSC will not hold the vendor responsible for undelivered training in the event that HHSC staff is unavailable for training.
<b>Article 2.5 Performance Measures and Associated Remedies – No. 4, TRC - 1</b>		
45	<b>Task No. 4</b> has a performance standard of 30 business days after <i>contract award</i> by HHSC; all deliverables listed in Section 2.2 are based on contract execution. Please confirm that the stated performance standard for Task No. 4 is contract award as opposed to contract execution.	In this RFP the term “contract awarded” and “contract execution” has the same meaning which is the date the contract is signed by both parties.
46	The task description appears to be describing the project plan that would be developed as part of the gap analysis in Section 2.3.1, which would be a project plan describing all projects schedule and milestones for achieving the MITA compliance over the long-term. This project plan is not scheduled to be completed until 32 weeks from contract execution according to section 2.2, Project Schedule. TRC-1 states that the project plan must be completed within 30 business days after contract award. This appears to align with the project plan required in the last paragraph of Section 2.3.1 for the scope of work of this contract. Please clarify.	Section 2.3.1 refers to a high level project plan the Vendor would assist HHSC in developing for HHSC to implement the long-term MITA vision. The project plan discussed in TRC-1 is the project plan for the Vendor tasks described in this RFP.
47	Requires a project plan 30 days after contract award. Is the state considering contract award to be the same date as execution, or literally the day they announce selection with execution being the day the contract is signed.	Please see the response to No. 45.
<b>Article 3.1 Vendor Conference</b>		
48	Is a HUB Vendor Conference scheduled? If so, when is it? Can interested parties participate in this conference by teleconference?	Please review Addendum No. 1. There will not be a HUB Vendor Conference.
<b>Article 3.14.1 Number of Copies</b>		
49	Section 3.14.1 states that one electronic copy of the proposal shall be submitted in a format compatible with Microsoft Office 2000. Is a PDF format also acceptable?	Yes a .pdf format is acceptable, but HHSC prefers a Microsoft Office document.
<b>Article 3.14.3 Additional Requirements</b>		

No.	Question	Response
50	Is it permissible to include the resumes in an appendix or must they be included in the actual Business proposal?	Resumes are required to be in the actual Business Proposal but they are not included in the 75 page limit.
51	It is required that each page of the proposal be sequentially numbered. Is it acceptable to sequentially number the pages within each section of the offer (for example, Executive Summary 1-1, 1-2; Corporate Background and Experience 2-1,2-2, 2-3) rather than sequentially numbering from the first page of the proposal to the end?	The documents in the 75 page limit are required to sequentially number.
52	Is the page limit for the Business proposal or is it inclusive of the Cost Proposal? Will the transmittal letter, a table of contents/list of exhibits, signed addendums, and Section 4-HUB Subcontracting Plan be included in the total page count?	The 75 page limit is just for the Business Proposal which includes the transmittal letter and the table of contents. The 75 page limit does not include Section 4 – HUB Subcontracting Plan, resumes, Financial Statements, Cost Proposal or signed addendums.
<b>Article 3.15.1 Volume 1 – Business Proposal</b>		
53	While a project plan is required as part of the scope of work (Section 2.3.1), we have not found that a preliminary project plan is required as part of proposal content. Please confirm that a preliminary project is not required in the proposal. If it is, will this be excluded from the page limit count? If it is what section of the proposal should it be included?	A Preliminary Project is not required in this procurement.
<b>Article 3.15.1.2. Section 2 – Corporate Background and Experience – No. 6 Bonding</b>		
54	What would the total amount of these bonds be (contract amount, percentage of contract amount)? This needs to be determined and disclosed as part of this procurement so a respondent knows what their cost of obtaining is and what their liability may be.	These amounts can vary. It has not been determined that a bond is required, merely that HHSC can request one.
55	What does this section requires as a response, it is simply that an acknowledgement of respondent's agreement? If something more than that is expected, please clarify.	An acknowledgement is sufficient at this time.
<b>Article 3.15.1.3 Section 3 – Management Plan – No. 4</b>		
56	Are examples of reports included in the page count? If currently included, we request that they are allowed to be provided in an appendix and excluded from the page count. Examples often requires several pages each and details that would be of benefit to the evaluators and if counted may have to be pared sown or deleted in order to accommodate these examples.	Examples of reports can be provided in an Appendix and are excluded from the 75 page count.
<b>Article 3.15.1.8. Section 8 – Certifications and Other Required Forms</b>		
57	<p>Child Support Certification Form</p> <p>a. Is this form asking for the names and social security numbers of our proposed staff for this project as well as anyone with a minimum of 25% ownership in the company?</p> <p>b. Will this form be provided in any FOIA requests for our proposals? We are concerned with providing social security numbers that could be released as public information.</p>	<p>a. This is relevant ONLY to anyone with 25% or more ownership.</p> <p>b. HHSC follows the Texas laws in responding to Public Information requests. If there are interests of a 3d party involved there are procedures that apply.</p>
<b>Article 4 - Historically Underutilized Business Participation</b>		
58	We would like to work with a certified Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) that is not in the State's HUB directory. We have worked with them in the past, they have the subject matter experts required for this project, and we are familiar with the quality of their work. Would the State accept a certified MBE from another state? Must we go out to solicit three or more HUBs in this case?	The HUB Program does not mandate the use of Certified Texas HUBs, though we do ask for all potential bidders to meet the "Good Faith Effort" to complete the HUB Subcontracting Plan (HSP) by soliciting three (3) Certified Texas HUBs and notifying a minority and women trade organization and

No.	Question	Response
		<p>development center as noted in Section 6(a), (b)and (c) of the HSP.</p> <p>Section 2161.001 of the Texas Government Code and Title 34, Section 20.12 of the Texas Administrative Code provides the definition of a HUB Vendor. The HUB Rules define a HUB as a business formed for the purpose of making a profit in which at least 51 percent of the business is owned, operated and controlled by one or more <b>American Women, Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Pacific Americans, or Native Americans</b> who are <i>economically disadvantaged</i> and who have been historically underutilized because of their identification as members of these groups. Eligible entities must have their principal place of business and permanent business office located in Texas where the majority HUB owner(s) makes the decisions, controls the daily operations of the organization and participates in the business. The qualifying owners must be residents of the State of Texas.</p> <p>The Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts will certify those eligible businesses that apply for HUB certification according to the business' definition, structure and defined ownership.</p> <p>To assist HHSC in receiving HUB Credit for HUB utilization in a state contract, each HUB or minority-owned business should be certified or have applied for certification with the State of Texas through the <a href="#">Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts</a>.</p> <p>The following links can help to verify who is considered a certified Texas HUB:  <a href="http://www.cpa.state.tx.us/procurement/cmb/hubonly.html">http://www.cpa.state.tx.us/procurement/cmb/hubonly.html</a>;  <a href="http://www.cpa.state.tx.us/procurement/cmb/cmbhub.html">http://www.cpa.state.tx.us/procurement/cmb/cmbhub.html</a> (Select either "HUBs on CMBL" or "HUB not on CMBL" when doing a search.); and  <a href="http://www.cpa.state.tx.us/procurement/prog/hub/">http://www.cpa.state.tx.us/procurement/prog/hub/</a>.</p> <p>Pertaining to certifications outside of the HUB Program, to maximize the number of certified HUBs, the Texas Procurement and Support Services (TPASS) of the Comptroller of Public Accounts (CPA), pursues certification agreements with local governments and nonprofit organizations in Texas which certify businesses under substantially the same definition as a HUB and meet certification standards as defined by TPASS. Those</p>

No.	Question	Response
		<p>organizations that the State of Texas has agreements with can be found at the following Web site:  <a href="http://www.cpa.state.tx.us/procurement/prog/hub/certagreements/">http://www.cpa.state.tx.us/procurement/prog/hub/certagreements/</a>.</p> <p>Due to the definition of a HUB vendor as defined by TPASS of the State of Texas, out of state minority certifications are not recognized by the State of Texas.</p>
<b>Article 5 - Proposal Evaluation</b>		
59	Can HHSC provide additional information regarding the criteria to be used to evaluate and score proposals? Specifically, what are the specific factors to be scored? What weighting will be applied to the individual factors to calculate a vendor's total score?	Best value factors, further described below, are used in evaluations. Weighting of criteria is not required to be disclosed.
<b>Article 5.1 Evaluation Criteria</b>		
60	It appears that information regarding demonstrated understanding on <b>item #1</b> is missing from the RFP. Please clarify what factors are being evaluated.	<p>5.1 Evaluation Criteria</p> <p>1. Past performance on similar projects and qualifications of key project personnel, including without limitation a demonstrated understanding of <b>MITA</b>.</p>
<b>General</b>		
61	MAXIMUS assumes that the State will negotiate exceptions to its standard terms and conditions, including such provisions as indemnification, limitation of liability and intellectual property. Is this correct assumption?	Any exceptions that an individual vendor may have to HHSC standard terms and conditions need to be raised by the vendor. It is premature to say which of these the State may or may not be willing to negotiate with a vendor at the point in time when, or if, a contract is being contemplated.
62	The MITA documents indicate that the first step in a self assessment is for the state to identify its Medicaid goals and objectives. My question is has HHSC completed that process and if so, would they share those goals and objectives?	HHSC has not completed this task yet and expects it to be completed as part of this project.
63	Will the vendor that is selected to do the strategic project be precluded from the potential future modernization project?	The vendor awarded a contract for the current procurement will be precluded from bidding on future solicitations for either the acquisition of system equipment for or modifications to the HHSC Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) and which stem from the results and recommendations of this RFP #529-08-0180.

Failure to acknowledge receipt of this addendum may result in offer rejection. Offerors may acknowledge receipt of this addendum by one of the following methods:

1. Sign and return this addendum to HHSC with the solicitation response; or
2. Acknowledge receipt of this addendum on the face of the offer, **or**;
3. If response has already been submitted by respondent, respondent may acknowledge receipt of this addendum prior to solicitation due date and time by signing and faxing to:

Elizabeth Ward	512-206-5416	512-206-5475
----------------	--------------	--------------

Attn: Phone: Fax:

Authorized Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed or Typed Name of Authorized Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Business Entity Name: \_\_\_\_\_