

SI RFP #17-630-4000-0002 Questions

Q#	Logistical or Technical	RFP Section	Section Title	Referenced Page	Question	Response
1	Logistical	VI.C	Proposal Format	43	The RFP states "Hard copy proposals shall be submitted typewritten, Times Roman twelve (12), on standard eight and a half (8½) by eleven (11) inch paper (larger paper is permissible only for charts, spreadsheets, etc.) and shall be placed in binders with tabs delineating each section." May Offerors use alternate fonts and sizes than Times Roman 12 for tables and/or figures?	Not smaller than 12.
2	Logistical	VI.B	Number of Copies	42	The RFP states that Offerors must submit the Technical Proposal in Binder 1 and offerors are encouraged to include example documents in a separate binder. Please confirm that multiple binders may be used for the Technical Proposal to accommodate items in addition to the example documents (e.g., financial stability documents, confidential information).	Yes.
3	Logistical	VIII.8	Evaluation Point Summary	47	<p>Section VII states that "The Offeror must adhere to the state's required Proposal format, page limitations and required content. Failure to adhere to these requirements may result in the proposal deemed nonresponsive and rejected."</p> <p>The evaluation criteria show that the Technical Solution will be evaluated on Vision for Solution, Reuse, Solution/SOW for a total of 280 points, while Requirements are scored for a total of 200 points. Since requirements are included in Response to Specifications, in which section of the response should Offerors include Solution, Reuse, Solution/SOW as these are not listed in the Proposal Content and Organization section (VI.C.1)?</p> <p>Could the State also provide details on what these sections would encompass such that all Offerors provide similar information?</p>	<p>Amendment to Add a new section in the RFP Section 1 of Binder 1</p> <p>From:</p> <p>1. Mandatory Specifications/ Technical Responses (480 points) Points will be awarded based on the thoroughness and clarity of the Offeror's response, the breadth and depth of the engagements cited and the perceived validity of the response. These responses are placed in Binder 1.</p> <p>2. Cost (280 points) The evaluation of each Offeror's cost proposal (the total of four years of detailed budgets) will be conducted using the following formula. Cost response is placed in Binder 2.</p> <p>To:</p> <p>1. Technical Responses (280 points) Points will be awarded based on the thoroughness and clarity of the Offeror's response, the breadth and depth of the engagements cited and the perceived validity of the response. These responses are placed in Binder 1.</p> <p>2. Requirements (200 points) Points will be awarded based on the thoroughness and clarity of the Offeror's response, the breadth and depth of the engagements cited and the perceived validity of the response. These responses are placed in Binder 1.</p>
4	Logistical	VI.C.1	Proposal Content and Organization	43	The RFP states "Additional items may be submitted as attachments following the mandatory items listed for Binder 1." Please confirm that these items are not included in page count (e.g., T&C markup, deliverables list, work plan).	Yes, it is not included in page count.

5	Logistical	VII.B.3	Financial Stability Documents	46	Please confirm that financial stability documentation is excluded from page count. These documents can be voluminous and could cause proposals to be outside of page count.	Yes, it is not included in page count.
6	Logistical	V.A	Sequence of Events	30	Should clarification be required on any question responses received from the State, would Offerors be able to submit clarification requests on those responses to enable more concise responses?	No additional clarification questions will be allowed. Offeror should include any assumptions.
7	Logistical	VII.B.3	Financial Stability Documents	46	Due to extensive page count dedicated to the Financial Stability Documents, will the state allow electronic submission or allow only 1 printed copy of these documents.	Electronic is acceptable provided the entire Financial Stability Documents file is not marked as confidential.
8	Logistical	V.B.3	Explanation of SI Events	31	The RFP states that, "Potential Offerors are encouraged to submit written questions to the Procurement Manager in advance of the conference (See Section I, Paragraph F)." (see Section I, Paragraph F) - Please clarify the page/location in the RFP of Section I, Paragraph F referred to in this section?	Amendment to reference the Procurement Manager section IV-E under background information (page 25). From: 4) Deadline to Submit Questions Potential Offerors may submit written questions to the Procurement Manager related to the intent or clarity of this RFP until 5:00PM MT, as indicated in Section V, A. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS. All written questions must be addressed to the Procurement Manager as declared in Section V, Paragraph F. To: 4) Deadline to Submit Questions Potential Offerors may submit written questions to the Procurement Manager related to the intent or clarity of this RFP until 5:00PM MT, as indicated in Section V, A. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS. All written questions must be addressed to the Procurement Manager as declared in Section IV, Paragraph E.
9	Logistical	VIII.E.3	Evaluation Process	49	The RFP states, "The Evaluation Committee may include other sources of information to perform the evaluation as specified in Section II.C.18. Please clarify "other sources of information" to be used. Section II.C only spans numbers 1-4. Is it possible the Section reference should be V.C.18?	Other sources of information refers to State-led PMO may be used as Subject Matter Experts, Reference Check, Web research, BAFO, etc. Amendment to Page 49 reference in E2 should be Section V B7, reference in E3 should be V C18 From: 2. The Procurement Manager may contact the Offeror for clarification of the response as specified in Section II. B.7. 3. The Evaluation Committee may include other sources of information to perform the evaluation as specified in Section II. C.18. To: 2. The Procurement Manager may contact the Offeror for clarification of the response as specified in Section V. B.7. 3. The Evaluation Committee may include other sources of information to perform the evaluation as specified in Section V. C.18.

10	Logistical	V.A	Sequence of Events	30	Would the state consider releasing answers to questions on a rolling basis before the Response to Written Questions date of March 23, 2017.	No
11	Logistical	VIII.B.2	Cost Points	47 & 48	The RFP indicated that there are 280 points associated with the Cost Proposal. These 280 points are broken into 4 categories; Form #1 - 120 points, Form #2 - 70 points, Form #3 - 70 points and Form #4 - 20 points (Incentives). The formula used in awarding the individual points for each of these forms awards the maximum points to the lowest price. Because the State is looking for the best /lowest price this formula works fine for Form #1, #2, and #3. However, when it comes to Form #4 (Incentive) it would seem the State is encouraging the vendor to have no incentives/ zero price to obtain the most cost points based on the formula. Would the state consider awarding the 20 incentive points based on the Vendor's Incentive plan/approach and not use pricing as the factor to award these points?	Scoring considerations for Cost response Form 4 is not based solely on costs. It also includes Offeror's plan and approach.
12	Logistical	2.1.2.3	Non-Service Interfaces	91	Please clarify whether Trading Partner Management is in scope for the EDI solution. Please clarify if the state plans to use the same Companion Guides going forward or will allow the Financial Services vendor to modify them. Please clarify if the SI is responsible for provider testing with the new Financial Services vendor and if the Unified Call Center is providing ongoing support.	Yes Trading Partner Management is in scope for the SI. The SI will manage all interfaces which includes TPM. The SI is expected to create new Companion Guides that establish standards for the Enterprise. The SI will need to perform integration testing with all Module Contractors and work with the Module Contractors to resolve issues related to interface, interoperability and security testing with the Trading Partners. Each module will have a help desk. (Amendment to Section 2.4.8 Technical Support and Help Desk)
13	Logistical	2.1.1.3	Reuse	84	How many State users will require access to security and project management tools?	The SI must provide tools that interface with the State's Project Management Tools. The SI should anticipate a small subset of total users will need access to SI security tools.
14	Logistical	2.2.1.5	System Integrator Resource Management	104	The RFP states "Offeror's proposal submission must include a resume for each position proposed." Please confirm that these resumes are not included in the 300 pages allotted to the technical proposal.	Resumes are not included in the 300 page limit.

15	Logistical	VI.C	Proposal Format	43	<p>Please clarify where the Vision for Solution, Reuse and Solution/SOW Sections (referenced on page 47 in Table 3 Evaluation Point Summary) are to be included in the Proposal Content and Organization of Binder 1.</p> <p>Please also clarify what the Vision for Solution, Reuse and Solution/SOW Sections shall encompass, such at all offerors provide similar information.</p>	<p>The RFP provides guidance on the Vision. include in Binder 1 - Amendment to Add a new section in the RFP Section 1 of Binder 1</p> <p>From:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mandatory Specifications/ Technical Responses (480 points) Points will be awarded based on the thoroughness and clarity of the Offeror's response, the breadth and depth of the engagements cited and the perceived validity of the response. These responses are placed in Binder 1. 2. Cost (280 points) The evaluation of each Offeror's cost proposal (the total of four years of detailed budgets) will be conducted using the following formula. Cost response is placed in Binder 2. <p>To:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Technical Responses (280 points) Points will be awarded based on the thoroughness and clarity of the Offeror's response, the breadth and depth of the engagements cited and the perceived validity of the response. These responses are placed in Binder 1. 2. Requirements (200 points) Points will be awarded based on the thoroughness and clarity of the Offeror's response, the breadth and depth of the engagements cited and the perceived validity of the response. These responses are placed in Binder 1.
16	Logistical	Appendix H, Appendix G	SI Offeror and Contractor Requirements	140-148	Please clarify the Appendix G section that correlates and supports Appendix H requirements 2.01-2.47.	Offerors responses to Appendix H do not require a reference to an Appendix G section.
17	Logistical	Appendix H, Appendix G	SI Offeror and Contractor Requirements	152-157	Please clarify the Appendix G section that correlates and supports Appendix H requirements 5.01-5.33.	Offerors responses to Appendix H do not require a reference to an Appendix G section.
18	Logistical	V.B.3	Pre-Proposal Conference	31	Will the state please publish the list of pre-proposal conference attendees, questions and answers provided, and transcript of meeting?	Yes. Only the list of attendees will be posted after the questions and answers are posted. Transcripts of meeting will not be posted.
19	Logistical	APPENDIX I	SAMPLE CONTRACT	169	"Performance Bond-Contractor shall execute and deliver to HSD" . What is the value of performance bond State is looking to seek from the Contractor? Can the State give an indicative percentage in terms of contract value i.e. if the contract value is \$100MN then State expects 10% of the value in Performance bond.	The Performance Bond amount is negotiated during contract negotiations with the selected Offeror.

20	Logistical	APPENDIX I	SAMPLE CONTRACT	181	"Nothing in this Agreement shall limit the Contractor's liability" - As per the clause, State does not limit the liabilities of Contractor i.e. the clause leads to unlimited liability for the Contractor, placing an unreasonable burden on Contractor. Though State is open to exceptions, requesting the State to clarify if it would be open to negotiate on this clause and consider limiting Contractor's liability to a mutually agreeable limit.	This is a matter for contract negotiations with the selected Offeror.
21	Logistical	APPENDIX H	REQUIREMENTS ; Perform SI Tasks ID 2.38	147	"Offeror shall describe how its proposed Solution will deliver a System Integrator Resource Management plan that includes a staffing model, organizational structure, key personnel definition, and roles and work site location" - What is the expected work location for this RFP? Is the contractor expected to establish a facility in New Mexico? Or Work can be done from an offsite location in USA.	The RFP intentionally does not express a preference for work location.
22	Logistical	V.	CONDITIONS GOVERNING THE PROCUREMENT	30	Would the State consider extending the deadline for asking questions?	No
23	Logistical	3	Proposal Format	43	can you please clarify that tables and/or figures may use other fonts and sizes different from the Times Roman 12 pt. font required.	Not smaller than 12.

24	Logistical	VII	Response Specifications	44	Appendix G describes the services to be delivered. In Section C. Proposal Format, Binder 1, where should vendors respond to Appendix G services in the Technical Proposal? Please clarify if proposals should also have sections added for Vision for Solution, Reuse and Solution/SOW in alignment with the evaluation criteria on page 47 of the RFP?	<p>Amendment to Add a new section in the RFP Section 1 of Binder 1</p> <p>From:</p> <p>1. Mandatory Specifications/ Technical Responses (480 points) Points will be awarded based on the thoroughness and clarity of the Offeror's response, the breadth and depth of the engagements cited and the perceived validity of the response. These responses are placed in Binder 1.</p> <p>2. Cost (280 points) The evaluation of each Offeror's cost proposal (the total of four years of detailed budgets) will be conducted using the following formula. Cost response is placed in Binder 2.</p> <p>To:</p> <p>1. Technical Responses (280 points) Points will be awarded based on the thoroughness and clarity of the Offeror's response, the breadth and depth of the engagements cited and the perceived validity of the response. These responses are placed in Binder 1.</p> <p>2. Requirements (200 points) Points will be awarded based on the thoroughness and clarity of the Offeror's response, the breadth and depth of the engagements cited and the perceived validity of the response. These responses are placed in Binder 1.</p>
25	Logistical				Can HSD provide minimum and preferred skillsets for each key staff position to ensure vendors provide similar skillsets for evaluation of key staff resumes?	The RFP requests your expertise in making a recommendation for skillsets.
26	Logistical	Appendix J	Crosswalk SI RFP to CMS Draft RFP Template,		under System Integrator Considerations, Section 4 on page 223 states in part "Provide an all-inclusive price for all activities related to DDI, including project management and hardware and software services." However Appendix B - Cost Response Forms #1 - 3 provide no fields for Hardware and Software related costs. Please clarify. Will revised Appendix B - Cost Response Forms with HW/SW cost fields be released? Or do you have instructions for where you want HW/SW costs to be put into the existing Forms? If the latter, do you want HW/SW costs delineated in any way or aggregated into an existing field in the Form without delineation?	Appendix B makes it clear the State is requesting an all-inclusive price for all SI services including Hardware and Software.
27	Logistical	Appendix H		131	states that "must present its cross-referenced response to the requirements in the order in which they are presented below." If we provide the responses to Appendix H in numerical order, can the state clarify to what we are cross-referencing each requirement in Appendix H?	If the responses are in numeric order a cross-reference is not required.

28	Logistical	Appendix G Section 2.2.2.4		117	can you please provide a copy of the current overall MMISR integrated Master Schedule referenced in this section.	No. Amendment includes an updated high level schedule TABLE 1: ESTIMATED MMISR MODULE PROCUREMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE
29	Logistical	Section 2.1.	Hosting	96	states in part "Offerors proposing an alternative hosting solution may be asked by the State to provide a proposal that includes, among other elements, the associated transfer costs to move the solution to the State-hosted data center at contract transition associated transfer costs to move the solution to the State-hosted data center at contract transition or at any other point in the contract life upon HSD request." Please consider requiring bidders who choose to propose an alternative hosting solution to include their transfer cost to the State-hosted data center as part of their proposal. Please also consider scoring the transfer cost as part of their total bid price. This protects the State from an initial lowprice bid to win and an unexpected high-price transfer to the State-hosted data center should HSD ever request such a transfer.	The State declines to score transfer costs.
30	Logistical	Appendix B	Form 4	59	are incentive payment meant to be payments to the vendor from the State in addition to the costs provided in Forms 1, 2 and 3?	Yes
31	Logistical	Appendix B	Form 4	59	how does the State intend to score the incentive payment costs provided in Form #4? Will vendors receive more points for higher incentive payment amounts? Or will the scoring of Form #4 be subjective?	The maximum score available for #4 is 20 points. The scoring will be subjective in that the points will not be based solely on the amount of incentive payment but rather on the assessment of what is most advantageous to the State.
32	Logistical	1.A	INTRODUCTION PURPOSE OF THIS REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS	4 of 227	The RFP states: 'As part of the State's commitment to maximizing the benefits of a modular MMISR Solution, which includes no longer being dependent on a single MMIS Vendor, each Offeror may win no more than two MMISR module procurements. The selected SI Contractor may not win any other module procurement as the Prime Vendor.' Question: Will New Mexico HSD be considering the Enrollment and Eligibility (E&E) system a 'module' as part of their commitment to maximizing the benefits of a modular MMISR Solution?	No. HSD does not consider Enrollment and Eligibility is not a module of the MMISR Solution.

33	Logistical	VI	RESPONSE FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION – NUMBER OF COPIES	42 of 227	The RFP states: “One electronic version of the Cost Proposal. Acceptable formats for the electronic version of the proposal are Microsoft Word, Excel and PDF” Question: Please confirm that the electronic version of the cost proposal and technical proposal should be submitted in the format of Microsoft Word, Excel and PDF, saved on a CD-ROM which is sent with the physical copies of the proposal.	Yes.
34	Logistical	VI	RESPONSE FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION – PROPOSAL FORMAT	43 of 227	The RFP states: “Hard copy proposals shall be submitted typewritten, Times Roman twelve (12), on standard eight and a half (8½) by eleven (11) inch paper (larger paper is permissible only for charts, spreadsheets, etc.) and shall be placed in binders with tabs delineating each section” Question: In order to increase the readability of the overall proposal document, can offerors use 10pt font size for graphics, table, charts, and similar items?	Not smaller than 12.
35	Logistical	VI	RESPONSE FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION – PROPOSAL FORMAT	43 of 227	The RFP states: “Hard copy proposals shall be submitted typewritten, Times Roman twelve (12), on standard eight and a half (8½) by eleven (11) inch paper (larger paper is permissible only for charts, spreadsheets, etc.) and shall be placed in binders with tabs delineating each section” Question: In order to increase the readability of the overall proposal document, can offerors use a font other than Times New Roman for graphics, table, charts, and similar items?	Not smaller than 12.
36	Logistical	VI	RESPONSE FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION – PROPOSAL FORMAT	43 of 227	The RFP states: “Response must be no more than three hundred (300) pages in length excluding the mandatory State required forms and examples of documents.” Question: Are offerors correct to assume that the Title Page, Table of Contents, Key Personnel Resumes, and tabs will be excluded from the 300 page limit?	Yes
37	Logistical	VI	RESPONSE FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION – PROPOSAL FORMAT	43 and 44 of 227	Under Binder 1 the RFP requires the inclusion of a “Signed Letter of Transmittal Form (APPENDIX C)” and under Binder 2 the RFP requires a “Letter of Transmittal.” Question: Can the government confirm that the “Signed Letter of Transmittal Form” and the “Letter of Transmittal” are the same thing?	The “Signed Letter of Transmittal Form” and the “Letter of Transmittal” are the same thing, and each binder requires a "Signed Letter of Transmittal Form.”

38	Logistical	VI	RESPONSE FORMAT AND ORGANIZATION – PROPOSAL FORMAT	45 of 227	The RFP states: "Offerors shall provide a minimum of three (3) and no more than five (5) references from similar large-scale Projects performed for private, State, or large local government clients within the last three (3) years." Question: Please confirm that offerors may also use references from similar large-scale projects performed for the Federal government as well.	Confirmed
39	Logistical	VIII	RESPONSE SPECIFICATIONS – ORAL PRESENTATION	47 of 227	The RFP states: "If selected as a finalist, the Offeror may be required to present an overview of its proposal to the Evaluation Committee to give the Evaluation Committee the opportunity to interview proposed Key Personnel, to ask questions, to seek clarifications on the Offeror's proposal and to better assess Offeror's ability to fulfill the requirements outlined in the scope of work." Question: There are 13 Key Personnel named in the RFP. Is there a maximum number of speakers that the offeror can bring to the Oral Presentation? Question: Are offerors required to bring all key personnel to the Oral Presentation?	Requirements for finalists will be provided at the time of selection.
40	Technical	2.3.4	Historical Data Conversion	127	What is the number of years' worth of data to convert into the SMR? Will there be multiple conversions that need to occur since the subsequent MES modules will convert their data from the SMR instead of the legacy system directly? Other than the Omnicaid MMIS, are there other systems/data sources for conversion?	It varies by system but Offerors should assume a minimum of 10 years of data plus any lifetime limits and the supporting data. There will be multiple conversions as there are multiple modules and multiple sources. The SMR capability is a reuseable, scalable platform and is anticipated to be used as each Module or Partner is added to the system.
41	Technical	2.1.1.3	Reuse	84	For the components to be considered for reuse TABLE G 1: CURRENT HSD ASSETS THAT MAY BE REUSED FOR THE SI , please consider adding a column indicating the current allocation (e.g. cores, Terabytes of storage, percent of the capacity currently available, etc.) Is the SI responsible for takeover of ongoing responsibility for support and maintenance or Table G1 reused components?	The SI is not responsible for takeover of the items in Table G1. The components are available for use if the SI so chooses. Amendment with licenses availability.
42	Technical	SI Critical Functions	5.23	153	The RFP states "Meet Recovery Point Objectives (RPO), as defined by HSD, to ensure that no data within the RPO window will be lost" and "meet Recovery Time Objectives (RTO), as defined by HSD, to ensure that the SI Solution is available within that timeframe." Please define the required RPO/RTO.	These will be addressed during contract negotiations, Offeror should state in their proposal their recommended RPO/RTO and any assumptions, understanding these are critical systems to the State and its Enterprise Partners and the State is seeking minimum loss.
43	Technical	2.1.1.3	Reuse	83	Is the State currently using Splunk as their Security Information and Event Management (SIEM) tool? If not which vendor/tool is currently used for SIEM?	Yes. Offerors may make their own recommendations for an SIEM tool.
44	Technical	2.1.1.3	Reuse	83	Does the State currently use address validation functionality from Informatica?	No, the address validation in use is SAP.

45	Technical	2.3.4	Conversion of Historical Data	125	Besides MMIS (XEROX/Conduent) what are other legacy source systems in scope of data profiling and migration (SMR)? Which business processes are part of data migration?	All Enterprise partner agencies will have legacy source systems that need to be converted. Case Management and Billing system processes will need to be converted from all agencies.
46	Technical	2.3.4	Conversion of Historical Data	125	For all the sources in scope of SMR (data migration), please provide number of tables, attributes and volume of data.	The Offeror's Solution must be scalable and capable of handling the current as well as the ability to expand during operations. Available information is in the Procurement Library.
47	Technical	2.3.4	Conversion of Historical Data	125	Is the data in scope of migration (SMR services) only structured data? If not, please consider updating the bidder's library with unstructured data to be converted.	Primarily structured data, but there is some unstructured data includes images and text blocks (e.g., physician notes from DOH service programs).
48	Technical	2.3.4	Conversion of Historical Data	125	Is the HHS 2020 Information Architecture target model available or is the design of HHS 2020 Information Architecture model (conceptual/logical) to use for MDM and SMR in scope for the SI contractor?	An IA target model is not available. The selected Contractor must design the model for use of MDM and SMR, both of which are in scope for the SI Contractor. The model design is subject to State approval.
49	Technical	2.1.2.1	Master Data Management	92	What are the source systems required for generation of MDM records? Are these part of SMR scope? If not, please share the list of source systems required for MDM master data generation, number of tables, attributes, and data volume.	Every system migrated (including Enterprise partners and subsequent modules) will provide MDM records and the SI will need to integrate into the MDM data sets. Please see Addendum 17 in the Procurement Library for known systems and partners.
50	Technical	2.1.2.2	Service Integration	87	With the ESB being a new component module for the framework, can the State provide expected transaction volume and size anticipated through the ESB?	No. Volume is not known at this time. The known data is in the Procurement Library. Again, the Offeror's Solution must be scalable and must be capable of handling more than the current capacity.
51	Technical	Appendix H. Requirement 1.27	Conversion of Historical Data	135	Will the SI be responsible for converting images from the legacy document management system (Docfinity OIT)? If so, approximately how many documents will need to be converted? Will the images and indices be provided in a non-proprietary format?	Yes, all of them. Yes, in a non-proprietary format.
52	Technical	Appendix H		136	requirement 1.43, states in part that "Offeror's proposal should demonstrate its consideration of the following list of tools and indicate either inclusion or a reason for exclusion or substitution of each". In reviewing the bullet list that follows only bullet (i) has tools listed. Please provide the tools to be considered for bullets (a) through (h) and bullet (j).	The Offeror's proposal should clarify as to whether or not its Solution provides the items (a) through (j).
53	Technical	Appendix H		158	requirement 5.31, are there existing State data sources of information that can be leveraged for identity proofing? Please provide the underlying technology (e.g., database, directory or external solution, etc.) hosting this source of information.	There is no existing identity proofing. The State uses the Federal market place identity proofing functionality. The MDM will be the source for identity proofing.
54	Technical	Appendix H		139	requirement 1.51, please clarify the meaning and scope of composite applications in this context.	The composite applications for each BPO are implemented by the BPO using the tools and integration provided by the SI. The Offeror should propose a Solution with such tools and assumptions as are necessary to address this requirement.

55	Technical	Appendix G	CURRENT HSD ASSETS THAT MAY BE REUSED FOR THE SI	85-86 of 227	The RFP provides a table (Table G 1) which outlines the current HSD assets that are candidates for reuse for the SI contract. Question: Will HSD provide the number of available licenses for the SI contract for each of the products which 'may require additional licenses depending on requirements'?	HSD does have some licenses available for reuse the items in Table G1. Amendment to SI provided. If an Offeror wishes to utilize any of the items it should specify the item in its proposal and acknowledge its responsibility to pay for or provide the additional licenses, if needed. Such costs should be included in the cost proposal. The Offeror should include any pricing assumptions and savings based upon reuse of license.
56	Technical	Appendix G	CURRENT HSD ASSETS THAT MAY BE REUSED FOR THE SI	85-86 of 227	The RFP provides a table (Table G 1) which outlines the current HSD assets that are candidates for reuse for the SI contract. Question: For pricing purposes, should the offeror assume that for each product listed in Table G 1 that HSD has a current enterprise license? Question: If the answer to the above question is yes, in order for offerors to accurately provide pricing for additional licenses, can the State please provide individual license pricing for each of the products listed in Table G 1? Question: Are the HSD assets listed in Table G 1 currently in production?	Yes. HSD does have some licenses available for reuse the items in Table G1. Amendment to SI provided. If an Offeror wishes to utilize any of the items it should specify the item in its proposal and acknowledge its responsibility to pay for or provide the additional licenses, if needed. Such costs should be included in the cost proposal. The Offeror should include any pricing assumptions and savings based upon reuse of license.
57	Technical	Appendix G	CURRENT HSD ASSETS THAT MAY BE REUSED	85-86 of 227	The RFP provides a table (Table G 1) which outlines the current HSD assets that are candidates for reuse for the SI contract. Question: Which assets listed in Table G 1 currently have APIs accessible?	The items in Table G1 are all commercially available and with the purchase of a license the API would be accessible. The APIs are accessible to the Vendor if the Vendor uses the State license. If the Vendor does not use a State license, then the
58	Logistical	General	General	General	Has a budget been allocated for this project? Is there an estimated contract value available?	Yes, there is a budget for the overall project. No, estimated contract for the SI is not available.
59	Logistical	General	General	General	May I know the current vendor in contract for the project? And its contract expiry date?	There is no current SI Vendor.
60	Logistical	General	General	General	My question is around the possibility of us receiving the RFP and based on the requirements in it, we may end deciding that we have two different partners that we feel would provide unique value to the State of New Mexico along with our solutions for the same RFP. Not sure this will be something that I will have to worry about, but if the situation arises, is it OK for us to respond as the Prime to a single RFP, but with two different RFP responses with a different partner/sub-contractor for each?	No, each offeror may submit only one response, see page 42.
61		Section B		9	RFP references the Data Services vendor leveraging infrastructure and tools offered by the SI module contractor. What is the state doing to ensure infrastructure and tool compatibility across vendors? Based on the RFP schedule, the Data Services vendor will likely respond to an RFP in which the expectation is infrastructure and tools from another vendor will be an integral part of their solution.	All module vendors will be expected to have services and tools which will be compatible with the core infrastructure and tools of the SI vendor.

62		Section B		9	<p>Would the state consider delaying the Data Services RFP until the SI module contractor and infrastructure/tools have been identified and can be shared as part of the Data Services procurement?</p> <p>This approach would mitigate risk to the state and compatibility concerns between vendors.</p>	No
63		Section 3	Project Timeline	14	<p>RFP outlines the procurement schedule and anticipated project start dates. Can the state clarify the anticipated implementation date for each module?</p>	The Anticipated implementation date is stated on page 14 Projected Module RFP Schedule Table 1: Estimated MMISR Module Procurement and Implementation Timeline.
64		Section 3	Project Timeline	14	<p>Specific to the Data Services contract, is it expected the Data Services vendor would integrate into the replacement modules and not the existing legacy platforms?</p>	The expectations for the Data Services vendor will be outlined in the Data Services RFP.
63		Section 3	Project Timeline	14	<p>If legacy platforms serve as the initial data source and get phased out as the replacement module platforms are implemented, the state would incur duplicate integration and testing costs. Would these duplicate costs be priced into the Data Services bid or be handled through a project modification hour pool?</p> <p>Positioning the Data Services implementation towards the end of the module implementation would minimize duplicate integration and testing costs.</p>	The expectations for the Data Services vendor will be addressed in the Data Services RFP.