



**State of Georgia  
The Georgia Technology Authority**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**Data Warehouse System with Decision Support and Executive Information  
Capabilities**

RFP No. GTA000211

Sealed Proposal Due By:  
**March 11, 2:00 PM ET**

Submit Proposal (with Offerors Information and Proposal Certification Letter) To:  
Georgia Technology Authority  
100 Peachtree Street  
Suite 2300  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

All available information concerning this Request for Proposal can be downloaded from the Georgia Procurement Registry website: <http://www.procurement.state.ga.us>

Refer ALL Inquiries to:  
*Deirdre Johnson, CPPO, CPPB*  
GTA Contracting Officer  
GTA Acquisitions Management Office  
100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2300  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303  
Email: [djohnson@gta.ga.gov](mailto:djohnson@gta.ga.gov)  
(404) 463-2300  
(404) 463-2390 (facsimile)

## Offeror's Information

**RFP NO. GTA000211** Data Warehouse System with Decision Support and Executive Information Capabilities

---

Complete all spaces below and sign the Proposal Certification Letter on page three (3). Failure to sign and return the Proposal Certification Letter as a part of the technical proposal may cause rejection of the Proposal.

<b>Offeror's Exact Legal Name and Tax ID No.</b>	
Legal Name and Tax ID No. of Parent Company if applicable	
Point of Contact ("POC") Name	
POC's Company Address	
POC's Company Telephone	
POC's Company Facsimile	
POC's Company Email	

\*NOTE: Provide the certificate of registration number (as required by O.C.G.A. § 48-8-59) as assigned to the Offeror or the Offeror's affiliate that will be providing the products or services described in this RFP. Prior to Contract Award, GTA will provide to the Georgia Department of Revenue ("DOR") the Offeror's name and certificate of registration number for verification that the Offeror or its providing affiliate is in compliance with applicable Georgia tax laws and regulations. In accordance with O.C.G.A. § 50-5-82, no Contract Award will be made unless DOR determines that the Offeror or its providing affiliate is in compliance with such laws and regulations.



## Proposal Certification Letter

The undersigned Offeror hereby offers and proposes to furnish and deliver any and all of the deliverables and services outlined in the attached Request for Proposal ("RFP") at the prices set forth herein ("Proposal"). The price or prices offered herein shall be valid for a period of one hundred twenty (120) days from Proposal Due Date. It is understood and agreed that this proposal constitutes an offer, which, when accepted in writing by the GTA, and subject to the terms and conditions of such acceptance, will constitute a valid and binding Agreement between the Offeror and the State of Georgia.

The Offeror further agrees to strictly abide by all the terms and conditions contained in the RFP and the Procurement Rules of the Georgia Technology Authority ("GTA Rules"), which are hereby incorporated in this RFP by reference and which may be found at <http://gta.georgia.gov/procurementrules>. Any exceptions to the requirements of the RFP, the terms and conditions of the proposed Agreement and the GTA Rules shall be noted in writing, with detailed explanation, and included with this Proposal. The Offeror acknowledges that taking exception may have a negative impact on evaluation of the proposal or may subject this Proposal to rejection.

1. I certify that, if awarded a contract, the Offeror will deliver goods and services, which will meet or exceed the specifications, set forth in this RFP, the Proposal and the terms of the final Agreement between the Offeror and the State.
2. I certify on behalf of the Offeror that this Proposal is made without prior understanding, agreement, or connection with any corporation, firm, or person submitting a proposal for the same materials, supplies, equipment, or services and is in all respects fair and without collusion or fraud. I understand that collusive bidding is a violation of State and federal law and can result in fines, prison sentences, and civil damage awards. I agree to abide by all conditions of the Proposal and certify that I am authorized to sign this Proposal for the Offeror.

3. I certify that the Offeror has not violated and will not violate the provisions of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, Section 45-10-20 et seq. (Conflicts of Interest).

**4. OFFEROR MUST CHECK ONE OF THE CERTIFICATIONS BELOW:**

4a.  I certify on behalf of the Offeror that no lobbyists have been employed or retained by Offeror in regards to this procurement or its underlying Agreement in a manner that would invoke the Executive Order dated October 1, 2003 ("Providing For The Registration and Disclosure Of Lobbyists Employed Or Retained By Vendors To State Agencies").

**OR**

4b.  I certify that the Offeror and all lobbyists that have been employed or retained by Offeror in regards to this procurement or its underlying Agreement have complied with all of the requirements of the Executive Order dated October 1, 2003 ("Providing For The Registration and Disclosure Of Lobbyists Employed Or Retained By Vendors To State Agencies") and GTA's Vendor Lobbyist Policy. I further certify that Offeror and its lobbyists will continue to comply with such Executive Order until this procurement process concludes. I understand and acknowledge that such requirements include, without limitation, the requirement to register with the Georgia State Ethics Commission and to file the disclosures required by Article 4 of Chapter 5 of Title 21 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated.

**[Offeror shall submit a list of all lobbyists employed or retained for this procurement along with their proposal]**

---

Authorized Signature

Date

---

Print / Type Name

---

Print / Type Company Name



## STATEMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY CERTIFICATION FORM

---

### INSTRUCTIONS:

**THIS FORM MUST BE COMPLETED, SIGNED, NOTARIZED AND SUBMITTED WITH YOUR BID/PROPOSAL.**

Please complete this form, answering every question. *A "Yes" answer to any of the subparts of Question No. 3 requires a written explanation attached to the completed form, submitted on your company letterhead and signed by an authorized representative of the company. A "Yes" answer to any of the subparts of Question No. 3 will not necessarily result in denial of award, but will be considered in determining Offeror responsibility in the event GTA undertakes an investigation into Offeror's responsibility status.* For any explanation, indicate to whom it applies and identify the initiating agency and the dates of action.

Offerors are responsible for updating any information submitted in their Statement of Responsibility Certification Form if a change occurs prior to the award of the contract.

### QUESTIONS:

1. Does Offeror certify that it has, or has the ability to obtain, adequate financial resources to perform the Services and Deliverables identified in the Agreement? This includes, but is not limited to, the ability to obtain required bonds and insurance from sureties and insurance companies authorized to do business in Georgia.  YES  NO
2. Does Offeror certify that it is able to comply with all contractual requirements and fulfill all of its contractual obligations, considering Offeror's other business obligations?  YES  NO

3. Within the past three (3) years, has Offeror's company, or any principal of Offeror (e.g., any owner, partner, officer, or major stockholder with 10% or more shares) been the subject of any of the following:

(a) a judgment or conviction for any conduct constituting a felony under local, State or federal law, including, but not limited to, fraud, extortion, bribery, racketeering, labor, anti-trust, price-fixing, or bid collusion?  
\_\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_NO

(b) a criminal investigation or indictment for any conduct constituting a felony under local, State or federal law, including, but not limited to, fraud, extortion, bribery, racketeering, price-fixing, or bid collusion (to the best of Offeror's knowledge\*)?  
\_\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_NO

(c) an unsatisfied judgment, injunction or lien obtained by a Georgia State government agency including, but not limited to, judgments based on taxes owed and fines and penalties assessed by any Georgia State government agency?  
\_\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_NO

(d) an investigation for a civil violation by any local, State or federal agency (to the best of Offeror's knowledge\*)?  
\_\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_NO

(e) a suspension, debarment or termination for cause from any local, State or federal government procurement process?  
\_\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_NO

(f) a suspension or termination for cause prior to the completion of the term of any local, State or federal government contract?  
\_\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_NO

(g) a denial of award for non-responsibility determination made by any local, State or federal government?  
\_\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_NO

(h) an agreement to a voluntary exclusion from bidding/contracting on any local, State or federal procurement?  
\_\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_NO

(i) an administrative proceeding or civil action seeking specific performance or restitution in connection with any local, State or federal procurement (to the best of Offeror's knowledge\*)?  
\_\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_\_NO

(j) any bankruptcy proceeding?

\_\_\_\_YES \_\_\_\_NO

**CERTIFICATION:**

The undersigned: (i) recognizes that this questionnaire is submitted for the express purpose of assisting the Georgia Technology Authority (GTA) and the State of Georgia, its agencies and political subdivisions to make a determination regarding the eligibility for award of a contract, or to approve a subcontract; (ii) acknowledges that the GTA, the State of Georgia, its agencies and political subdivisions may, in their sole discretion, by means which they may choose, verify the truth and accuracy of all statements made herein; (iii) acknowledges that submissions of false or misleading information may constitute fraud, may result in ineligibility for contract award, may be used as grounds for termination for default of any contract awarded in relation to this certification, may be considered by the GTA, the State of Georgia, its agencies and political subdivisions in making responsibility determinations in other procurements, and may subject the Offeror or its representatives to criminal liability; (iv) as the authorized representative of the Offeror, states that the information submitted on this certification form and any attached pages is true, accurate and complete.

The undersigned hereby attests that he/she is duly authorized by the Offeror to make the statements and representations contained herein and/or attached hereto, on behalf of such Offeror.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Legal Name of Offeror Company  
Representative

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Offeror's Authorized

\_\_\_\_\_  
Address

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name of Offeror's Representative

\_\_\_\_\_  
City, State, Zip

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

State of \_\_\_\_\_ County of \_\_\_\_\_

Sworn to and subscribed before me on this \_\_\_\_day of \_\_\_\_\_200\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_

Notary Public

My Commission Expires: \_\_\_\_\_

**Note:** \*As used herein, the term "to the best of Offeror's knowledge" shall refer to the current actual knowledge of Offeror and shall be construed, by imputation or otherwise, to refer to the knowledge of any agent, manager, representative or employee of Offeror but does not impose upon Offeror any duty of inquiry or investigation of the matter to which such actual knowledge, or the absence thereof, pertains. The fact that Offerors (or their principals) are under investigation will not necessarily result in a determination of non-responsibility; rather, GTA will determine if the information and circumstances regarding such investigation are of such a nature or magnitude as to cause the GTA to deem the Offeror non-responsible in order to protect the interests of the GTA and/or the State.

# Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	11
1.1	Purpose of Procurement.....	11
1.2	Overview of Procurement Process.....	11
1.3	Background.....	12
2	General Requirements.....	14
2.1	Communications with State Staff.....	14
2.2	Schedule of Events.....	15
2.3	Addenda and Supplements to the RFP.....	15
2.4	Acceptance of RFP Terms.....	16
2.5	Costs of Preparation.....	16
2.6	Contract Award.....	16
2.7	Agreement Term.....	16
2.8	Protests.....	16
2.9	Confidential/Proprietary Information.....	17
2.10	Ownership.....	17
2.11	Proposal Prices.....	18
2.12	Agreement.....	18
2.13	Small and Minority Business Policy and Tax Incentive.....	19
2.14	Exceptions to RFP Requirements.....	19
2.15	Miscellaneous.....	20
3	Scope of Services.....	21
3.1	Mandatory Requirements.....	21
3.2	General System Requirements.....	21
3.3	Specific Technical Requirements.....	23
3.3.1	Integrated Healthcare Database and Data Warehouse Requirements.....	23
3.3.2	Decision Support System Requirements.....	25
3.3.3	Executive Information System (EIS) Requirements.....	28
3.3.4	Data Mart Requirements.....	29
3.4	Security Requirements.....	30
3.5	Training/Support Requirements.....	32
3.6	Offeror Qualifications.....	33
3.6.1	Offerors Experience.....	33
3.6.2	Current Client References.....	34
3.6.3	Staffing Plan.....	34
3.6.4	Subcontractors.....	34
3.6.5	Financial Information.....	35
3.7	Implementation.....	35
3.8	Contractor Performance.....	36
3.9	Disaster Recovery.....	36
4	Proposal Submission.....	37
4.1	Economy of Presentation.....	37
4.2	Submission of Proposals.....	37
4.3	Administrative Package Content.....	37
4.4	Technical Proposal Content.....	38
4.5	Price Proposal Content.....	39
5	Evaluation.....	40
5.1	General.....	40
5.1.1	Communications and Clarifications Process.....	40
5.1.2	Oral Presentations (Optional).....	40

5.1.3	Best and Final Offers (Optional).....	41
5.1.4	Financial Information.....	41
5.2	Mandatory & Administrative Review of Proposals .....	41
5.3	Technical Proposal Evaluation.....	42
5.4	Price Proposal Evaluation .....	43
5.5	Selection of Successful Offeror and Contract Award .....	44
	Appendix A – Schedule of Events.....	46
	Appendix B – Master Agreement.....	47
	Appendix C – Price Proposal .....	48
	Appendix D – Data Feeds.....	50

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of Procurement

The purpose of this Request for Proposal ("RFP") is to replace the Georgia Department of Community Health's (hereinafter referred to as "DCH" or "the Department") current Decision Support System (hereinafter referred to as "DSS") Executive Information System (hereinafter referred to as "EIS") and Data Warehouse (hereinafter referred to as "DW"). The Department currently maintains two (2) separate contracts for DSS services. DCH realizes there is a need to administratively simplify and perform one (1) procurement for an Offeror that will provide one (1) combined solution for accurate and readily available information that is retrievable in flexible reporting formats.

## 1.2 Overview of Procurement Process

- 1.2.1 Pursuant to the provisions of Official Code of Georgia Annotated (O.C.G.A.) § 50-25-7.2 and 50-25-7.3, GTA may solicit competitive sealed bids or competitive sealed proposals on behalf of any State Agency for any technology resource purchase. GTA has determined that the use of competitive sealed bidding will not be practical or advantageous to the State in completing the acquisition of the services and commodities described herein. However, competitive sealed proposals shall be submitted in response hereto in the same manner as competitive sealed bids.
- 1.2.2 GTA will act as an agent for the procuring Agency or Agencies during the term of the procurement process, and may exercise any and all rights, powers and responsibilities available to such Agency or Agencies and/or granted to GTA by law. The Administrative Rules and Regulations of the State of Georgia Chapters 665-1 and 665-2 et seq. ("GTA Rules") are incorporated in this RFP by reference. After receipt of Offers, GTA may conduct Clarifications, Communications and/or Negotiations, as such terms are defined in the GTA Rules. As used herein, the term "Agency" shall have the meaning set forth in GTA Rule 665-2-1-.02(a). In addition, the term "Agency" shall include any city, county, municipality or other political sub-division of the State that agrees to be bound by GTA's Rules for the limited purpose of the Georgia Technology Authority conducting, coordinating or facilitating a technology resource purchase or solicitation on their behalf.

### **1.3 Background**

- 1.3.1 The DCH was created in 1999, with the responsibility for insuring nearly two million people in the State of Georgia to maximize the State's health care purchasing power and to coordinate health planning for state agencies. DCH is comprised of several divisions, offices and administratively attached agencies. The Office of Planning and Fiscal Analyses within the Division of Financial Management is responsible for overseeing the DSS contract and activities.
- 1.3.2 DCH plans to obtain the services of a vendor that will design, create and maintain a state-of-the-art integrated healthcare database comprised of Medicaid/PeachCare data, State Health Benefit Plan data and data from the Board of Regents' Healthcare Plan. In addition to claims data, the Department should also have access to comparative/benchmarking healthcare data from the vendor and other sources including other DCH divisions, other State of Georgia agencies and DCH strategic partners. The proposed solution must facilitate efficient comprehensive analysis of financial and quality data and access information across all DCH division lines. It is DCH's intent to obtain the best overall solution for its DWS/DSS/EIS, based on relational database technology and state-of-the-art business intelligence tools, which can be licensed to meet the requirements under this procurement. DCH will consider existing systems, which can be adjusted to meet the needs of the state of Georgia, as well as customized solutions resulting from the systems integration of best-of-breed tools and applications.
- 1.3.3 The Successful Offeror must have expertise in all areas of the healthcare industry and be able to leverage that expertise and work with DCH on large-scale projects and analyses, including but not limited to the following: healthcare fraud and abuse analysis; provider profiling; modeling proposed plan design changes; and analyzing the cost drivers in the various DCH healthcare plans. These large-scale projects must be built into base cost of the contract.
- 1.3.4 The successful Data Warehouse System with Decision Support and Executive Information capabilities (DWS/DSS/EIS) solution will be comprised of the following components (this is a broad overview of the solution the Department is seeking; detailed requirements are in section 3):
- 1.3.4.1 **An Integrated Healthcare Database:** An operational data store (ODS) containing data from different external systems, after extraction, transformation and loading (ETL) processes have been applied to the

source data. In addition to standard claims data, benchmarks from other health plans and grouping data (i.e. admission level data, episode groupers, data roll-ups, diagnosis groupers, etc.) will be part of this database, which must be relational, normalized to the third normal form, and implemented in Oracle, SQL Server, or DB2.

1.3.4.2 **A Data Warehouse (DW):** A multidimensional database containing data in a form suitable for fast retrieval and reporting in aggregated form. This database will be used by the application systems that provide reporting and analysis capabilities.

1.3.4.3 **A Decision Support System (DSS):** The main system for most users at the Department and other agencies granted access. This system must be capable of creating standard and ad hoc reports specifically for healthcare claims data. A robust suite of standard reports will be available for users to run and customize for their own needs.

1.3.4.4 **An Executive Information System (EIS):** This system is used mainly by managers and directors within the Department. The EIS will also use the data stored in the data warehouse and must be user-friendly, with a point and click interface that will supply managers and directors with standard reports that can be quickly accessed. The suite of reports should be high level, designed to measure general trends (financial, utilization, enrollment, demographics, etc.) within and across the separate DCH health plans and suitable for public distribution.

1.3.4.5 **A Data Mart (DM):** A database for advanced users at DCH, whose needs go beyond the standard and ad hoc reporting and capabilities that the DSS and EIS (i.e. importing other data sets, creating and tagging columns on the data, linking data tables, creating summary data tables, etc.) may provide. The Data Mart will contain subsets of data from the ODS and the Data Warehouse and will have the capability to export data to DCH to facilitate further manipulation of data and analysis in conjunction with other data sets.

## 2 General Requirements

### 2.1 Communications with State Staff

- 2.1.1 From the issue date of this RFP until Contract Award, or cancellation of this procurement, Offerors shall not communicate, for any reason, with any State staff, or contractors working for the State, regarding this particular procurement, except through the Contracting Officer named herein or his or her designee. In the event Offeror cannot reach the Contracting Officer or believes there would be a conflict with communicating with the Contracting Officer, Offeror may communicate with the Director of GTA's Acquisition Management Office. GTA reserves the right to reject the proposal of any Offeror who violates this provision.
- 2.1.2 All contacts with GTA Contracting Officer must be in writing. Violation of the foregoing may result in disqualification. No oral conversations or agreements with any officer, agent or employee of GTA or the State regarding this RFP are authorized, and if the same shall occur, they shall not affect or modify any terms of this RFP. No written statements of any persons other than those issued by the GTA Contracting Officer shall be binding on GTA, nor shall they affect or modify any terms of this RFP. Prospective vendors may submit written questions to the Contracting Officer concerning this RFP by mail or email. Telephone inquiries will not be accepted. Written inquiries received after the deadline for questions specified in the Schedule of Events, may or may not be accepted or responded to by GTA. Submit all written inquiries to the Contracting Officer at the contact information provided on the cover page of this RFP.
- 2.1.3 Questions submitted via email should be in MS Word format. Additionally, questions should be submitted in the following table format:

COMPANY NAME	
Referenced RFP Section	Question

- 2.1.4 All written questions and any written responses will be posted on the Georgia Procurement Registry website at <http://www.procurement.state.ga.us>. GTA makes no representations or warranties as to the completeness or accuracy of any response; nor does GTA undertake to answer all questions asked. This RFP may be amended only by written

addenda to this RFP specifically identified as such and issued by the GTA Contracting Officer.

- 2.1.5 An Offerors' Conference may be held if specified in the Schedule of Events. The Offerors' Conference is intended to be an opportunity for authorized representatives of the Offerors to ask questions to further clarify any uncertainties that they may have. Oral answers given at the Conference are not binding, but represent a good faith effort to provide useful information.

## **2.2 Schedule of Events**

The anticipated timetable, including the Proposal Due Date and other important dates, are set forth in Appendix A. The name of any Offeror submitting a proposal shall be a matter of public record on the Proposal Due Date. GTA will announce all proposals received on that date. If you require assistance in attending the announcement, please contact the Georgia Relay Center at 1-800-255-0056 (TDD Only) or 1-800-255-0135 (Voice). Messages will be relayed in strict confidence.

## **2.3 Addenda and Supplements to the RFP**

- 2.3.1 This RFP consists of this Request for Proposal and all appendices attached hereto and any written addenda to this RFP specifically identified as such and issued by the GTA Contracting Officer. The procurement rules of GTA as set forth in Chapter 665-2-1 et. Seq., (the "GTA Rules"), are incorporated herein by reference. No other information in any form, including any other information posted on the GTA website or on the Georgia Procurement Registry website, shall be deemed part of this RFP.
- 2.3.2 GTA reserves the right to, and may, amend, modify or cancel this RFP without prior notice, at any time, at its sole discretion. In the event that it becomes necessary to revise or supplement any part of this RFP, a written addendum shall be posted on the Georgia Procurement Registry, which is accessible via the GTA website at <http://gta.georgia.gov>. It is the Offeror's responsibility to check this website on a daily basis, as such, the Offeror will be held accountable for any addenda to the RFP. Offerors may not discuss GTA requirements, preparation of proposals in response to this RFP, or technical questions with any GTA or State personnel other than the GTA Contracting Officer or as otherwise specified in this RFP.

## **2.4 Acceptance of RFP Terms**

Once the proposal due date has passed, a proposal submitted in response to this RFP shall constitute a binding offer. A submission in response to this RFP acknowledges acceptance by the Offeror of all terms and conditions of participation in this procurement as set forth in this RFP. The Offeror, by signing the proposal letter, certifies that it accepts all of the terms and conditions of participation in this procurement as set forth in this RFP, in full, without reservations, limitations, assumptions, restrictions, caveats, or any other type of qualification, except for those exceptions to the Agreement noted in writing and submitted within Offeror's Proposal. Further, the cover letter to any GTA-issued addenda to this RFP shall be signed and returned with the proposal.

## **2.5 Costs of Preparation**

The Offeror shall be solely responsible for the costs incurred in the preparation of a response to this RFP.

## **2.6 Contract Award**

A Notice of Award will be posted to the Georgia Procurement Registry website. Such posting shall constitute official and public notice of a Contract Award.

## **2.7 Agreement Term**

The Agreement term will begin upon the Effective Date stated in the final Agreement executed between the Georgia Department of Community Health (DCH) and the Successful Offeror. GTA anticipates that the initial term of this Agreement shall be from the Effective Date until the close of the then current State of Georgia Fiscal Year (June 30<sup>th</sup>). There may be up to four (4) one-year renewals of the term at the sole discretion of DCH. Renewals are not guaranteed and are contingent upon funding and successful performance by the Contractor. Renewals shall only be effective upon an affirmative action of DCH to expressly renew the Agreement.

## **2.8 Protests**

Any protest in connection with this procurement must be submitted in strict accordance with GTA Rule 665-2-11-.07.

## **2.9 Confidential/Proprietary Information**

- 2.9.1 Offerors are hereby given notice that any and all materials submitted in response to this RFP are subject to the provisions of Georgia's Open Records Act (O.C.G.A. § 50-18-70 et seq.). GTA receipt, review, evaluation or any other act or omission concerning any such information shall not create an acceptance by GTA of any obligation or duty to prevent the disclosure of any such information except as required by the Open Records Act. Offeror's who decide to submit, as part of their Technical Proposal, information that they believe should be exempt from disclosure under the Open Records Act, shall clearly mark, with specificity, only those elements of each document they reasonably consider confidential as "confidential", "proprietary" or "exempt", and state the legal basis for the exemption of each such element with supporting citation(s) to the Georgia Code.
- 2.9.2 Pursuant to Georgia Law, if any information marked as specified above is requested under the Open Records Act, GTA shall make a determination as to whether any exemption actually exists for GTA to deny the request for disclosure. GTA will withhold any such information from public disclosure under the Open Records Act only if GTA determines, in its sole discretion, that there is a legal basis to do so.
- 2.9.3 All information that is not properly identified or marked as specified in the preceding paragraph may be presumed by GTA to be subject to disclosure under the Georgia Open Records Act. Any technical proposal that is marked in its entirety, or in unreasonably large part, as confidential, proprietary and/or exempt may be presumed by GTA to be entirely subject to disclosure under the Georgia Open Records Act without further obligation of GTA to determine what portions of such proposal may, in fact, be excepted from disclosure.
- 2.9.4 Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this section, GTA will not withhold any part of a price proposal or other offer of pricing from disclosure under the Georgia Open Records Act after Contract Award or cancellation of this procurement.

## **2.10 Ownership**

All material submitted regarding this RFP becomes the property of GTA.

## **2.11 Proposal Prices**

The Offeror shall submit firm, fixed pricing that meets the requirements of this RFP for the services/deliverables described in this RFP. Offeror shall not anticipate nor rely on clarifications, discussions, redefinition, or further negotiations with GTA after the Contract Award to adjust Offeror's proposed pricing. Any efforts by Offeror to limit, qualify, caveat, restrict or place conditions on the price being offered may be considered to be a violation of the firm, fixed price submission requirement and may result in the proposal being rejected as non-responsive. Offerors are hereby put on notice that GTA reserves the right to calculate additional charges that will be added to Offeror's proposed prices for evaluation purposes in order to more appropriately evaluate the cost to the State to implement Offeror's proposed solution. In such cases, the impacted Offeror will be notified.

## **2.12 Agreement**

- 2.12.1 References to "GTA" in the following subparagraphs of this Section 2.12 shall mean GTA and/or the applicable signing Agency.
- 2.12.2 GTA's terms and conditions are set forth in the proposed agreement attached in **Appendix B**. Offeror may submit exceptions or alternative language by clearly identifying all changes in bold or in a manner similar to the MS Word "tracked changes" feature. Any undocumented changes made to the Agreement shall be grounds for immediate termination of the Agreement at any time at GTA's sole discretion. GTA reserves the right to reject or negotiate any or all of Offeror's exceptions or alternative language submitted with Offeror's proposal. Only those exceptions or alternative language shall be eligible for such negotiation. GTA reserves the right to modify, add or delete provisions consistent with the successful Offeror's proposal as needed to assure that the final executed Agreement accurately reflects the parties' intent, the procurement and the award.
- 2.12.3 Prior to award GTA may conduct communications, clarifications and/or negotiations (collectively referred to as, "discussions") for the purpose of finalizing the Agreement with either the highest ranked Offeror or the two (2) highest ranked Offerors. These discussions are to be finalized and all exceptions resolved within ten (10) business days of initiation of discussions

or such other period as GTA may authorize. GTA reserves the right not to disclose whether it is conducting concurrent discussions with the highest ranked (i.e. the apparent successful) Offeror and the second highest ranked Offeror. GTA reserves the right not to identify whether an Offeror is the apparent successful Offeror or the second highest ranked Offeror. Notwithstanding this right, GTA shall reveal to an Offeror their identity as the apparent successful Offeror at least three (3) business days prior to issuance of a final deadline for contract finalization to occur, before declaring a failure to reach essential terms and abandoning the apparent successful Offeror's proposal. If however, the agreement is not finalized within such time frame, the apparent successful Offeror's proposal will be abandoned and a new apparent successful Offeror and second highest ranked Offeror identified.

### **2.13 Small and Minority Business Policy and Tax Incentive**

It is the policy of the State of Georgia that small and minority business enterprises shall have a fair and equal opportunity to participate in the State purchasing process. Therefore, the State of Georgia encourages all small and minority business enterprises to compete for, win, and receive contracts for goods, services, and construction. Also, the State encourages all companies to sub-contract portions of any State contract to small and minority business enterprises. There is a Minority Subcontractor Georgia Income Tax Incentive opportunity. See O.C.G.A. § 48-7-38. Offeror's interested in taking advantage of the Georgia income tax incentives, relative to the use of minority subcontractors in the performance of contracts awarded by the State of Georgia, should address their questions to the Governor's Small Business Center, see address below:

**The Governor's Small Business Center  
Re: Minority Subcontractor Tax Incentive  
200 Piedmont Avenue, S.E.  
Suite 1306, West Tower, Floyd Building  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334-9010  
Telephone: (800) 495-0053 or (404) 656-6315  
E-Mail: [gsbc@doas.ga.gov](mailto:gsbc@doas.ga.gov)**

### **2.14 Exceptions to RFP Requirements**

**2.14.1** In the event that this RFP contains certain requirements that have been designated as "[Mandatory]" requirements, failure to meet any

Mandatory will result in the disqualification of Offeror's Proposal. Further, Offerors are not permitted to take exceptions to any requirement labeled as "[Mandatory]."

- 2.14.2 Except for the Mandatories, exceptions to a statement or requirement of this RFP shall not be grounds for an automatic disqualification of an Offeror, regardless of the use of mandatory language (e.g. "must," "shall," "require," or "will") or permissive language (e.g. "may," "should" "prefer," "desires" or "desirable") in this RFP. Offerors must clearly identify, in writing, any and all exceptions as a part of their Proposal. However, any exception may negatively affect Offeror's score.

## **2.15 Miscellaneous**

- 2.15.1 In addition to those rights reserved elsewhere in this RFP, GTA reserves the right to: (a) waive minor variances, irregularities, bid formalities, or defects in a proposal (except for "[Mandatory]" requirements, if any); (b) reject any and all proposals, in whole or in part, submitted in response to this RFP; (c) request Clarifications, conduct Communications or Negotiations (collectively referred to as "discussions") with any Offeror; (d) request resubmissions from all Offerors; and (e) make partial, progressive or multiple awards.
- 2.15.2 **DISCLAIMER: ALL STATISTICAL AND FISCAL INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS RFP AND ITS EXHIBITS, INCLUDING AMENDMENTS AND MODIFICATIONS THERETO, ARE PROVIDED "AS IS," WITHOUT WARRANTY, AND REFLECT THE GTA'S BEST UNDERSTANDING BASED ON INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO GTA AT THE TIME OF RFP PREPARATION. NO INACCURACIES IN SUCH DATA SHALL CONSTITUTE A BASIS FOR AN INCREASE IN OFFEROR'S PROPOSED PRICING OR AN INCREASE IN PAYMENTS TO THE OFFEROR. SUCH INACCURACIES SHALL NOT BE A BASIS FOR DELAY IN PERFORMANCE NOR A BASIS FOR LEGAL RECOVERY OF DAMAGES, ACTUAL, CONSEQUENTIAL OR PUNITIVE, EXCEPT TO THE EXTENT THAT SUCH INACCURACIES CAN BE SHOWN BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT TO BE THE RESULT OF INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION BY GTA.**
- 2.15.3 The successful Contractor will always be responsible for the performance of the subcontractor obligations resulting from the RFP. Accordingly, the Contractor is not relieved by non-performance of any subcontractors.

### **3 Scope of Services**

#### **3.1 Mandatory Requirements**

The Offeror's proposal must meet all of the following **[Mandatory]** requirements to be considered for further evaluation under this RFP (Ref. RFP Section 2.15) Offeror must indicate "yes" or "no" for compliance to the following requirements and provide the required information as proof.

1. **[Mandatory] Healthcare Data Analysis Experience**: Offeror must have a minimum of three (3) years of experience within the past five years with healthcare data analysis in the Medicaid and commercial health care markets, including experience with fraud, waste and abuse analysis.

Required for proof: Provide reference(s) with the contact person's name, address, phone, fax, e-mail, and a brief description of the work performed by the Offeror for the reference and how the experience meets the requirement.

2. **[Mandatory] Healthcare DSS/EIS System Experience**: Offeror must have a minimum of three (3) years experience within the past five years with the maintenance of and licenses for a healthcare Decision Support System and Executive Information System that is specifically designed to supply analysis of healthcare claims and enrollment data.

Required for proof: Provide reference(s), with the contact person's name, address, phone, fax and e-mail and supply details on where the product is used and who developed the software, and a brief description of the work performed by the Offeror for the reference and how the experience meets the requirement.

#### **3.2 General System Requirements**

The Offeror must indicate how the system they provide will meet the following general requirements for their DWS/DSS/EIS proposed solution. Offerors must provide a detailed explanation of how their system will handle the requirements listed below, and where appropriate, give examples of output from a current system. Offeror's systems must:

1. Safeguard and protect Protected Health Information (PHI) in accordance with the HIPAA guidelines. Provide a copy of the offeror's privacy policies.
2. Have the ability to perform queries for retrieval of information on DCH claims, eligibility, provider, and reference data and other data sets and create linkages between the different data sets, which are described in Appendix D.
3. Identify patterns in the behavior of DCH members and providers to better understand the utilization of services and design effective cost containment initiatives using claims, eligibility, provider, and reference data and external data sets.
4. Apply normative data to measure cost, utilization, quality and access of care findings against relevant norms.
5. Enable DCH to respond to legislative requests to determine the impact of policy and reimbursement changes using state of the art healthcare analytical tools that will analyze claims, eligibility, provider, and reference data and other data sets.
6. Allow DCH to model benefit design and program changes to project utilization and cost using all relevant data sets available with a dedicated state-of-the-art healthcare analytical software tool.
7. Interface with the Medicaid Management Information System's (MMIS) Contractor(s), Medicaid Care Management Organizations (CMOs), the Pharmacy Benefit Manager Contractor and the Third Party Administrator(s) for the State Health Benefit and Board of Regents Health Plans. The interface details are described in Appendix D: Data Feeds.
8. Have the capability for access via the Internet for authorized entities.
9. Be able to update claims, eligibility, and provider data, at a minimum, on a monthly basis.
10. Have the ability to cross division lines for data comparison in order for DCH to make informed, data-driven decisions on the financing of healthcare for DCH members utilizing all available data sets including claims, eligibility, provider, and reference data, vital records, incidence rates, provider licensure data, etc.
11. Supply access to benchmark and normative data from other health plans in the Medicaid or employer or both markets.
12. Be able to monitor and benchmark health status by county, eligibility criteria, or provider and provide data and analytical capabilities to build comprehensive disease management and effectiveness programs utilizing claims, eligibility, provider, and

reference data and other data sets such as vital records, statewide incidence rates, etc.

13. Support the data requirements of the Peer Review organizations established under Part B of Title XI of the Social Security Act.
14. Support efficient, economical and effective administration of the Medicaid State Plan, the PeachCare for Kids Program (Georgia's State Children's Health Insurance Program or SCHIP), the State Health Benefit Plan and the Board of Regents Health Plan.
15. Support the reporting requirements of Title XXI, Section 2108 relating to the PeachCare for Kids Program (Georgia's SCHIP).
16. Support the evaluation of DCH healthcare programs including PeachCare for Kids Program (Georgia's SCHIP), the Georgia Better Healthcare Program (Georgia Medicaid's primary care case management program) and aid in the evaluation of rural healthcare issues.
17. Support the detection of fraud, waste and abuse using claims, eligibility, provider, and reference data as well as other data sets that relate to these issues, such as licensure and normative data.
18. Have the ability to draw data from other divisions within DCH or other Departments within the State or from DCH partners to perform healthcare utilization analyses with an eye towards improving health outcomes and health status for citizens across the State.
19. Have predictive modeling capabilities that will, at a minimum, stratify patients into risk pools that can be used for disease state management and similar analyses.
20. Support the evaluation of Medicaid Managed Care reform.

### ***3.3 Specific Technical Requirements***

#### **3.3.1 Integrated Healthcare Database and Data Warehouse Requirements**

The Offeror must indicate how their solution will meet the following requirements for the Integrated Healthcare Database and the Data Warehouse components. For each item, the Offeror must provide a detailed explanation of how their system will handle the requirements and give examples of output from a current system where appropriate.

1. Construction of inpatient admission episodes and outpatient episodes of care, linking all claims to a related episode to aid primarily in analyses related to fraud, waste, and abuse, and quality of care.

2. Assignment of Diagnosis Related Groups (DRG) codes and Major Diagnostic Category (MDC) codes to all inpatient cases.
3. Assignment of outpatient classifications (e.g., MDCs, treatment groups, procedure groups).
4. A method to track providers and to profile their case-mix and their expenditures.
5. Creation of subsets and internally generated norms.
6. Automatic case-mix and age-sex adjustment capabilities.
7. Maintain at least sixty (60) months of detail-level medical and pharmacy claims, managed care encounter data, member, provider, reference data, and other healthcare related data as needed on-line and in reports from all entities providing data.
8. Carry all financial fields to the penny.
9. Automatic integration of eligibility and claims data for the purpose of calculating rates and tracking cost per capita.
10. Capability to access, integrate and report data from multiple files within multiple subsystems.
11. Standardization of data into a common format to enable normative comparisons.
12. Employment of proven database design and data management methodologies to validate, edit, scrub, and transform raw data into an analytically ready database, including the assessment and improvement of the quality of data contained in the database system.
13. An open, non-proprietary operational data store built upon a relational database schema that enables easy cross-program, member level, and episode level reporting and analysis.
14. Integration of clinical, service quality, and health status attributes critical to medical management and planning efforts into the data model.
15. The operational data store platform must be relational and scalable in nature. The database must be in at least third normal form (3NF) and capable of supporting large and complex data sets and exponential growth in total database size over the life of the contract without negative impacts on system performance or flexibility. The system must allow end-users open accessibility to disparate data sets and the ability to easily extract and view data. The database must allow for parallel processing enabling the end-user to perform efficient ad hoc querying to the greatest extent possible.

### 3.3.2 Decision Support System Requirements

The Offeror must indicate how their solution will meet the following requirements for the Decision Support System component. For each item, the Offeror must provide a detailed explanation of how their system will handle the requirements and give examples of output from a current system where appropriate.

#### 3.3.2.1 Functional Capabilities

1. Capability to summarize and compare services provided to members or by providers on the basis of selection criteria specified by DCH.
2. Quality of care measurement capabilities using established key indicators of quality.
3. Readmission analysis capabilities.
4. Modeling and trend analysis capabilities for the purposes of:
  - a. Provider performance profiling;
  - b. Rate testing;
  - c. Projecting the effects of various proposed policy changes on claims processing, budget, quality of care;
  - d. Budget forecasting (a variety of forecasting models must be available); and
  - e. Interactive modeling capability, including but not limited to:
    - i. Ability to conduct simulation and regression analysis to predict outcomes;
    - ii. Support statistical inference or has built-in statistical inference tools for hypothesis testing;
    - iii. Ability to input user defined variables for analysis;
    - iv. Option to set up models on future benefit changes such as deductible/co-pay, adding or terminating coverage that will be helpful in estimating the financial effects of benefit design changes;
    - v. User ability to specify factors for inflation, change in use patterns, population changes, incurred but not reported (IBNR) claims (including determining lag/completion factors), and retention rates;
    - vi. Capability to allow projections for single, family and retiree premiums and calculate the impact of HMO selection on indemnity plan rates; and

- vii. Capability to profile cost and use performance of specified physicians or hospitals.
5. Automatic statistical capabilities both on-line and in reports – these capabilities, at a minimum, will include: sum, mean, unique count, median, mode, variance, standard deviation, coefficient of variation, minimum and maximum values, and range of values.
6. Automated normative comparison with national, regional, and State level medical databases with Medicaid plans as well as public, and private sector commercial plans.
7. Capability to report all claims data by date of service and by date of payment.
8. Availability of graphics output, including geographic mapping of data elements.
9. For service and eligibility data, capability to apply various lags for incurred but not reported (IBNR) claims and eligibility counts with user choice of lags.
10. Capability to allow for the analysis and reporting of data on the basis of any combination of data dimensions.
11. Capability to randomly select samples of claims, eligibles, or providers.
12. Reports must include a full set of standard reports and algorithms designed for detecting healthcare fraud, waste, and abuse.
13. Besides the ability to provide ad hoc and “canned” reports, the software must allow independent analysis and study, providing drill down capabilities to the level of individual participant, provider, or claim line.
14. Utilization analysis at the clinical level for inpatient and outpatient services.
15. The ability to build custom formulas for data interpolation.

#### 3.3.2.2. Application Features

1. Ability to schedule reports to run and sends automatically to select addressees through e-mail.
2. User has access to individual record, claims, detail level data and the system displays a capability to efficiently download large reports where access is immediate (“on-demand”) and performs quickly.
3. Either has as an inherent feature, or has the ability to be used with, Geo Coding technology.

4. The application should have a Graphical User Interface (GUI) or a browser based interface with a seamless integration with the standard Windows operating system environment and an on-line/contextual help menu and reference information.
5. Exception highlighting where thresholds have been met. This feature entails the system being "proactive" in notifying the user that certain criteria have been met. This could be a DSS and/or EIS function that will either prompt the user to access a certain query or report and/or deliver it automatically to the user in the form of an e-mail or an Intranet posting.
6. Guards patient confidentiality by offering multiple levels of controlled access and encryption of personal identifiers (select individuals must have the ability to access un-encrypted patient identifiers without the Contractors active participation).
7. Multidimensional reporting capabilities, which would approximate or be superior to the Pivot Table function of the most current version of Excel.
8. Flexible querying interface similar to the most current version of Microsoft Access where the user has the option of creating a query with straight Structured Query Language (SQL); a graphical interface showing table structure, relationships and has built in expression "builders"; or even a "natural language" interface where a user could just type in a question and the system will convert this to SQL or other code.
9. Interactive, adjustable time-out feature for inactivity where the user will be notified and "timed-out" after specified period of inactivity.
10. User friendly access to all of the application features on-line without the need for the user to write SQL;
11. Access to a matrix-driven report request facility with the capability for DCH staff and other authorized users to produce ad hoc reports via PC workstation;
12. Flexible interface/downloading capabilities (to the most current versions of Excel, Access, or other standard PC-based software) available to users on-line without the need for programming expertise.
13. Flexibility to define and access subsets of the full database based on any data variable;
14. Generation of norms (national, regional, State specific, and customizable) and the ability to incorporate norms from a third source software and to create normative comparisons from any subset of the full database;

15. Ability to store data subsets, custom reports, and customized norms in user specific on-line libraries;
16. Ability to create sets of reports that can be scheduled to run following each monthly database update and at user-defined times;
17. Access to the DSS/EIS via PC workstations required at other designated office locations, at the fiscal agent's office, and at other locations designated by DCH, as well as remote access via a secure connection over the internet;
18. Provide query and ad-hoc reporting capabilities to support information management needs of DCH and all other authorized users.
19. Contain a directory of all data elements enabling users to easily and quickly determine the validity or completeness of various data elements; additionally, a centralized repository for metadata including data definitions, data relationships, screen and report formats, and data completion factors compared to a norm (e.g. Offeror standards, Georgia historical standards, or industry conventions) must be available on-line.
20. Provide an audit trail of all updates/changes to the data including the nature of the change, when it occurred (date/time stamp), and who was involved in making the change and authorizing the change.

### **3.3.3 Executive Information System (EIS) Requirements**

The Offeror must indicate how their solution will meet the following requirements for the Executive Information System component. For each item, the Offeror must provide a detailed explanation of how their system will handle the requirements and give examples of output from a current system where appropriate.

1. A menu of reports, charts, maps, and graphs that are available in a "view-ready" and "print-ready" format in a point and click mode (Windows environment) without the need for specific commands.
2. All reports, charts, maps, and graphs in the menu are developed from the latest data available in the database system used for the DSS.
3. The proposed EIS will have "geographical information system" (GIS) capabilities either by using a commercial off the shelf software or custom applications developed as a part of the EIS; the GIS must be equipped with and maintain complete and updated geographical

- databases at the: national level, State level, health district level for the State of Georgia, county level, city level, and zip code level.
4. All reports, charts, graphs, and GIS displays must be printable on all contractor/state-supplied printers local or on the DCH network and must be transferable to other applications (i.e. Microsoft Word and PowerPoint).
  5. Predefined reports, charts, graphs, and maps will be proposed by the Offerors and refined during the requirements analysis phase with input from DCH. The Offerors will also be required to provide the capability to change, add or delete the EIS menu items to meet DCH's ongoing requirements.
  6. The EIS must include an extensive menu with:
    - a. The ability to view reports, graphs, charts, and the GIS displays in multiple formats and levels.
    - b. The ability for DCH managers to view a predefined number of reports, charts, and graphs containing the latest data available in the DSS databases;
    - c. The ability to display Medicaid, SHBP and BOR demographic data by Plan (e.g. Medicaid PCCM, PeachCare, SHBP, BOR, SHBP High Option, BOR PPO, or HMO) on geographical maps at State, health district, county, city, and zip code levels;
    - d. Ability to see aggregated status data from non-claims portion of the DW (i.e. socio-economic, health status, planning, and quality data); and
  7. Web-enabled features: for other customers such as the general public (providers, DCH Board, legislatures, etc.) the DCH may require certain web-enabled EIS components. These features will require the following at a minimum: secure access to aggregated, non-confidential data, browser-compatible interface that functions like a web site, and customization to meet needs of specific user groups (i.e. providers, plan administrators, media/general public, oversight agencies).

### **3.3.4 Data Mart Requirements**

The Offeror must indicate how their solution will meet the following requirements for the Data Mart component. For each item, the Offeror must provide a detailed explanation of how their system will handle the requirements and give examples from a current system where appropriate.

1. Support for stratified random sampling with appropriate statistics (i.e. list of members or claims), and generation of random sampling with associated statistics.
2. The ability to import other data sets, and link to the ODS and the Data Warehouse, and facilitate analyses of multiple data sets.
3. Flexible analytic tool and application that can be used to very quickly access data and perform data queries.
4. The ability to export very large data sets (up to at least 1 gigabyte) easily to the DCH network.
5. Seamless integration of the most current version of Excel, Access, SAS, and other reporting packages.
6. Create complex study groups across multiple data sets.
7. The ability to run complicated data analysis and queries (including the ability to "tag" data, create rollups, create lookup databases, etc.)
8. Automate complicated data analysis and queries (similar to the macro function in Excel).
9. Flexibility to create, access, and store tables created from user queries of the full database.
10. Includes the ability to easily create standard healthcare metrics on the database (PMPM, unique count of patients, average monthly enrollment, etc.)

### **3.4 Security Requirements**

The Offeror must indicate how their solution will meet the following security requirements. For each item, the Offeror must provide a detailed explanation of how their system will handle the requirements and give examples of output from a current system where appropriate.

1. There must be an access control mechanism in place to support individual accountability (e.g., passwords are associated with a user identifier that is assigned to a single individual).
2. There must be preventive measures in place to protect user authentication mechanism (e.g., passwords are transmitted and stored with one-way encryption to prevent anyone [including the System Administrator] from reading the passwords in clear-text).
3. Passwords must be checked against a dictionary of disallowed passwords (e.g. same as username, too short, too simple).
4. Passwords must be encrypted while in transmission.
5. System must be capable of establishing an Access Control List or register of the users and the types of access they are permitted.

- (i.e., list of users and their permissions to keep users from performing administrator type activities).
6. Security software must allow system owners to restrict the access rights of other system users, the general support system administrator, or operators to the system programs, data, or files (i.e., users/administrators must use program to manipulate files, not operating system).
  7. Encryption must be used to prevent unauthorized access to sensitive files as part of the system access control procedures (i.e., files can't be read through normal operating viewing procedures).
  8. Users must be restricted from accessing the operating system, other applications, or other system resources not needed in the performance of their duties (i.e., no O/S-level access for normal users).
  9. Security controls must detect unauthorized transaction attempts by authorized and/or unauthorized users and notify interested parties of such attempts (i.e., break-in attempts or users trying to go beyond their limits).
  10. Users must not be allowed to delegate access permissions to other users (i.e., users cannot let other users access their areas).
  11. System must allow for automatically locking/blanking associated display screens after certain period of user inactivity.
  12. System must allow for automatically disconnecting inactive users after a certain period of user inactivity or require the user to re-enter unique password before reconnecting to the system.
  13. System must provide mechanisms for monitoring consecutive failed access attempts (e.g. incorrect password) and setting threshold to be reached before acting on consecutive failed access attempts (number of failed attempts. System must allow for account to be locked after threshold is reached.
  14. System must provide audit trail support accountability by providing a trace of user actions (i.e., show everything a user id and everything he/she did from sign on to sign off).
  15. Audit trail must support after-the-fact investigations of how, when, and why normal operations ceased (i.e., reports written and saved in readable text to include time, date, type of intrusion attempt, machine name(s)/ip address(es)) .
  16. Audit trail must include sufficient information to establish what events occurred and who (or what) caused them. Specify the following:
    - a. Type of event
    - b. When the event occurred

- c. User ID associated with the event
- d. Program or command used to initiate the event.
- 17. Security-related documentation must be included for administrators and network managers to ensure proper security controls have been set.
- 18. Security training documentation must be included to address the specific security controls of the system.
- 19. System must provide web based access with security provisioning protocols such as SSL, IPsec VPN, etc.
- 20. Sensitive data must be encrypted in stored state and in transit.

### **3.5 Training/Support Requirements**

The Offeror must provide a detailed description of how their solution will meet the following requirements related to training and support for DCH.

1. The Offeror will have an account team that is dedicated to the Georgia DWS/DSS/EIS contract, located in the Atlanta area (within a 50 mile radius of the main DCH office) and consist, at a minimum, of the following:
  - a. Project Manager, who has the authority to make decisions for this contract;
  - b. Analysts (2); and
  - c. Administrative Assistant;
2. Training program for all DCH and other authorized users on the DWS/DSS/EIS tools and specific training for dedicated staff using the DWS/DSS/EIS tools to find and investigate healthcare fraud, waste, and abuse. Training sessions in the base contract beyond the initial training of users at DCH should include 2 training sessions per product and 2 additional sessions to be used at DCH's discretion.
3. On-going support activities with DCH, (i.e. analytical, data management, or technical support) and training for any changes or upgrades in software or databases during the course of the contract.
4. A complete Data Warehouse System/Decision Support component/Executive Information component user manual and field descriptions/valid values manual to include annual reviews for updates.
5. The Contractor's computer and communications system must initially be capable of handling at least seventy (70) simultaneous users at DCH for the DSS. The systems must be capable of increased capacity up to a maximum of one hundred (100) concurrent users

at various DCH, State, or Offeror sites. The EIS must support one hundred (100) users initially with increased capacity up to one hundred and twenty (120). The DM must support thirty (30) users initially with increased capacity up to forty (40).

6. The Contractor will be required to maintain the computer hardware on which the databases will be stored and operated plus the schedule for the purchase, installation and maintenance of this hardware, and the network or other computer equipment required at DCH to integrate DWS/DSS/EIS with existing DCH network plus the schedule for the purchase, installation and maintenance of this equipment and any other hardware or telecommunication equipment needed to accomplish the operation of the DWS/DSS/EIS interface.
7. The proposed system, equipment configuration, and platform must account for growth and free technological upgrades, including upgrades or changes in software through the life of the contract.
8. Provide ample support and personnel to work with DCH on large-scale projects and analyses, including but not limited to: healthcare fraud and abuse analysis; provider profiling; analyzing the cost drivers in the various DCH healthcare plans, providing monthly management reports for various programs, etc. This work must be included in the base cost of the contract (i.e. as a consulting retainer). The support provided here should be flexible as some projects will be ongoing and some will be one-time analyses.

### **3.6 Offeror Qualifications**

#### **3.6.1 Offerors Experience**

1. Describe the offeror's experience in analysis and evaluation related to Medicaid Fee For Service Plans, giving samples of work with other clients.
2. Describe the offeror's experience in analysis and evaluation related to Medicaid Managed Care, giving samples of work with other clients.
3. Describe the offeror's experience in analysis and evaluation related to commercial health care plans, giving samples of work with other clients.

### **3.6.2 Current Client References**

The Offeror must provide four (4) references, who are or have been clients of Offeror, of which one must be Medicaid related and one must be a commercial health plan. Please include the name of the contact person, their address, telephone and fax numbers and email address, as well as a brief description of the work performed by the Offeror for the reference.

DCH reserves the right to contact reference as well as develop its own references.

### **3.6.3 Staffing Plan**

1. Staffing Proposal: The Offeror must present a staffing proposal that illustrates the best mix of skills and experience to achieve the project objectives.
2. Key Personnel: Describe and provide names, resumes and responsibilities of all Key Personnel, whether employed by either Offeror or any subcontractor of Offeror, and time commitments of proposed staff (full/part time and/or number of man days/months/years/ per person over the course of the implementation phase). This key personnel includes the project manager, database managers, and analysts.
3. Organizational Chart: Provide an organizational chart for the personnel who will be providing deliverables and/or performing the services requested during the implementation and operational phases. Changes of Key Personnel during the life of the contract are subject to DCH approval.

### **3.6.4 Subcontractors**

1. Named Subcontractors: The Offeror shall disclose the planned use of any subcontractor that will perform twenty percent (20%) or more of the services or work effort described in the RFP. In addition, Offeror may choose to identify any other subcontractor that Offeror believes may add value. Offeror should note that Named Subcontractors may impact the evaluation of Offeror's proposal.
2. Named Subcontractor Information: Offeror shall provide the following information: Name and address of each Named Subcontractor and the work the subcontractor will be performing.

3. Subcontractor Approval: Adding or changing Named Subcontractors during the contract requires prior DCH approval.
4. Subcontractor Performance: The Successful Offeror will be responsible for the performance of any subcontractors and will not be relieved by non-performance of any sub-contractors. Offeror shall provide a summary of qualifications, years of experience, and references for all Named Subcontractors, as well as identifying key personnel working for the subcontractor(s).

### **3.6.5 Financial Information**

1. DCH reserves the right to request evidence of an Offeror's financial capability or stability if DCH has a question as to such Offeror's abilities.

### **3.7 Implementation**

1. Project Plan: Submit a detailed project management plan that includes items such as: methodology, processes, procedures, work breakdown structure (WBS), and schedule, demonstrating the Offeror's understanding of the Scope of Work as outlined in the DWS/DSS/EIS RFP. The following milestones must be included in the project plan.

#### A. Implementation Phase:

- Final Project Work Plan shall be delivered to DCH no later than 15 calendar days after contract signing
- Data Conversion and Downloading shall be completed by September 1, 2005
- Required staffing levels shall be in place by September 1, 2005
- Data enhancements/corrections shall be completed or identified in a corrective action plan by November 1, 2005
- Data Mart data transfer shall be completed by December 1, 2005
- EIS Reports shall be completely designed by December 1, 2005
- Training materials, equipment, and documents shall be submitted for approval by December 1, 2005
- Operational Readiness Testing shall be completed by December 16, 2005
- Installation of the base system and all necessary equipment shall be completed by January 3, 2006

- All actions set forth in the corrective action plan shall be completed by January 3, 2006
- Implementation Phase shall be completed by January 3, 2006
- Final user training for all products shall be completed by March 1, 2006

#### Operational Phase

- Databases shall be updated at least on a monthly basis within 10 calendar days of receipt of data.
- The vendor and DCH shall schedule a monthly status meeting to cover any outstanding or ongoing issues or projects involving the DWS/DSS/EIS and/or the DWS/DSS/EIS vendor.

### **3.8 Contractor Performance**

Offeror must describe how they will meet the following performance requirements:

1. The database will be updated monthly during the operational phase of the contract within ten calendar days of receipt of the data.
2. Provide DCH initial training for all users of the DWS/DSS/EIS products by the deadline indicated in the project plans.
3. Provide DCH telephone support for technical and analytic problems Monday through Friday, 8 AM to 5 PM.
4. The system must be available 24-7 except for scheduled down time approved by DCH. Scheduled down time must not occur during business hours (Monday through Friday, 8 AM to 5 PM).
5. The Offeror will create data backups and implement the proper recovery processes.

### **3.9 Disaster Recovery**

Provide the Offeror's Disaster Recovery plan that will be implemented in the event that the Offeror's facility experiences a disaster (for example, power outages, computer virus infections, etc.) that impacts fulfilling the requirements of this RFP. This plan must identify the Offeror's disaster recovery location and equipment, testing of the plan, and backup & recovery procedures of services within 12 hours. DCH reserves the right to conduct a site visit of the Offeror's disaster recovery location before contract award.

## **4 Proposal Submission**

### **4.1 Economy of Presentation**

Each proposal shall be prepared simply and economically, providing straightforward, concise delineation of Offeror's capabilities to satisfy the requirements of this RFP. Fancy bindings, colored displays, and promotional materials are not required. Emphasis on each proposal must be on completeness and clarity of content. To expedite the evaluation of proposals, it is essential that Offerors follow the format and instructions contained herein. Each Proposal should be bound in a 3 ring, 8.5" x 11" binder with an index and tabbed section dividers should delimit each section.

### **4.2 Submission of Proposals**

Proposals must be submitted in three (3) separate parts: an Administrative Package, a Technical Proposal and a Price Proposal. The proposal packages must be separately sealed, and identified as follows:

**Proposal of (Your Company's Name):**

**Type of Package:** (Administrative, Technical or Price)

**RFP Number: GTA000211 – Data Warehouse System with  
Decision Support and Executive Information  
Capabilities**

**Proposal Opening Date and Time:**

(As determined in Appendix A – Schedule of Events)

**Any proposal received after the due date and time MAY BE rejected. GTA's Time Stamp shall determine time. The acceptance of late proposals shall be governed by GTA Rule 665-2-4-.06.**

Submit all proposals to the attention of the Contracting Officer at the address provided on the Cover Page of this RFP.

### **4.3 Administrative Package Content**

The Offeror must provide two (2) signed original hardcopies and two (2) CD-ROM copies, clearly labeled, "[Offeror's Name] – Administrative Package," of the following Administrative documents:

- Offeror's Information Page (see page 2 of this RFP)
- Signed Proposal Certification Letter (see page 3 of this RFP)
- Statement of Responsibility Certification Form (see page 5 of this RFP)
- Signed Addenda Signature Page(s) (if applicable)

#### **4.4 Technical Proposal Content**

In order to facilitate the State's evaluation of the proposals, the Offeror must provide a complete description of how each requirement will be met. Submitting merely an acknowledgement (e.g. "Read and Understood") may provide insufficient information to effectively evaluate the offered solution and, therefore, may have an adverse impact on Offeror's score.

The Offeror's Technical Proposal must provide its approach/solution to all of the requirements in the Scope of Services Section 3.0. **The Technical Proposal must not contain any proposed prices.** The Offeror's responses to the requirements must be arranged in the sequence in which the requirements are referenced, and formatted with responses inserted directly after the requirement or request, unless otherwise specified. Specific answers may be cross-referenced throughout Offeror's response to avoid duplication of material. Additional information may be submitted to accompany the proposal. In submitting additional information, please mark it as supplemental to the required response.

#### **Number of Copies**

One (1) original version (clearly labeled as, "ORIGINAL"), ten (10) hard copies and three (3) copies on CD-ROM of Offeror's ENTIRE Technical Proposal. Each CD-ROM must be clearly labeled, "[Offeror's Name] – Technical Proposal and RFP number."

#### **Required Sections**

- Offeror's Response to Section 3.1, Mandatory Requirements
- Offeror's Response to Sections 3.2 through 3.9 Requirements

## **4.5 Price Proposal Content**

Appendix C contains instructions for submitting Offeror's proposed pricing. All Offerors must follow the instructions in this appendix carefully.

### Number of Copies

One (1) original version (clearly labeled as, "ORIGINAL"), four (4) hard copies and three (3) copies on CD-ROM of Offeror's ENTIRE Price Proposal submitted in a package separately sealed from the "ORIGINAL" Price Proposal. Each CD-ROM must be clearly labeled, "[Offeror's Name] – Price Proposal and RFP number."

## **5 Evaluation**

### **5.1 General**

An evaluation team consisting of a technical evaluation committee and a price evaluation committee will conduct a competitive Best Value source selection in accordance with GTA Rules and the approach outlined in this Section 5. Proposals are eligible for a maximum of 1000 points (700 Technical/300 Price). Any proposal, which does not meet one or more of the Mandatories, will be disqualified. The State reserves the right to reject any and/or all proposals.

#### **5.1.1 Communications and Clarifications Process**

Written Communications and Clarifications are not required, may not occur, and are not intended to substitute for a well-written Proposal or to facilitate negotiations of any Proposal. All Responsive Offerors' responses to written Communications and Clarifications: 1) must be submitted in writing (e-mail and fax permitted); 2) are incorporated into and become part of Offeror's Proposal; and 3) can and will be relied upon by the Evaluation Team, the GTA, and the State.

#### **5.1.2 Oral Presentations (Optional)**

After the preliminary technical evaluation, some Offerors may be requested to make one or more oral presentations regarding their Proposals, at dates, times and locations determined by the GTA. The purpose of such presentations will be to allow Responsive Offerors to explain their proposed solutions and key points of their Proposals. Additionally, Offerors may be asked questions in order to provide a better understanding of how the Responsive Offeror's proposed solution will meet the requirements of the RFP. It is critical that Offerors bring staff familiar with the detailed contents and solutions presented within Responsive Offeror's Proposal in order to maximize the productivity of the Oral Presentation sessions. Any and all discussions that occur during Oral Presentation sessions shall be considered Communications as the term is defined in Section 665-2-1-.02 (f) of the GTA rules. Responsive Offerors must be aware that, under GTA Rules, Communications shall not be used to cure material omissions in the Proposal. Oral presentations are not required, may not occur, and are not substitutes for a well-written Proposal.

### **5.1.3 Best and Final Offers (Optional)**

At any time after the initiation of negotiations, Offerors may be invited to submit best and final offers (BAFOs). At this time, offerors can make their prices as competitive as possible and address questions and concerns specifically raised during negotiation/discussions. Revisions submitted by Offerors as part of their BAFOs may require the evaluation team to revise their scoring. In the event that a Competitive Range has been determined, requests for BAFOs shall be limited to those Offerors in the Competitive Range.

### **5.1.4 Financial Information**

GTA reserves the right to request evidence of an Offeror's financial capability or stability and to conduct additional due diligence in this area at the sole discretion of GTA or at the request of any agency that will receive the benefits or services under any contract awarded pursuant to this RFP.

## ***5.2 Mandatory & Administrative Review of Proposals***

- 5.2.1 The Contracting Officer will be responsible for performing a review of the administrative requirements set forth in the RFP. The technical evaluation committee will be responsible for verifying if each Proposal is compliant with the technical Mandatories. The price evaluation committee will be responsible for verifying if each Proposal is compliant with the price Mandatories set forth in the RFP (if any).
- 5.2.2 Failure to meet one or more Mandatories will result in the disqualification of the Offeror's proposal and such proposal will be removed from further evaluation. Proposals that (i) are determined to be materially incomplete; or (ii) Offerors that do not satisfy the administrative requirements of the RFP in an acceptable timeframe as determined by GTA; may be declared non-responsive and rejected with no further evaluation.
- 5.2.3 If at any time during the Evaluation Process an Offeror's proposal is determined to have failed to meet one or more Mandatories, such proposal shall be disqualified and removed from further evaluation.

### 5.3 Technical Proposal Evaluation

- 5.3.1 A technical evaluation committee comprised of State employees will assess the merits of the Technical Proposal. The State may engage one or more consultants or attorneys to assist in an advisory capacity. The committee will review the responses to the technical requirements of the RFP and evaluate the proposals using the technical evaluation factors set forth later in this Section. Incomplete, inconsistent or inaccurate responses in the Technical Proposal may have a negative impact on the technical score.
- 5.3.2 Offerors are urged to convey the technical, management, key personnel and other factors necessary to meet the requirements of the RFP in sufficient detail within their written Proposal, rather than to seek to negotiate or provide such factors through written Communications, and Clarifications.
- 5.3.3 Technical proposals will be eligible for a maximum of 700 points distributed amongst the following areas as follows:

Technical Evaluation Areas	Available Points
General System Requirements	50
Database and Data Warehouse	75
Decision Support Requirements	100
Executive Information System Requirements	50
Data Mart Requirements	50
Security Requirements	50
Training/Support Requirements	100
Offeror Qualifications	75
Implementation	50
Contractor Performance	50
Disaster Recovery	50
<b>Maximum Available Technical Points</b>	<b>700</b>

The technical evaluation committee will complete raw scores, on a consensus basis, in each of the Evaluation Areas listed in the table above. The sum of the raw scores will be totaled giving each scored proposal an overall raw technical score.

Raw Technical scores will then be prorated as follows:

- Step 1 - Proposal receiving the highest overall raw technical score will be awarded the maximum available points (700 points).
- Step 2 - Remaining proposals will receive prorated scores utilizing the following formula:

$$X/N \times 700 = \text{Prorated Score}$$

Where: X = Overall Raw Technical Score of proposal under consideration

N = Highest Overall Raw Technical Score given to a proposal

#### 5.3.4 Competitive Range

GTA reserves the right, at the end of technical evaluations, to establish a Competitive Range of less than all Offerors that submitted initial Proposals. The competitive range shall be 75% (525 points) or more of the available raw technical points. Those Offerors not included in such Competitive Range will be removed from further consideration. If GTA does not establish a Competitive Range, then for purposes of GTA Rule 665-2-4-.02, all Offerors (other than those that failed to meet mandatories (if any) or were otherwise disqualified) shall be deemed to be within the Competitive Range.

### **5.4 Price Proposal Evaluation**

A price evaluation committee comprised of State employees will conduct an analysis and scoring of the Price Proposal. The State may engage one or more consultants to assist in an advisory capacity. Price proposals will be eligible for a maximum of 300 points, which will be allocated as follows:

- Step 1 - The Price Proposal determined to offer GTA the lowest price will be awarded the maximum available points (300 points).
- Step 2 - Remaining Price Proposals will receive prorated scores utilizing the following formula:

$$X/N \times 300 = \text{Price Score}$$

Where: X = dollar amount representing overall lowest price

N = price associated with the Pricing Proposal under consideration

- 5.4.1 If at any time during the Evaluation Process, an Offeror's proposal is determined to have failed to meet one or more Mandatories, such proposal shall be disqualified and removed from further evaluation.
- 5.4.2 If at any time during the Evaluation Process a Competitive Range is established, and an Offeror's proposal is determined to fall outside of the Competitive Range, such proposal shall be removed from further evaluation.
- 5.4.3 Based on their evaluation, the price evaluation committee will provide scores for each Offeror that has not been disqualified. The price evaluation committee will transmit its scores to the GTA Contracting Officer for use in further evaluation in accord with this RFP or for any purposes permitted by the Rules of the GTA.
- 5.4.4 At anytime during the evaluation process, the price evaluation committee may, but is not required to, engage in written Communications, Clarifications or Negotiations with Offerors in regards to their respective proposals. Written Communications and Clarifications or negotiations are not required, may not occur, and are not intended to substitute for a well-written Proposal.

### ***5.5 Selection of Successful Offeror and Contract Award***

- 5.5.1 After the conclusion of the Technical and Price evaluations, Prorated Technical Proposal scores and Price Proposal scores will be combined for each of the remaining Offerors to determine the apparent successful Offeror, and the ranking of the remaining Offerors.
- 5.5.2 The Contract Award shall be made to the responsible Offeror whose written proposal is determined to be the most advantageous to the State, taking into account all evaluation factors set forth in this RFP, subject to DCH and such Offeror's ability to agree and enter into a final Agreement (see subsections below). Responsibility shall be determined in accordance with GTA Rules and responsibility criteria set forth in this RFP.
- 5.5.3 DCH reserves the right to reject or negotiate any or all of Offeror's additional terms or conditions, or Offeror's proposed modifications to DCH's stated terms or conditions. GTA reserves the right to modify, add or delete provisions consistent with the successful Offeror's proposal as needed to assure that the final executed Agreement accurately reflects the parties' intent, the procurement and the award.

- 5.5.4 Prior to award, the highest ranked Offeror (i.e. the apparent successful Offeror) may be required to enter into communications, clarifications and/or negotiations (collectively referred to as, "discussions") with the DCH to resolve any contractual differences before an award is made. These discussions are to be finalized and all exceptions resolved within ten (10) business days of notification of intent to award or such other period as DCH may authorize.
- 5.5.5 In addition to discussions with the apparent successful Offeror, DCH reserves the right to enter into discussions, including but not limited to negotiations with the second highest ranked Offeror at any time, including concurrent with discussions between DCH and the apparent successful Offeror.
- 5.5.6 GTA reserves the right not to disclose whether it is conducting concurrent discussion with the apparent successful Offeror and the second highest ranked Offeror. GTA reserves the right not to identify whether an Offeror is the apparent successful Offeror or the second highest ranked Offeror. Notwithstanding this right, GTA shall reveal to an Offeror their identity as the apparent successful Offeror at least seven (7) calendar days prior to issuance of a final deadline for contract finalization to occur, before declaring a failure to reach essential terms and abandoning the apparent successful Offeror's proposal.
- 5.5.7 If however, the contract is not finalized within such time frame, the apparent successful Offeror's proposal will be abandoned and a new apparent successful Offeror and second highest ranked Offeror identified. The process will then proceed as above, subject to DCH's right to cancel this solicitation, until an Agreement is finalized and awarded to a substitute contract awardee or no potential substitute contract awardees remain.

## Appendix A – Schedule of Events

Schedule of Events	
Release of RFP to the Georgia Procurement Registry	1/26/2005
<b>Deadline for Written Questions via email</b> Email Questions to: Deirdre Johnson, GTA Contracting Officer at <a href="mailto:djohnson@gta.ga.gov">djohnson@gta.ga.gov</a>	2/9/2005 (Vendor's close of business)
Responses to Written Questions (posted to the Registry)	2/18/2005 (on/about)
<b>Proposal Due Date</b>	3/11/2005, 2:00 PM, ET
<p>The Contract Award of this RFP is subject to the evaluation criteria as set forth in Section 5 (Proposal Evaluation) and any subsequent negotiations with the apparent successful Offeror. Therefore, the Contract Award date will be made within 120 days of the Proposal Due Date. The start of work for this project will be determined during negotiations with the apparent successful Offeror(s).</p>	
<p><b>Special Instructions:</b> For the Georgia Procurement Registry, go to the GTA website and select "Procurement," then "Bid Information" and "Search" to locate the link for the RFP listing and related documents. The Contractor Officer may amend dates listed above as appropriate. Interested vendors should monitor the Georgia Procurement Registry on a daily basis for updates as well as the posting of the Notice of Award.</p>	

## **Appendix B – Master Agreement**

**See document posted via internet at the Georgia Procurement Registry RFP webpage.**

## Appendix C – Price Proposal

The price proposal must be submitted in the following format:

Offeror Name: \_\_\_\_\_

PART A: IMPLEMENTATION PHASE COSTS (State FY 2006, July 1 – Dec 31)	
Medicaid/PeachCare for Kids	
State Health Benefit Plan/Board of Regents Health Plan	
<b>TOTAL IMPLEMENTATION COSTS</b>	

PART B: OPERATIONAL PHASE COSTS							
	State FY 2006 (Jan 1 – June 30)	State FY 2007	State FY 2008	State FY 2009	State FY 2010	State FY 2011	State FY 2012
Medicaid/PeachCare for Kids							
Training of users							
Operations of DWS/DSS/EIS software and storage							
Vendor consulting/report generation							
Monthly conversion of data							
License renewal fee (for proprietary software)							
<b>TOTAL OPERATIONAL COSTS for Medicaid/PeachCare for Kids</b>							
State Health Benefit Plan/Board of Regents Health Plan							
Training of users							
Operations of DWS/DSS/EIS software and storage							
Vendor consulting/report generation							
Monthly conversion of data							
License renewal fee (for proprietary software)							
<b>TOTAL OPERATIONAL COSTS for State Health Benefit Plan/Board of Regents Health Plan</b>							
<b>TOTAL OPERATIONAL COSTS (Both plans)</b>							

Total Contract Value for ALL Requirements including G&A\*. This figure will be used in the evaluation:

Part A \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Part B \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Total \$ \_\_\_\_\_

\*G & A: **all** General and Administrative Costs, Profits, Travel, per diem, and **ALL** costs associated with this contract.

---

Offeror's Company Name

---

Authorized Signature

---

Print Name

---

Date

## **Appendix D – Data Feeds**

**See document posted via internet at the Georgia Procurement Registry RFP webpage.**