

Questions and Answers #1
CATS+ TORFP for Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) Services F50B0600003

Ladies and Gentlemen:

This list of questions and responses is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above referenced TORFP. The State's responses are italicized. The statements and interpretations contained in responses to any questions, whether responded to verbally or in writing, are not binding on the Department unless the TORFP is expressly amended. Nothing in any response to any questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the Department of any statement or interpretation on the part of the entity asking the question.

1. Question: Page # 45 and 48 Section | Subsection 5.4.1 Section Content for Clarification All pages of both TO Proposal volumes shall be consecutively numbered from beginning (Page 1) to end (Page "x"). Does the page numbering requirement include attachments and forms? If so, on page 48, it says we can't alter forms; Can the State please clarify if adding customized header/footer for page numbering considered alteration?

Response: Altering forms would be considered altering format, not the header/footer.

2. Question: Page # 46 Section | Subsection 5.4.2 | 5 Draft Risk Assessment: Identification and prioritization of risks inherent in meeting the requirements in TORFP Section 3 – Scope of Work Can the State please confirm that the Section Number and Title were mislabeled? The RFP indicates that Section 2 is Scope of Work and Section 3 is General Requirements.

Response: Please refer to Amendment #2.

3. Question: Page # 6 and 7 Section | Subsection 2.4.4 Overview of the Medicaid Enterprise Certification Life Cycle. The numbering for the two subsections is the same, i.e., 2.4.4 Overview of the Medicaid Enterprise Certification Life Cycle 2.4.4 State Staff and Roles. Vendor Clarification/Question. Will the State issue an amendment to correct the numbering?

Response: Please refer to Amendment #2.

4. Question: Page # 19 Section | Subsection 2.7.1.11 IV&V Project Financial Status Reports Section Content for Clarification The Deliverable Description states that the 'reports shall be submitted quarterly', however the Time of Performance states 'monthly thereafter' Vendor Clarification/Question Please confirm the correct periodicity of the reports

Response: The statement requesting quarterly submission was made in error, please refer to Amendment #2.

5. Question: Page # 19 Section | Subsection 2.7.1.11 IV&V Project Financial Status Reports Vendor Clarification/Question Please confirm that the scope of the IV&V Project Financial

Status Report is the expenditures of State and federal funding related to IV&V activities. If this is not correct, please elaborate on the intended scope and purpose of the reports.

Response: Please refer to the Acceptance Criteria for Deliverable 2.7.1.11. The scope as stated is correct. The State asks that the TO Contactor provide an accounting of funds for the MMT project including what was budgeted, spent, and remains unspent along with any foreseen funding risks for the MMT project.

6. Question: Is there an incumbent who is already performing the IV&V Services for this contract or for any portion of this contract? If yes, can the agency let us know who is the incumbent?

Response: There is no incumbent, this is a new requirement.

7. Question: Can the agency let us know the name of the contractor who is currently providing the MMIS service (the contract for which the IV&V needs to be performed)

Response: Not applicable to this TORFP.

8. Question: Part 1 of the IV&V is an initial “Snapshot” or baseline assessment of the current project health.

Response: Please refer to TORFP Section 2.1.

9. Question: We understand that there are various modules under this project of which section 2.4 explains the modules in focus for this opportunity. Can the agency confirm that these 3 modules are the only ones that will be covered under scope of work for this TORFP. Are there possibility to extend service to other modules?

Response: Please refer to TORFP Section 2.4.

10. Question: Can the agency let us know the exact list of Current projects module for which baseline assessment has to be done under this contract?

Response: Please refer to TORFP Section 2.4.

11. Question: Can the agency confirm the contractor that is currently performing the following module work for the agency :

- a. CRM
- b. Medicaid data warehouse and decision support system
- c. Pharmacy point of sale electronic claims management service

Response: Not applicable to this TORFP.

12. Question: We understand that one of the key task for the agency is to achieve CMS certification for all MMIS modules – Can the agency mention if any of the modules have acquired this certification and if so who is the service provider. In order to help agency acquire CMS certificate.

Response: No MMT modules have been procured or obtained CMS certification at this time.

13. Question: Can the Agency please mention for how many MMIS Modules the CMS Certifications needs to be achieved?

Response: Please refer to TORFP Section 2.4.

14. Question: Can the agency mention the current project methodology (Waterfall or Agile)?

Response: Please refer TORFP Section 2.2.B, Application of the State of Maryland’s SDLC methodology.

15. Question: Under section 2.4, CMS Seven Conditions and Standards (CMS 7C&S) (see <https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid-chip-program-information/by-topics/data-and-systems/downloads/efr-seven-conditions-and-standards.pdf>). This link is leading to an error page, can the agency provide us the correct link?

Response: <https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/data-and-systems/mect/index.html>, please refer to Amendment #2.

16. Question: Can the Vendor use their subcontractors experience to get in compliance with the offerors required experience stated in Section 3.6?

Response: Yes.

17. Question: Can the contractor use their proposed resources experience to meet the offerors qualification criteria?

Response: The Offeror’s organization must provide documentation in the TO Proposal that their organization meets the experience requirements listed in TORFP Section 3.6.

18. Question: Page 30 Section 3.5(F) – Key personnel states that, Key personnel proposed as part of the TO proposal shall start as of TO Agreement issuance unless specified otherwise in the this TORFP or the Offeror’s TO Technical proposal . Key personnel may be identified after Task Order Award – Can the agency clarify our understanding that we can let agency know who is the key personnel of the proposed personnel list on the proposed up on Task order award?

Response: Offerors must identify Key Personnel at the time of proposal submission.

19. Question: Section 3.9.2 states that in case of replacing the key personnel within 30 days after TO execution, the contractor must exhibit that the originally proposed Key personnel is actually a full time employee. Can the agency confirm If the contractor does not have the need to replace the key personnel, do they still have to show case that they key personnel proposed are contractor’s actual full time employee? In other words, Can the contractor’s proposed key personnel - work with the contractor as 1099s ? or should the key personnel proposed should be actually a full time employee of the contractor?

Response: Proposed Key Personnel can work with the contractor as a 1099, however, substitution will only be allowed if the proposed Key Personnel are actual full-time direct employees with the Offeror prior to or within 30 days after Task Order execution. Please refer to TORFP Section 3.9 Substitution of Personnel for specific requirement.

20. Question: If the key personal has to be an employee of the contractor, can the contractor employ this key personnel post award? Since the award date is not specific it is extremely hard to hold the proposed resource available for many months together. Especially when a small business try to prime this contract it posts a significant challenge on them. Can the agency consider this request?

Response: Key Personnel must be identified in the proposal, and the Appendix 3 – Labor Classification Key Personnel Resume Summary Form must be submitted for all proposed Key Personnel in the Technical Proposal.

21. Question: Can the agency mention the prospective date of award?

Response: Award is targeted for January of 2020.

22. Question: How many locations are identified for this project? Can the agency confirm the number of locations where the key personnel will be working form and their exact work location address?

Response: Please refer to the Key Information Summary Sheet, Primary Place of Performance section.

23. Question: The TORFP says that this contract is FFP and T&M. Can the agency confirm how much of work will be FFP and if so which portions of the work?

Response: Please refer to Attachment B - TO Financial Proposal, Tab B for Deliverable Pricing which is fixed price. Work orders will be issued as FFP or T&M and pricing will be determined prior to release of a work order.

24. Question: Which portions of the contract will be of T&M?

Response: Please refer to the response to Question 23.

25. Question: Providing specifics will help us to price effectively. Also considering the scope of work and the amount of discovery that is involved, we suggest this to be a T&M all the way. Will the agency consider this suggestion?

Response: No the pricing requirements will remain as required in the TORFP.

26. Question: DoIT had issued an RFP titled DoIT – MITDP – Oversight Program Support Service several months ago – Solicitation ID - 060B8400062 – OPSS. While reading that RFP it mentioned the vendor performing the oversight services for the MITDP contracts will be conflicted to work on other MITDP projects. Since this RFP will be a MITDP project – are the contractors who are performing the work for the DoIT – OPSS conflicted to submit a response to this TORFP?

Response: The State has determined that it **would** be considered a conflict of interest for Master Contractors awarded under the Oversight Program Support Service TORFP #060B8400062 – OPSS to submit a proposal in response to TORFP #F50B0600003 – MMIS II IV&V.

27. Question: Follow up question - Why the agency is not using the above mentioned OPSS contract for acquiring IV&V services for the current proposed TORFP. Can the agency explain the need for a separate contract?

Response: Not applicable to this TORFP.

28. Question: I am helping a prime with submittal of a response for the above RFP. They are trying to locate the links referenced on the DOIT website for download of the required attachments to be submitted—they indicate the links are not functional. Could you please confirm that all required Attachments to be completed and submitted are posted to the DOIT website, and the state has validated they are operational?

Response: The link to the solicitation on the DoIT website is <https://doit.maryland.gov/contracts/Pages/CATSPPlusTORFPStatus.aspx>. The required attachments are included/linked within the solicitation. The price proposal sheet is on the website.

29. Question: Could you please help clarify-trying to find the attachment links requested from Prime. In the DOIT CATS+ website, it states ‘no open soliciations’ at this time. Perhaps the site is not current? <https://doit.maryland.gov/contracts/Pages/bids.aspx>

Response: The link to the solicitation is <https://doit.maryland.gov/contracts/Pages/CATSPPlusTORFPStatus.aspx>

30. Question: Page 3:
Conduct requirements and design gate reviews in accordance with step 17 of the MECL
a. If using a waterfall approach the state may only have one requirements and design review

b. If using agile methodology, the state may choose to have multiple reviews across multiple sprints

Q: Should the Offeror have expertise in executing Predictive and Agile projects for this IV&V requirement?

Response: It is at the discretion of the Offeror.

31. Question: Page 5:

The initiatives outlined in the Roadmap are designed to meet the operational needs and objectives of the Department while promoting alignment between the Department's solutions and the CMS Seven Conditions and Standards (CMS 7C&S) (see <https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid-chip-program-information/by-topics/data-and-systems/downloads/efr-seven-conditions-and-standards.pdf>).

Q: Can someone correct the link to the PDF: EFR-Seven-Conditions-and-Standards.pdf? I was not able to locate this doc.

Response: Please refer to Amendment #2, the correct link is:

<https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/data-and-systems/mect/index.html>.

32. Question: Page 8

Where an evaluation of the IT solution is required, the TO Contractor shall apply the Software Engineering Institute's Capability Maturity Model Integration or other recognized industry standard.

Q: For example, If the Offeror is using CMMI as a standard, are they required to be at least CMMI DEV Level 3 Certified? Is there a list of Industry Standards that the State of Maryland will accept as required for the Technical proposal?

Response: It is at the discretion of the Offeror.

33. Question: Key Personnel – A subset of TO Contractor Personnel whose departure during the performance period, will, in the State's opinion, have a substantial negative impact on Task Order performance. Key Personnel proposed as part of the TO Proposal shall start as of TO Agreement issuance unless specified otherwise in this TORFP or the Offeror's TO Technical Proposal. Key Personnel may be identified after Task Order award. Are Key Personnel mandatory or optional for the Technical submittal?

Response: The IV&V Project Manager is a required Key Personnel. In addition, the Offeror shall identify proposed personnel that the Offeror considers Key and must include Appendix 3 – Labor Classification Key Personnel Resume Summary Form with the Technical Proposal.

34. Question: Is the Offeror required to have resumes as part of the submittal for the six referenced roles?

Response: Offerors are required to submit an Appendix 3 – Labor Classification Key Personnel Resume Summary Form for the IV&V Project Manager which is considered key. In addition, the Offeror shall identify proposed personnel that the Offeror considers Key and must include Appendix 3 – Labor Classification Key Personnel Resume Summary Form with the Technical Proposal. Please refer to TORFP Section 3.7.

35. Question: Role: IV&V Project Manager (Key)/Agile
Is the above Role the only Key Personnel needed for submittal?

Response: Please refer to TORFP Section 3.7 and also the response to Question #33 and #34.

36. Question: SECTION 3.6 - OFFEROR EXPERIENCE, Page 30. Can you please clarify what is meant by "Offerors must provide documentation in the TO Proposal that their organization has previous experience with providing IV&V services on projects of comparable size and complexity as the MMT Project"?

Response: Please refer to TORFP Section 5.4, Volume I – TO Technical Proposal, specifically Section 5.4.2.F – Master Contractor and Subcontractor Experience and Capabilities.

37. Question: SECTION 3.6 – OFFEROR EXPERIENCE, Page 30. Can we use project references from the MSA (Successful Project Examples) to fulfill the documentation of previous experience requirement?

Response: Please refer to the response to Question #36.

38. Question: KEY INFORMATION SUMMARY SHEET - MBE Subcontracting Goal: 20% (for the base period and all options), Page ii. Can you please clarify if the 20% Subcontracting Goal pertains to the number of MBE staff resources proposed for the project, or does it pertain to the percentage of total IV&V portion of workload for which the proposed MBE subcontractor would be responsible?

Response: The MBE goal is based on 20% of the total value of the award amount based on the services to be provided and not the number of MBE staff resources proposed.

39. Question: KEY INFORMATION SUMMARY SHEET - TO Proposals Due (Closing) Date and Time: 9/17/2019 2:00 pm EST, Page ii. We respectfully request an extension to the due date by one week.

Response: Please refer to Amendment #1.

40. Question: Page 5 Tab 2 Section 2.4.A 1. Page 5 lists the “initial set of MMIS modular initiatives” as A. CRM B. Medicaid Data Warehouse and DSS and C. Pharmacy POS Electronic Claims Management.

- a. Does the State view these three named modules as three distinct projects under the MMT program umbrella?

Response: The State views the MMIS Modular Transformation as a project.

- b. Do these three initiatives constitute the scope of the IV&V baseline review to be done within Part I of the IV&V effort?

Response: The scope of the baseline review will be determined at time of kick-off for the task order.

- c. If these three initiatives are separate development efforts with different contractors, software, PM's and project teams, should the quantity for some of the Part I Snapshot deliverables listed on Attachment B be 3 instead of 1?

Response: The State views the MMIS Modular Transformation as a project.

41. Question: Page 6 Section 2.4.2 Relative to the draft MMT roadmap, can you provide further information about the current lifecycle phase of work for each of these efforts? Are there final requirements and specifications defined for all three?

Response: There is no information to provide at this time.

42. Question: Page 6 Section 2.4.2, have any procurements for the three modules been issued yet or awarded?

Response: Solicitations have been issued. No awards have been made to date.

43. Question: Page 6 Section 2.4.2. Can you provide a rough estimate of the size (in approximate headcount or project costs) of each of the three efforts, including both state and contracted staff?

Response: There is no information to provide at this time.

44. Question: Page 8 Section 2.6. In paragraph 3, the State states "the TO Contractor shall manage the IV&V in accordance with the Project Management Plan (PMP) as submitted with their TO proposal." Sections 2.7.1.3 and 2.7.1.4 indicate that the IV&V Management Plan will be submitted after notice to proceed. Could you confirm that the State wishes Offerors to submit a draft PMP as part of its submittal? Please explain how the PMP is different than the IV&V Management Plan.

Response: Please refer to Amendment #2.

45. Question: 4.1.1, Paragraph 2 describes possible COI's that would limit the IV&V awardee from competing for or being awarded any PM, QA, design, development, planning, design, development or implementation phase activities on the MMT project. Would this exclusion also

apply to any contractor currently active on MD THINK, since this will be the platform used by MMT? What about other prime contractors that are currently active on MMT, are they also precluded from bidding on this IV&V as either a prime or sub?

Response: It **would not** be considered a conflict of interest for contractors currently active on the MDTHINK project to propose in response to the TORFP for the IV&V for MMIS Modular Transformation (#F50B0600003). It **would** be considered a conflict of interest for contractors performing PMO services for the MMIS/MMT to propose in response to the TORFP for the IV&V for MMIS Modular Transformation (#F50B0600003).

46. Question: Table C Section 3.7.1 What is the significance of the word “Agile” at the end of the IV&V Project Management role? Can you elaborate on what experience you are looking for with the role that is Agile in nature?

Response: The State seeks highly qualified candidates to manage the IV&V according to the State of Maryland’s SDLC methodology.

47. Question: Page 46 Section C1 Can you confirm exactly how many Key personnel you wish to have explicitly named? Our interpretation is that you are requesting only 1 named Key personnel.

Response: Please refer to the response to Question #33 and #34.

48. Question: Pages 46 49 C.4.i states that no other specific names or qualifications should be supplied for any other team members listed in the staffing plans for fulfillment of the work. Section 6.2.2 states that the experience and qualifications of the proposed staff will be based only on the Key personnel qualifications. Can you confirm our understanding of this is correct?

Response: Please refer to TORFP Section 6.2.2.

49. Question: Please confirm that the vendor providing services to DOIT, as part of Oversight Program Support Services TORFP #060B8400062, is organizationally conflicted (Organization Conflict of Interest-OCI) from bidding on this RFP either as a subk, or a prime, to support DOIT IVV work for Medicaid.

Response: Please refer to the response to Question #26.

50. Question: Please confirm that the current and any future PMO vendors for MDH Medicaid PMO program is/are organizationally conflicted (OCI’d) from participating in this current DOIT IVV for MDH MMIS Modular Transformation (MMT) project: F50B0600003.

Response: It **would** be considered a conflict of interest for current or future contractors performing PMO services for the MMIS/MMT to propose in response to the TORFP for the IV&V for MMIS Modular Transformation (#F50B0600003).

51. Question Page 63 Section Pricing Please confirm that due to the enterprise scope of the current MD THINK program, the pricing requirements identified in this IVV TORFP (page 63), the current MD THINK IVV vendor is organizationally conflicted (OCI) from bidding on this RFP?

Response: The current MD THINK IV&V TO Contractor is not organizationally conflicted from submitting a proposal in response to the IV&V for MMIS Modular Transformation (#F50B0600003).

52. Question Page 5 Section 2.2.1.A.1.B The requirement states if using agile methodology, the state may choose to have multiple reviews across multiple sprints.” Of the three modules, can you inform us which of these efforts are using agile development methodologies and which are using waterfall? Or, if that has not yet been determined?

Response: It is the intention of the State to leverage the State of Maryland’s SDLC methodology as much as is reasonable and in the best interests of the State.

53. Question Page 4 Section 2.4 Can you supply copies of the following documents, as described in the TORFP, so that vendors may better respond to the IVV requirements in this TORFP:
- MITA 3.0 State Self-Assessment (SSA) to establish a baseline of their current business operations and technical architecture.
 - (Expanded/updated) MMIS Modular Transformation (MMT) Project Roadmap, for the modular replacement of its current Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS).

Response: The MITA 3.0 State Self-Assessment is publicly available via <https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/data-and-systems/mita/mita-30/index.html>. The MMIS project roadmap is located in section 2.4.2.

54. Question: Will you be publishing any transcripts from the bidder’s conference?

Response: The pre-proposal conference summary was sent to all Master Contractors that received the TORFP.

55. Question Page 93, 94 Section Appendix 5, Task descriptions DOIT indicated in the bidders conference that the PMO TORFP for Medicaid will be released shortly. Does the State anticipate the MMT IV&V contract to be awarded before the PMO contract? Does the State expect the PMO work to be part of the baseline assessments once the PMO is awarded?

Response: Yes, the State anticipates that the MMT IV&V TORFP will be awarded before the PMO TORFP for Medicaid PMO. The scope of the baseline review will be determined at time of kick-off for the task order.

56. Question: Pages 6 Section 2.4.2 The graphic in Section 2.4.2 specifies Agile DDI for the CRM module. Has a methodology or standard been selected by the State for each individual module?

Has the State selected a methodology or standard for management of the overall MMT program/project/portfolio/product line?

Response: It is the intention of the State to leverage the State of Maryland's SDLC methodology as much as is reasonable and in the best interests of the State.

57. Question: Page Summary Information Sheet Section 2 the current due date for submissions in September 17, 2019 at 2 pm. Will the state please extend the due date to October 1, 2017 2 pm, in order to allow sufficient time for responders to incorporate the state's answers to questions into their submissions?

Response: Please refer to Amendment #1.

58. Question: Could the State reconsider the requirements of three (3) references per proposed Key Personnel?

Response: No, the requirement remains at three reference for each Key Personnel proposed.

59. Question: Could the State clarify whether the "IV&V Part 2 - ONGOING (TORFP Section 2.6.2)" activities will start after the "IV&V Part 1 - SNAPSHOT (TORFP Section 2.6.1)" is completed? If yes, could the State adjust the quantity of deliverables for the ongoing reviews accordingly?

Response: Please refer to the "Time of Performance" indicated in the deliverables table within TORFP Section 2.7.

60. Question: What is the type of development methodology (e.g., Waterfall, Agile, Hybrid) followed by the project?

Response: It is the intention of the State to leverage the State of Maryland's SDLC methodology as much as is reasonable and in the best interests of the State.

61. Question: How frequently releases are deployed in the production?

Response: This solicitation does not include any releases into production.

62. Question: What are the primary Software technologies and tools used for the system development?

Response: This solicitation does not include any system development.

63. Question: Pages 12 Section 2.4.4 The CMS Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Toolkit is referenced. Should this have been the CMS Medicaid Enterprise Certification Toolkit?

Response: Page 12 incorrectly references the CMS Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Toolkit. The correct reference is the CMS Medicaid Enterprise Certification Toolkit. Please refer to Amendment #2.

64. Question: Section 2.4 / Page 4 Can the State please share the findings from the MITA 3.0 SSA?

Response: The MITA 3.0 SSA is not applicable to this solicitation.

65. Question Section 2.4 / Page 5 The CMS 7C&S URL does not work. Can the State please provide the correct link?

Response: Please refer to Amendment #2, the correct link is:
<https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/data-and-systems/mect/index.html>.

66. Question: Section 3.7 / Page 31 Can the State please clarify the worksite and any level of effort requirements for all key personnel?

Response: Please refer to the TORFP, Key Information Summary Sheet, Primary Place of Performance section. It is up to the Offeror to determine any level of effort requirements.

67. Question: Section 3.7 / Page 31 Can the State please clarify the worksite requirements for all non-key personnel proposed by the TO Contractor?

Response: Please refer to the response to Question #66.

68. Question: Section 4.5 / Page 40 Will all offerors who submit a proposal be invited to the oral presentation?

Response: Only those Offerors found technically qualified to perform the requirements of the TORFP will be invited to an oral presentation.

69. Question: Section 4.5 / Page 40 Can the State please clarify the oral presentation logistics such as maximum contractor attendance, roles of presenters, facilities and equipment available, agenda and durations, Q&A during or after the presentation, etc.?

Response: Information regarding oral presentation logistics will be provided to each Offeror in the invitation from the Procurement Officer to an oral presentation.

70. Question: Section 4.5 / Page 40 Can the State please clarify how it intends to use the MBE participation goal in the evaluation and ranking of vendors? Will a fully MBE team lead to a higher "score" and be given priority over a partial MBE offeror?

Response: The MBE participation goal is not used in the evaluation/ranking of Offerors, please refer to TORFP Section 6.2 which outlines the evaluation criteria.

71. Question: Section 5.3.4.C / Page 44 Can the State please clarify the password protection requirements? Should offerors password protect the individual documents or zipped packages? Is there a particular encryption tool/method that offerors must use or avoid? Should offerors provide passwords in separate follow up emails during proposal submission?

Response. For the technical proposal, password protect each individual document with the same password. For the financial proposal, password protect each individual document with the same password which must differ from the technical proposal password as stated in TORFP Section 5.3.4. There is no encryption requirement. Offerors will provide these two passwords to the DoIT TO Procurement Officer upon request or their TO Proposal will be deemed not susceptible for award.

72. Question: Section 6.4.B / Page 50, the TORFP states that “Oral presentations and discussions may be held...”Is the oral presentation mandatory or optional?

Response: Oral presentations and discussions will be held for those Offerors found technically qualified to perform the services required in the TORFP. Although not mandatory, oral presentations and discussions are part of the evaluation process for this TORFP and can impact the evaluation of an Offeror’s proposal. If an Offeror chooses not accept an invitation to an oral presentation or discussions of their proposal, then the proposal will be evaluated based on the written proposal.

73. Question: Section 2.7 / Page 11 Does the State expect this contract start date on 1/1/2020?

Response: Please refer to the response to Question #21.

74. Question: When would the Department like the services to be completed by?

Response: Refer to TORFP Section 2.7.1 for the due dates for specific deliverables. Services requested through work orders will have specific requirements for completion of those services.

75. Question: What is the estimated cost of the Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) Services project?

Response: The State will cannot provide that information.

76. Question: Has the Department allocated funding for the Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) Services yet? If so, through which source (budget, CIP, state/federal grant, etc.)?

Response: Not applicable to this solicitation.

77. Question: How is the Department currently meeting this need?

Response: This is a new requirement.

78. Question: Would it be possible to name the three greatest challenges the Department is having with their current solution?

Response: Not applicable to this solicitation.

79. Question: If a vendor is currently performing PMO work in the DOIT PMO oversight program, are they prohibited/conflicted from priming or subcontracting on the DOIT IVV Services for Medicaid?

Response: Please refer to the response to Question #26.