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MS. DAVIS: This is the pre-proposal conference for the solicitation for the MERP Project Management Support and Quality Management Services. My name is Queen Davis. I’m from the Office of Procurement and Support Services. I’m here representing the procurement officer, Sharon Gambrill. I ask everyone, if you haven’t already, again to sign in and please leave your business card so that if we need to get in touch with you or send you any addendums or minutes from this meeting we are readily able to do so.

I’m going to ask each of the representatives from the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene to introduce themselves. And afterwards, I would like all vendors to introduce themselves. I’ll start again with me. My name is Queen Davis, and I’m from the
Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Office of Procurement.

MS. MORRIS: Hi. I’m Zena Morris. I’m Assistant Project Manager for Medicaid, Office of Systems Operations and Pharmacy.

HOOVER: Lydia Hoover, with the Office of the Attorney General, representing DHMH.

MR. LEHMAN: I’m Chuck Lehman. I’m the Executive Director of Operations and Medicaid.

MR. SMALLS: I’m Craig Smalls, Director of Systems Operations.

MS. DAVIS: And we have a couple in the back. If you don’t mind introducing yourselves, DHMH employees.

MR. ASLAND: Matt Asland, Chief of (unintelligible.)

MR. WHEELER: Craig Wheeler, Dr. Kurlanzik Consulting, consultant to DHMH.

MR. LEHMAN: And we have on the line John Bohns, who is our contract monitor for this project. He’s recuperating from back surgery and hopes to be back out in the first week of November.

MR. BOHNS: I’m here.

MS. DAVIS: Good morning, John.

MR. BOHNS: This is the highlight of my day.

(Laughter.)

MS. DAVIS: Okay. We can start with the gentleman next to Zena and go around.

MR. GOLDBERG: Charlie Goldberg, Managing Director, CognoSante.

MR. HESS: Michael Hess, Managing Director, CognaSante.

MS. CORCORAN: Savantage Solutions.

MR. MAGRANE: Jack Magrane, Savantage
MR. VENZKE: Stuart Venzke, First Data.

MR. HANS: Harry Hans, Sona Networks, MBE, Maryland.

MR. MILK: Good morning. Rob Milk, SLI Global Solutions.

MS. MILLINER: Good morning. Lily Milliner with Delmock Technologies.

MR. SHEA: Brian Shea, Policy Studies.

MR. DARANYI: Ed Daranyi with Berry Dunn.

MS. TATE: Good morning. I’m Amanda Tate with Navigator Management Partners.

MR. MOTTE: Charles Motte with Angarai International.

MR. TOTTEN: Nick Totten with Octo Consulting Group.

MS. MADORSKY: Yelena Madorsky, Business Solutions Group, MBE.
MR. SHERIDAN: Jonathan Sheridan, North Highland.

MS. DENHOLM: Diane Denholm, North Highland.

MR. PADGETT: Jack Padgett, Broad Point Technologies.

MR. MOTAGI: Prakash Motagi, Kahibee Services.

MR. HARPALANI: Sanjeet Harpalani, Dimensional Concepts.

MR. SEDAGHATFAR: Good morning. Davood Sedaghatfar, Dimensional Concepts.

MR. SADERES: Jim Saderes with KPMG.

MR. DAVIS: Jim Davis, Medicaid Consultant.

MR. SHUGART: Alan Shugart, CSC.

MR. DUNN: Scott Dunn, Optum Insight.

MR. GUNTHER: Bob Gunther, CSG Government Solutions.

MS. SELLAMI: Hi. I’m Mina Sellami with
Telligen.

MR. MASHEK: Vince Mashek, CSC.

MR. BRATTON: Chris Bratton,

(unintelligible)

MR. NATOLA: Jim Natola, Software Consortium.

MR. FEEHAN: Tom Feehan, Cirdan Group, Maryland MBE.

MS. VATZ: I’m Joanne Vatz from Cirdan Group.

MR. WEISS: Steve Weiss, HMA.

MS. DAVIS: Okay. Again, good morning and welcome everyone. Let me take this opportunity to ask if there any MBEs here if you could please stand so that you can be identified.

(Whereupon, members of the audience stood.)

MS. DAVIS: Thank you very much everyone. I
I am here to give an overview of the procurement process for this solicitation. Afterwards I will turn it over to Chuck Lehman and his associates who will be able to give you background and information on the program and answer any programmatic questions you may have.

Minutes will be taken of this meeting and will be posted on eMarylandMarketplace and Department of Health and Mental Hygiene’s website at the conclusion. Please be sure that your information is correct so that you can be one of the first in attendance to get copies of it, of the minutes.

If you decide not to submit a proposal for the solicitation, I ask that you please fill out the vendor’s comments in the front of this RFP and send it back to us, either email it or fax it. And that helps us to determine and plan future solicitations and give us insight on what we can do to better accommodate the businesses that were not able to submit a proposal.
Subsequent to this pre-proposal conference questions will be accepted by Medical Care Program until there is insufficient time for response for proposal submission. The program has determined that October the 20th will be the cut off date for any questions that you have. And they hope to have all questions answered and released by October 27th. Questions and answers will be distributed to all persons known by the issuing office to have obtained a copy of this RFP and all persons who are in attendance of this meeting. As I said, they will also be on eMarylandMarketplace and DHMH’s website.

The procurement method for this solicitation is competitive sealed proposals. The contract resulting from this solicitation will be for four years beginning on or about February 1, 2012, and ending January 31, 2016. At the discretion of the department the contract may be extended for two one-
year renewal options.

All dates and times can be found on the key information summary sheet in the front of the RFP. Proposals are due on or before Thursday, November the 10th, 2011, at 2:00 p.m. local time. Proposals will be received at the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Office of the Medicaid Program, 201 West Preston Street, Room SS-9, Baltimore, Maryland 21201, attention Zena Morris. Timely submissions are vital. Late submissions shall not be accepted.

Please note that a MBE subcontracting goal of 25 percent has been established for the contract resulting from this solicitation. If a waiver in full or in part is requested and not approved, the contract will go to the next best offer. The goal must be met in two ways. The commitment made to each MBE as well as the overall MBE goal. We recommend that any problems that the vendor may experience during the
life of the contract with meeting the goal be shared immediately with the contract monitor, which is John Bohns, who is on the telephone, having the highlight of his day. The contract monitor will inform the MBE liaison, and the corrective action plan will be developed.

The MBEs utilized must be certified to provide the services that the vendor is using them for in the MBE participation schedule. So if you have an MBE that you’re utilizing for printing, then NACES (phonetic) code registered on MDOT must be that they provide that service, printing. So please be sure whatever you’re using your MBE for the NACES code matches that description of service.

As well, the MBE must be providing services within the scope of work of this contract, the MBE cannot be providing service on another contract and using that as a goal for this contract. No certified
MBE can be removed from this contract, replace, or added without the approval of the MBE liaison and a modification by the Office of Procurement and Support Services.

MBE attachment D-1 must be properly completed, signed, and included in a separate sealed envelope. Failure to include this attachment with the proposal will result in a determination that the proposal is not reasonably susceptible of being selected for award of this contract. If recommended for award and requesting an MBE waiver, the vendor must complete, sign, and have notorized the MBE Attachment D-6. That’s the minority contractor unavailability certificate. Include the name, address, and the telephone number of the certified MBE’s contact and the reason the MBE is unavailable. COMAR 21.11.03.11, waiver instructions, will guide you through that process. And the guidelines of that
regulation must be followed.

If the apparent awardee fails to return each completed document within the required time, and in compliance with the requirements in section 1.1.24, that’s of the RFP -- It’s the MBE minority enterprise participation instructions -- the procurement officer, which is Sharon Gambrill, may determine that the apparent awardee is not responsible and, therefore, not eligible for contract award. If the contractor has already been awarded the contract is voidable. You must show a good faith effort that you tried to solicit and get MBE participation.

Remember, the appropriate MBE forms must be included for the offer to be considered for award of the contract.

I’d like to turn your attention to the minimum qualifications in section two. And all of the minimum qualifications are mandatory. The offeror
shall provide information in a transmittal letter to its proposal that includes details of how the offeror meets the following minimum requirements. Number one, at least 10 years of experience running a project management office. And number two, experience in project management support function for a federal or state health and human services agency with operations of similar size and scope to Maryland. And finally, the offeror shall include a minimum of two references, each from a public sector client for whom work similar to this project in size, strength, and scope has been completed within the last ten years. The references shall include the name of each client reference, a point of contact, telephone number, and email the address of that contact. DHMH has the right to contact any references of its choosing as part of the evaluation process, including references not provided by the offeror but otherwise known to DHMH.
The scope of work is listed in section three of the RFP. And the program will get into that in more detail after I have concluded my overview.

There is two part submission for your proposal. Volume one is the technical proposal, and volume two, the financial proposal. The general format for proposals is stated in section four. Your technical and financial proposals are to be submitted in separately sealed envelopes. For the purpose of this RFP technical proposals and financial proposal will not have equal weight. Technical proposal will have greater weight than the financial.

The correct copies of the technical proposals are two original and five copies, clearly labeled, “technical proposal.” Also, one CD insertable PDF format, marked “technical proposal,” and one copy of the technical proposal must be labeled “PIA” for Public Information Act. And you can see
section 1.119 for explanation of the PIA.

The envelope containing your technical proposal shall include the office name and business address, the due date and time of receipt for the proposals, and the title of the RFP. The technical proposal must be referenced by sections of the RFP as listed in section four, beginning with section -- I think it’s 4.43. The proposal shall be presented in the same order as listed in the section of the RFP. Technical proposals are to be accompanied by a brief transmittal letter prepared on the offeror’s letterhead and signed by an individual who is authorized to commit the offeror to the services and requirements as stated in this RFP. Also, please include a federal ID number or Social Security Number acknowledgment of any addenda and if any, the electronic mail address.

Important documents to be included with the
technical proposals are listed under section 4.4.2.

Your bid proposal affidavit is a document that has your resident agent information on there. If you are unsure of who that resident agent is, please get in touch with our State corporate charter division. And their phone number is (410)767-1330. The office is located at 301 West Preston Street.

Confidential statements by the offeror must identify portions of its proposals which it believe to contain trade secrets and/or confidential or proprietary information. Offerors must provide a justification to support its position. If request for informations are made under the Maryland Public Information Act, the procurement officer will determine whether or not the information can be disclosed.

The financial proposal. Offeror shall enter all cost information on attachment “F,” financial
proposal worksheet, and complete the financial proposal summary. Please review section 4.4.5 for all items to be included with your financial proposal. Two original and five copies of your financial proposal clearly labeled “financial proposal” is requested, one CD marked “financial proposal,” and one copy of the financial proposal must be labeled “PIA” for Public Information Act. Again, see section 1.119 for instructions on PIA.

The evaluation criteria listed in section five of this RFP. The evaluations will be based on the criteria set forth in this section. The criteria are arranged in descending order of importance. For purposes of this RFP again, the technical factors will receive greater weight than the price factor. Your proposal will be reviewed and evaluated by an evaluation committee that will be appointed by the issuing office using the evaluation criteria set forth
in section five of the RFP. The Committee may conduct with discussions with offerors and may request best and final offers.

If it is determined that your discussions are needed, discussions will be held with all offerors. You will be notified if at anytime during the process it is determined that your proposal is not reasonably susceptible of being selected for award. The Committee shall recommend an offeror whose overall proposal provides the most adventagous offer to the State.

The contract affidavit, attachment “C,” and extended contract, attachment “A,” are not required until determination of award is made.

There are three acceptable means of delivering your proposal. One is the U.S. Postal Service. Two, hand delivery by offeror. And please ask for a receipt. And three, hand delivery by
commercial carrier. Please ask that the commercial carrier ask for receipts.

Unsuccessful vendors may request a debriefing after notification of non-award.

And if you don’t have any questions for me, or if you do, you may start asking now. If not, I’ll turn it over to Chuck Lehman. Yes, sir?

VOICE: I do have one question.

MS. DAVIS: Sure.

VOICE: Mandatory requirement number one. Is that at a corporate level or is that at an individual management level for a person that’s going to be managing the project?

MR. LEHMAN: It’s for the offeror. So the firm that’s bidding needs to have -- there’s separate experience for the project manager.

VOICE: And to add onto that. So all of these requirements are for the firm, such as the MMIS
experience is for the firm, not for any of our key players?

MR. LEHMAN: Are you talking about in the general requirements or --

VOICE: General requirements.

MR. LEHMAN: The general requirements apply to individuals. So the minimum qualifications are for the firms themselves. The general requirements refer to the project members that you propose to work on this project. So the team that you put together has to have -- the individuals on that team have to meet those general requirements.

VOICE: So for the firms, for the minimum qualifications, can -- for the offeror, can that be met by both the prime and subcontractors?

MR. LEHMAN: I believe it’s the offeror. So that combination of team is appropriate. And I probably should have said this caveat before. Pretty
much anything I say is not gospel. So we’d like any of those questions to be submitted in writing. We’ll respond in writing. What we respond in writing will be the State’s official response. We received about 25 questions already. We hope to take any questions that we get by say close of business today and have a response out by close of business Friday. So we’re really encouraging you to get your questions in. We’ll get those responses back as quick as we can so that we can try to keep the project on schedule.

VOICE: I guess the reason why I raise that question is that our company comes from the federal atmosphere. And when we’re looking at that type of experience in house, how is that not a conflict. Usually we’re told that if we’ve actually worked on a system and implemented these things, then we should be doing the QA or the IVV or the testing of that. So that’s why I was a little taken back by that one.
MR. LEHMAN: I don’t understand your --

VOICE: Okay. It says, the implementation oversight experience of the actual system.

MS. DAVIS: So your question is, how is the project --

VOICE: How are we going to be independent in the QA process?

MS. DAVIS: QU process?

VOICE: Yeah.

MR. LEHMAN: Well, there’s a separate IV&V component to this project. The Department of Information Technology has their own IV&V requirements that they’ll procure. What we’re looking for -- and maybe I’m kind of getting into what we’re really trying to buy here -- as a State of Maryland we kind of get to do a new MMS about once every 20 years. It’s kind of important to us to get it right. We are one of the last states to still be state run. And
we’ll continue to be state run until we implement this new system. So a lot of our key staff are still trying to keep the claims process going and to be able to maintain that MMIS while we’re doing this very important project. Why we think it’s important to procure this contract is, number one, we need a PMO office in order to effectively manage this project and be able to provide the necessary reports to the legislature, Department of Information Technology and to CMS to make sure that we’re staying on track. So that’s kind of the baseline, to make sure that the project stays on track, complies with all the PIN (unintelligible) requirement, and the other generally accepted project management approaches that are necessary.

The corollary to that is, we also need to supplement our staff to ensure that the quality of the work is being done in a timely manner. I can’t wait
till an IV&V vendor comes in six months after the fact to tell us we’re off our rails. We need to supplement our staff. We have a lot of subject matter expertise, but we need support for those people to kind of guide them in the right direction, to give us the issues ahead of time and help us resolve those issues so we keep the project on track.

And then the third piece of it is the management consulting, which where necessary we may need to supplement our subject matter expertise in order to keep the project on scope and identify requirements or clarify requirements so we can keep the project going. So it’s kind of what we’re trying to buy here. And I know in the federal government they kind of have a very big dividing line between the IVV and the QA and project management. In this case you all are working for me and for John, and we expect you to be an extension of the state in that aspect.
And somebody else can come back later on and perform those other independent processes.

VOICE: Is there a vendor already who is providing any or some of those services currently?

MR. LEHMAN: We currently have a vendor, DK Consulting, who has been with us for a couple of years, that helped us do our requirements, our advance planning document, our RFP for the MMS solicitation. And they assisted us with developing this procurement. But they’re contact was under a CATS vehicle and it’s run the end of its course. So the vendor that we select here will be kind of a transition from the planning to the implementation. This is now the implementation assistance contractor.

VOICE: The vendor that provided the MMIS transition planning, are they eligible for bidding on this?

MR. LEHMAN: No.
VOICE: Regarding the technical volume, is there a page limit?

MR. LEHMAN: No. I mean, we’d like you to be economical, but we won’t limit you in your response. Any other questions?

VOICE: Will you provide office space?

MR. LEHMAN: Yes. They’ll be space on-site here. We’re negotiating with our DGS people now to try to get contiguous space.

VOICE: And with the fiscal agent that you select, will there be space there for --

MR. LEHMAN: They will have a location. I think it’s planned to be down in Charles Center South. And we’ll also have some facilities here for them. But their operational site will be just a subway stop or two away.

VOICE: Are all staff required to be on site for the duration of the project or will you consider
some off site work?

MR. LEHMAN: Our intent is for you to be here full time.

VOICE: Section 1.32. It mentions that there are programmatic conditions that apply to the contract. Is that because there’s federal funding for this? And can you talk a little bit about what the programmatic conditions are?

MR. LEHMAN: I don’t know other than federal funding. Although they’ve thrown some new ones on our plate with the seven conditions. It applies I think more to the actual system. But our role as an oversight agency and as your role in consulting will help us assure that the system will comply with those new conditions.

VOICE: Okay. I thought maybe what that might be referring to is the selected offer might have support additional reporting in the form of the APDs...
and things like that. I didn’t see it specifically called out, but I --

MR. LEHMAN: You should ask that question, and we’ll clarify.

VOICE: Sure. Thank you.

VOICE: There’s one section, section 2.1, says the offeror shall include a minimum of two references. And then in section 4.4.3.8 it says at least three references from customers capable. Is that an error or are you looking for three, two?

MR. LEHMAN: What we want is, in order for us to determine whether or not we’ll even open your technical proposal we want to make sure that you have at least those two references. We’d like more so we can actually talk to them. So give us your two best ones.

VOICE: In the appendices there are two large documents. One refers to the new MMIS
procurements RFP. The other is regarding ICD-10. I see there are references to ICD-10 throughout this. And I apologize, I didn’t read both of them in detail. Is the ICD-10 effort separate apart from the new MMIS implementation? Is there anything that this scope of work would need to be aware of in terms of ICD-10 efforts across DHMH? Or is it something where it’s all built in and that successful vendor or the MMIS modernization, revitalization will have responsibility for meeting the 10 requirements?

MR. LEHMAN: The complicated response. I’ll try my best. When we originally planned the MERP procurement we thought we had plenty of time to not have to remediate our MMIS, and get a new MMIS that would be ICD-10 compliant. As a result of the procurement schedule we had to separately begin the process to remediate our current system for IC10. We expect that this vendor will also assist us in
managing those two separate contracts.

VOICE: A follow-up question on that. Is DSS the same concept?

MR. LEHMAN: Correct. The DSS is an integral part of the MMIS. It will contain our service component as well as portions of MARS component, but it’s being procured separately as well. Probably -- we’re not even started writing our -- we’re not far enough along. The RFP probably won’t be released until next year sometime.

VOICE: So does it mean that you have to go back to CMS for the approval?

MR. LEHMAN: We did an APD that covered what we consider the enterprise which included the MMIS, the DSS, and some other components. So we have -- we already have the APD approved for that. And now as we get to the point where we can go -- we’ll go back to them with the RFP and get approval for the RFP, and go
forward from there.

VOICE: On page 21 I noticed that the SOA integration framework is going to allow a bi-directional real-time interface with CARES. As part of the scope of this initiative would the successful offeror be expected to interface with DHR and oversee in any capacity DHR’s compliance with making sure they can meet that requirement?

MR. LEHMAN: With the health care reform, I’m not sure what this is going to look like right now.

VOICE: Okay.

MR. LEHMAN: This is one of the things we’ll have to evaluate. Because I don’t know whether the interface is going to be with CARES anymore.


MR. LEHMAN: We know we have to have an eligibility interface. And that’s an integral part of
the MMIS. And so how does that get defined? We’ll have to tailor the scope to make sure that we adequately monitor that development and interface.

VOICE: In 1.10 it says the RFP response should be in Word. And then in 4.2.2 it asks for pdf.


MR. LEHMAN: I think what the purpose of that is, I think for us the Word is what we’ll use to evaluate. The pdf I think is so you can redact it for the PIA request. So they have two separate purposes.

VOICE: Okay. So it’s two separate.

VOICE: With respect, in the RFP it mentioned that the contract start date for the fiscal agent has yet to be determined.

MR. LEHMAN: We’re working towards a Board of Public Works of, I think, December 7th, which will put us somewhat around the first of the year. So already we’re probably going to play catch up with you
all. I’m hoping we can stay on schedule so it’s not very far behind. But it looks like they’ll be starting around the first of the year. And hopefully we’ll have you on as quickly as possible. We’re talking February here. VOICE: Just as a follow up. If you’re planning on BPW, at least from a planning prospective, of December 9th, does that mean the offeror should be preparing for orals somewhere between that date and November 11th?

MR. LEHMAN: For this purpose?

VOICE: Yes.

MR. LEHMAN: I don’t think they’re connected.

VOICE: You mean BPW --

MR. LEHMAN: For the fiscal agent.

VOICE: I’m sorry.

MR. LEHMAN: The reason yours is probably going to start in February is we don’t think we can
probably get to the Board until January at this point.

VOICE: I see.

MR. LEHMAN: Based on the schedule we have now. I hope that clarifies it. Yeah, what I’m talking about is the first one, I think we’re on track to get to the Board of Public Works for the fiscal agent vendor December 7th, which would -- and then yours would follow.

VOICE: I was going to send this question in. I was going to send all my questions in as well.

MR. LEHMAN: Sure.

VOICE: I noticed throughout the document you refer to a plan for share point implementation, their references to a defect tracking tool. There’s also references to an SLA monitoring or reporting system, sort of manage the SLAs over that vendor for which we’re providing oversight, and also a project portfolio management tool. Are you currently using
anything today or would these be tools that this contract would come in, offer, there would be recommendations, you would select one, and then this contract would have the expertise to sort of get it set up for you, get it running?

MR. LEHMAN: You definitely should submit that question. We don’t really have any tools right now. My guess is, if you are comfortable with us, we have tools that you propose, then that’s what we will go with. But you should ask us that. I’ll get John to make sure that’s --

VOICE: That probably doesn’t make his morning, that question right now. He’s going to take a pain pill.

VOICE: Section 3.6.2 about updating and maintaining project management plans. I guess our assumption is that the development vendor will own the project management plan and then PMO will help fill it
out with state staff and staff augmentation, however the peripherals that go on there. So is it the responsibility of the development vendor to really own the management plan or does that shift to the PMO?

MR. LEHMAN: They’re responsible for their piece of it. We have to have a master project plan for the MERP program. So you will be responsible for that master project plan.

VOICE: That was my next question, 3.6.2, letter “K.” And it refers to update and maintain these project management plans consistent with PMBOK and PMI standards, and all that other good stuff. And that was exactly my assumption that the development vendor would develop a project management plan that we would then oversee and supplement, and make sure it’s maintained by them. But our job would be to make sure that they’re adhering to it. Is that your understanding of that specific --
MR. LEHMAN: That, as well as implementing it into our overall project.

VOICE: To me, the way this is written, the plan is different than the integrated work plan. This is like the how and the work plan is the detailed task. So I just wanted to make sure whose responsibility that was. I’ll put that in writing.

MR. LEHMAN: We’re responsible for the overall success of all of the MERP activity. So your role is to help us make sure that we have all of those effectively managed.

VOICE: In 3.6.3, letters “A” and letters “I” look to be very similar to each other. Are they duplicative or are they different?

MR. LEHMAN: Go ahead and submit it and we’ll clarify it. I think the “I” is really, but go ahead and ask it.

VOICE: And also in that same section letter
“J” talks about executing test scripts. When you say execute, I’m guessing that the scope of this work is to be an impartial third party working as an extension of DHMH. You wouldn’t want this team to necessarily execute anything because that breaks that barrier of being impartial. I think I just want to clarify that when you say execute you mean support the execution. Make sure the team is there, that they are doing the test scripts, they’re completing things on time, support overall your AT effort, but not actually executing.

MR. LEHMAN: Go ahead and submit that. I don’t want to change the scope here. But my vision of what you’re doing is really an extension of us. Obviously the state has overall responsibility for assuring that the system meets our requirements, but we do need assistance with those activities.

VOICE: 3.6.4.2, there’s a reference in the
PRR to including maintenance and hosting/data center services. Is this the first time you’re hosting data center services? I’ll also put that in writing. But I’m wondering did you require those data center services on that?

MR. LEHMAN: On MERP? Yes.

VOICE: Oh, okay. So this oversight would also include that.

VOICE: I have a question regarding attachment “F.” Can vendors propose only the staff that they believe are necessary to meet their requirements of the RFP? Since pricing will ultimately based on the number of staff that are provided, if we complete attachment “F” how will the evaluation group sort of differentiate between the loaded staffing versus what is necessary to really operate?

MR. LEHMAN: What we’re looking for here is
to be able to get all of the vendors on the same plain as far -- you should be submitted your fully loaded rate for those labor categories. And we’ll extend it based on the hours here. And that will be your evaluate price.

VOICE: So when folks have different staffing plans, that won’t matter?

MR. LEHMAN: That will go into our technical evaluation.

VOICE: But not your price evaluation?

MR. LEHMAN: Correct.

VOICE: 3.7.2, deliverable descriptions/acceptance criteria. Are there any critical milestones that are in the four-year span that we should be aware of in forming our responses?

MR. LEHMAN: Obviously the MERP MMIS project has some pretty clear milestones. I guess we can make available our proposed project schedule for MMIS.
That’s the only one that’s kind of known right now. And then obviously IC-10 in October 2013. Other than that, some of those haven’t been established yet.

VOICE: In reference to the staffing, from a cost perspective, I believe there’s nine positions listed. During the course of the project you may find that you need more support in UAT and maybe less in business process. Is there flexibility within that budget as long as it adheres to the rate structure, et cetera, to deploy different resources based on need?

MR. LEHMAN: I think so. And I’m not sure how clear that process is here. We will have to address that. We know it’s not a straight line. There’s peaks and valleys. Our objective would be to kind of stay within budget and be able to shift resources to a task. But we also know there’s a significant fixed component where the project management office, for example, is going to be a full-
time job for four years.

VOICE: With respect to hours of proposed work rate structure. Should we assume that those are the resources we’ll have available of nine FTEs in order to -- we’re just trying to do, you know, resource evening and loading and stuff on WS -- BS, I’m sorry.

MR. LEHMAN: I don’t want to dictate your proposal strategy, but I think you should use your judgement as to what you think is appropriate for the level of effort required to accomplish those tasks.

MS. MORRIS: Make sure you ask all of your questions to our group address, which is MPMOProcurement@dhmh.state.md.us. And we’ll post all of the questions and answers on eMarylandMarketplace. And it’s in the solicitation on page nine.

MR. LEHMAN: Any other questions?

(No response.)
MR. LEHMAN: I appreciate the large turn out, the interest. Once again, this is a very, very important project for us. And we’re looking for project management team to help us successfully get to the finish line. And I look forward to your responses and looking forward to working with one of you shortly. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 9:53 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.)
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