

## CA HBEX 9 QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

	Question	Answer
1	<p>Section 4.2.5, page 7 identifies a financial cap of \$300,000. Does this include services only or services and travel related expenses?</p>	<p>Addendum #2 modifies the financial cap to \$500,000. It is expected that the contact cost includes services and all travel related expenses. The duration is also extended to be June 15 – September 5, 2012 for the services to be provided under this cap.</p>
2	<p>Section II – Statement of Work, section 4.2, Under the Solicitation Document Components, Vendor Scope of work on page 20 identifies that “Details of Business, Technical, Usability and other requirements will be provided in appendices and will not be the primary responsibility of the consultant.”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. What percentage of the business, technical, and usability requirements have been identified and documented?</li> <li>b. If these are not complete, when will they be completed?</li> <li>c. Will the appendices be delivered as final documents ready to be published or will it be the responsibility of the consultant to author the appendices based on input from designated entity resources?</li> </ol>	<p>While requirements have been identified, the selected bidder is expected to review, validate and modify the requirements to meet the California Health Benefit Exchange business model.</p> <p>The starting point for the requirements are those contained in the HBEX 4 solicitation Service Center related requirements and appendices. In addition, the Exchange is looking for the new solicitation to address the staffing needs of the new Service Center.</p>
3	<p>Section II – Statement of Work, section 5, page 23. This schedule is overly aggressive and will put the publishing of a successful solicitation within the specified time line at risk. Are the proposed dates in the schedule for example purposes only or the actual dates CA HBEX requires? What is driving the aggressive schedule?</p>	<p>The schedule is based on the need to have the Service Center tested and operational by July 2013.</p>
4	<p>Section II – Statement of Work, section 5, page 23.</p>	<p>Addendum #2 modifies the terms of the contract</p>

	<p>Our interpretation of this schedule is the publication of the solicitation is scheduled for August 1 with a contract award date of Aug 23. Is this correct?</p> <p>a. Based on the above, the term of the work under this RFO (HBEX 9) will be from June 15 through August 23 unless Task 5 (described in Section II – Statement of Work, section 4.5, starting on page 22) is exercised. Is this a correct understanding of the term?</p>	
5	<p>Have resources from each participating agency that will provide input into the solicitation document been identified and committed to complete required input sessions and reviews within the timeframe indicated?</p>	Yes.
6	<p>To how many vendors do you expect to deliver the solicitation being developed under this RFO (HBEX 9)?</p>	The solicitation will be public as it will be posted to the California Health Benefit Exchange web site. As such it is unknown how many bidders will respond.
7	<p>Of those vendors from number 6 above, how many responses do you expect to receive?</p>	The solicitation will be public as it will be posted to the California Health Benefit Exchange web site. As such it is unknown how many bidders will respond.
8	<p>While Call Center, Mail Room, and Document Image Management are referenced as within the scope of the Service Center, is there any intent to use other interaction channels, such as email, chat, or electronic processing to handle incoming and outgoing interactions?</p>	All interaction channels are planned for inclusion and should be considered as part of strategic planning. See Addendum #1.
9	<p>Would the California Health Benefit Exchange (CAHBE) consider a fixed price bid for Phase I tasks that includes all resources and travel?</p> <p>a. If not, can we quote a separate travel budget for the engagement or does travel need to be embedded in the rates?</p> <p>b. Can you share the per diems for this project for</p>	<p>Addendum #2 modifies the financial cap to \$500,000. It is expected that the contact cost includes services and all travel related expensive.</p> <p>The reporting tool is acceptable.</p>

	<p>hotel and meal expenses?</p> <p>c. Eventus leverages a web-based project-tracking tool called Harvest. Will this be an acceptable tool that we could use for reporting, and then have an authorized agency representative sign and send weekly in a pdf?</p>	
10	<p>From my understanding, CAHBE has the same structure as COHBE (Colorado Health Benefit Exchange). Can you confirm the structural status of CAHBE, as this may allow us to leverage similar techniques during BAFO (Best and Final Offer) stage of the project to drive significant costs savings to the state?</p> <p>Please confirm that the CAHBE is “a <u>nonprofit unincorporated public entity</u>.” If so can we assume while a public entity, CAHBE is not an agency of the state? Is CAHBE an entity of the state government of California, not a private entity?</p>	<p>We cannot confirm the structure of the California Health Benefit Exchange (CA HBEX) in relation to COHBE.</p> <p>California Health Benefit Exchange is a public entity.</p>
11	<p>In the Procurement Evaluation Timeline (Task 3.x), has consideration been given to performing site visits with selected vendors within the existing proposed dates? When driving the RFP process we would strongly recommend site visit(s) be included as part of the selection process of the proposed short list of contact center partner finalists.</p>	<p>Yes, the California Health Benefit Exchange is considering site visits.</p>
12	<p>What mechanism will the state deploy for contractor to access the Exchange local area network storage devices to store work products and deliverables?</p>	<p>To be determined based on location of resources.</p>
13	<p>If we choose to leverage our current laptops to help the state avoid having to provide computers, will the state provide the commercial third-party encryption software?</p> <p>a. If not, can you provide the state approved encryption software?</p>	<p>This will be provided to the selected bidder.</p>

14	Bidder has both MACs and PCs. Would this create any technology challenges working with CAHBE infrastructure?	No.
15	In regards to the submission of invoices, will the CAHBE consider the use of electronic invoice submission web-based technology acceptable?	No. Invoicing mechanism is defined in the RFO.
16	Can we leverage consultants who are out of state but commit to be onsite Monday-Friday as budgeted?	Yes.
17	Bidder would like to leverage a similar strategy that was delivered the COHBE project, which was staffed by onsite resources combined with remote resources. This model proved to be very successful from an outcome and cost perspective. Is this consulting engagement model acceptable for the project?	Yes.
18	Contact Center RFP responses: In our work estimate we are assuming there will be up to 8 RFP responses to be evaluated. Is this consistent with CAHBE expectations?	The solicitation will be public as it will be posted to the California Health Benefit Exchange web site. As such it is unknown how many bidders will respond.
19	<p>Have you developed a down select process and considered how many RFPs will go to BAFO?</p> <p>a. Can you confirm the state will consider RFP responses for providers who don't have physical contact center locations in California?</p> <p>b. Would the state consider Agent@Home solutions versus brick and mortar facilities?</p>	Not determined..
20	<p>Will the RFP include both the contact center and all the associated technologies to support the contact center?</p> <p>a. Has CAHBE made a decision on ownership of the contact center technology licenses or are you willing to have the contact center outsourcer to have ownership of the platform?</p> <p>b. Would there be interest to leverage solutions that have already been negotiated by other states to</p>	Not determined.

	<p>reduce implementation costs? This was a key area of discussion during the Health Insurance Exchange System-Wide Meeting May 21<sup>st</sup>-May 23<sup>rd</sup> in DC, and there was a strong consensus to leverage efforts from multiple states to improve the implementation cost and timeline for all Exchanges.</p>	
21	<p>Has the exchange considered how to accommodate the need for walk in support?</p> <p>a. Will you leverage existing state offices and will the selected vendors be responsible for managing walk-in traffic from state offices?</p>	Not determined.
22	<p>Can you please provide the RFO attachments (Attachments 1-C and 1-G) in a non-pdf file so we can edit in order to complete our response?</p>	Yes.
23	<p>Would the exchange allow vendors to respond to partial requirements of the RFP that is issued? Example: would be a vendor responding only to the scanning and mailroom activities be considered?</p>	Not determined.
24	<p>Can we assume that Agreement 11-E9 has been provided in the RFO as the standard documents that will be leveraged for the consultant that is awarded the business and will not require any input during the RFO selection process?</p>	Bidders should include exceptions to the Exchange's Standard Agreement, Exhibits B-E, as part of their proposal. Exceptions not raised in the proposal will not be considered.
25	<p>Section 4-2 Response Requirements, Question 1 - Understanding the Approach</p> <p>a. We are assuming Section 4.5 Costs, tasks 1-4 (pp. 23-24 with required timeframe June 15<sup>th</sup> 2012 – August 23<sup>rd</sup> 2012) are to be priced in the not to exceed \$300,000 budget. Please confirm.</p> <p>b. Can we assume that work to be completed from September 1 2012 – March 31<sup>st</sup> 2013 is not required to be priced, but that CA HBE is still</p>	<p>a. Yes. Note: Addendum #2 reflects an adjustment in the financial cap.</p> <p>b. Addendum #2 has removed forecasting.</p> <p>c. No.</p> <p>i. Yes</p>

	<p>expecting us to forecast the work hours per week, per person (task 5) in the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Can we provide recommended job roles and hours required of each rather than names of specific individuals for task 5?</li> <li>ii. Can we provide monthly work &amp; hour estimates by job type in place of weekly hourly detail for task 5?</li> <li>c. For the September 1<sup>st</sup> 2012 – March 31<sup>st</sup> 2013 timeframe, will CAHBE require a full time project management lead to be on site in Sacramento? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Can we identify that person after the Exchange commits to task 5?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
26	Will Attachment 1G (pp. 15-16) suffice to meet the resume requirements as outlined in Section 4.2, #2?	Completion of Attachment 1G and 1H (see Addendum #2) meets this requirement.
27	Would it be possible that interviews be done via conference call? Some of our critical resources that were part of the Colorado Health Benefit Exchange success will be out of the country from June 10-17.	Yes.