



Amendment #1

Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 2022IACDS001

Intake, Assessment, and Case Decision Support Services

Questions and Answers

Q1: Will a list of vendors who submit a letter of intent be posted?

A1: The names of vendors who only submit a letter of intent and don't submit a proposal to MDCPS will not be published on the website and MAGIC Procurement Portal. The names of vendors who submits a proposal and is received by MDCPS will be published once an award is made and will be posted to the agency's website and MAGIC Procurement Portal.

Q2: The RFP states that there is a requirement to align with RedMane's timeline, which is not provided. Can MDCPS provide the timeline? Do alternative timelines need to be documented on Attachment D?

A2: The proposed Go Live date based on the RedMane project schedule is May 2024. Yes, any alternative timelines need to be documented in Attachment D

Q3: The length of time to secure a data sharing agreement varies significantly by agency and jurisdiction. To build efficiency, is it possible to embed the data sharing agreement in the contract so both are secured at once?

A3: Yes.

Q4: Does MDCPS require Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval to conduct the pre-implementation data collection (interviews) and analyses, including analyses of existing administrative and case-level data?

A4: No.

Q5: In section 2.2, last paragraph on page 8, it is stated that the vendor will complete a variety of tasks "...specifically to design an algorithm in the automated system to make screening decisions." Is MDCPS specifically seeking a predictive analytics tool to make screening decisions? Would an alternative SDM screening tool need to be documented on Attachment D?

A5: MDCPS is seeking a tool to provide an approach to child protection services that uses clearly defined and consistently applied decision-making criteria for screening for investigation, determining response priority, identifying immediate threatened harm, and estimating the risk of future abuse and neglect for intakes, risk assessments, safety assessments and ongoing casework assessments. Yes. An alternative screening tool should be documented on Attachment D (Exceptions).

Q6: The RFP asks the vendor to be prepared to help MDCPS develop intake, safety, risk and 'other relevant case assessments.' Can MDCPS provide detail on the other relevant assessments they are interested in having included in a response?

A6: Assessments that lend themselves to decision making in ongoing case work (In-Home prevention cases, foster care cases and permanency).

Q7: Item 3.3.4 of the RFP (Cost Proposal). To determine if travel expenses should be included, does MDCPS have a preference whether some deliverables (e.g., kick-off meetings, workgroups, training, case reviews) are provided in-person or remotely?

A7: MDCPS prefers in person meetings to the extent possible but understand the unique needs/accommodations for remote work.

Q8: Section 2.2, page 8 of the RFP, includes a bullet that states "Training of MCIA (Mississippi Centralized Intake & Assessment) staff, MDCPS professional development staff and other identified staff/caseworkers, on the use of the newly designed and implemented evidenced based SDM model."

- a. Can MDCPS provide a number of staff that need to be trained, as listed above?
- b. Does MDCPS have a preference for a "train the trainer" model in which the vendor creates curriculum and provides training and coaching to skilled trainers from the MDCPS professional development staff to complete training for other staff in the department, or for the vendor training all staff as listed above?
- c. Does MDCPS provide virtual training to its workforce?

A8: a. Approximately 1,000
b. MDCPS would prefer both methods of training.
c. Yes.

Q9: The RFP requires that no identifying information be included in the Technical Proposal. Structured Decision Making (SDM) is trademarked by Evident Change. Because Evident Change is the only vendor who can implement SDM, can we mention SDM in the Technical Proposal?

A9: Referring to any program, process, model, or other item that is trademarked by the Offeror does not constitute identifying information as defined in Section 3.3.3, unless identifying information (such as the name of the Offeror) is part of the name of the trademarked item on its face.

Q10: In RFP section 3.3.2 Minimum Qualifications and Information, there is a bold header “Written Proposals shall contain the Following MANDATORY Minimum Information...” which then lists the scope of services described in RFP section 2.2.

In RFP section 3.3.3 Technical Proposal, the final paragraph states “Offerors should submit a plan giving as many details as is practical to explaining how the services will be performed pursuant to Section 2.2 of this RFP and information for quality control and assurance programs.”

Can MDCPS confirm what materials are to be included in Tab2: Minimum qualifications and information, and what materials are to be included in Tab 3: Technical proposal?

A10: Pages 13 and 14 of the RFP are hereby amended as follows:

3.3.2 Minimum Qualifications and Information

The Offeror must submit documentation demonstrating that it meets the following minimum qualifications:

- The Offeror must receive a minimum total score of 12 from two references on the Reference Score Sheet, provided as Attachment F to this RFP. The Offeror must have or have had contracts or projects with the references submitted on Attachment E under which services similar in scope, size, or discipline to the services required herein were performed or undertaken during the past three (3) years. References must be familiar with the Offeror’s abilities in the areas involved with this RFP. MDCPS will use these references to determine the Offeror’s ability to perform the services. It is the responsibility of the Offeror to ensure that the reference contact information is correct and current. Offerors should verify before submitting their response that the contact person and phone number are correct for each reference. MDCPS staff must be able to reach at least two (2) references for an Offeror within two (2) business days of proposal opening. The Offeror may submit as many references as desired. MDCPS will begin contacting references at the top of the list and will continue down the list until MDCPS completes a Reference Score Sheet for two (2) references.
- The Offeror must be financially stable or solvent. Each Offeror shall submit copies of the most recent year’s independently audited finance statements as well as financial statements for the preceding two (2) years. The submission must include the audit opinion, the balance sheet, and statements of income, retained earnings, cash flows, notes to the financial statements, and account balances for the past six (6) months. If independently audited financial statements do not exist, Offeror must state the reason and, instead, submit sufficient information to enable the Agency to assess the financial stability or solvency of the Offeror, such as financial statements,

credit ratings, a line of credit, or other financial arrangements sufficient to enable the Offeror to be capable of meeting the requirements of the RFP.

3.3.3 Technical Proposal

Offerors must submit a Technical Proposal which contains no identifying information. If any portion of the Technical proposal, including any exhibits or attachments thereto, contains identifying information, the Offeror's proposal may be immediately rejected and may not be considered for an award. Offerors may not include any live internet links in the Technical proposal and should ensure any graphics included in the Technical proposal do not contain identifying information.

Identifying information includes, but is not limited to, any prior, current and future names or addresses of the Offeror, any names of incumbent staff, any prior, current and future logos, watermarks, and company colors, any information, which identifies the Offeror as an incumbent, and any other information, which would affect the blind evaluation of technical or cost factors.

Offerors should submit a plan giving as many details as is practical explaining how the services will be performed pursuant to Section 2.2 of this RFP and information for quality control and assurance programs.

Written Technical Proposals shall contain the Following MANDATORY Minimum Information:

- a. Project planning and startup activities,
- b. Planning, studying/analyzing MDCPS policies, procedures, MS state laws, statues, and federal regulations to set forth an SDM that is in alignment with these guiding documents. This may also include interviews with relevant stakeholders
- c. Assessing relevant data to determine a baseline of MDCPS' current functioning and performance of Intakes, case practice and outcomes, along with Safety Assessments, Risk Assessments and other relevant case assessments.
- d. Developing, Designing, Implementing and certifying an evidenced based Intake and Assessment, Safety and Risk Assessment, and other relevant case assessments.
- e. Training of MCIA (Mississippi Centralized Intake & Assessment) staff, MDCPS professional development staff and other identified staff/caseworkers, on the use of the newly designed and implemented evidenced based SDM model.
- f. Development of curriculum and training materials for MDCPS for all associated assessments of SDM.
- g. Ongoing support, training and technical assistance including data analysis post implementation of the evidenced based SDM.
- h. Implementation evaluation to ensure fidelity of the model, post implementation.

Q11: Will the vendor selected through this RFP have primary project management responsibility? Will RedMane be required to conform to the project plan established?

A11: No, the vendor selected through this RFP will not have primary project management responsibility. See 1.1 of the RFP: MDCPS is seeking to procure the services of a vendor with experience in implementing and certifying Evidenced Based Structured Decision Making (SDM). The vendor must be willing to collaborate with MDCPS's primary vendor implementing the new Comprehensive Child Welfare Information System (CCWIS) (RedMane) to align a project schedule parallel to the CCWIS implementation schedule. Additional information about the services the Agency is seeking can be found in Section 2 of this RFP.

Q12: What is the anticipated target date to migrate/convert from MACWIS to the application designed by RedMane?

A12: The current expected Go Live date for CCWIS is May 2024.

Q13: If an offer is rejected based on "any other reason MDCPS determines to be in the best interest of the State," will that reason be conveyed and explained to the proposer?

A13: Yes. In a debriefing requested by the vendor.

Q14: What time will the vendor have to meet with RedMane to analyze their application to determine if an integrated or standalone system would be most beneficial to MDCPS? Would RedMane or MDCPS be open to making application changes prior to conversion?

A14: Time can be secured for vendor meetings however a stand-alone solution is not preferred. MDCPS and RedMane would be open to application changes prior to conversion through the design phase based on the proposer's timeline response to the RFP.

Q15: Does MDCPS plan on allowing any knowledge sharing between the vendor and MDCPS field staff?

A15: Yes. This should be requested in the response to the RFP and should be built into the project timeline.

Q16: Will the vendor have any input on or the ability to redesign applications, questionnaires, intake documents, etc., to ensure compliance with Federal requirements, system integration, and user-friendliness?

A16: Yes, depending on project schedule. However, RedMane is charged with this task.

Q17. Does MDCPS have a format preference for providing the detailed budget including an itemized list of all expenditures for the services and activities required by this RFP?

A17: There is not a format preference, but please ensure that any and all pricing to perform these services is including within your budget with no additional or hidden fees. Please see a sample budget for guidance.

Q18: Would MDCPS entertain a hybrid approach to pricing, with a fixed fee for development and implementation, and time and expenses for ongoing support?

A18: Yes, as long as the total project cost is included.

Q19: Will MDCPS provide a copy of the RFP used to procure RedMane's application development services? Will MDCPS provide a copy of RedMane's response to the RFP used to procure RedMane's services?

A19: This information may be obtained by visiting www.Transparency.MS.gov, or through a Public Records Request.

Q20: Is the Redmane solution for Mississippi configured in or utilizing an enterprise cloud platform, or is it a custom-built solution? Is the Redmane solution for Mississippi configured in or utilizing an enterprise cloud platform, or is it a custom-built solution?

A20: RedMane's solution will be hosted in an Azure Cloud Environment.

Q21: If it is on a cloud platform, can you please provide details of parts of the technology that Redmane is utilizing to build your new CCWIS?

A21: RedMane's solution is proprietary and MDCPS is not at liberty to provide any details on their technology directly.

Q22: Please confirm if your preferred solution is custom-coded into Redmane or an existing commercial product that can be integrated into Redmane's solution more affordably and efficiently?

A22: RedMane's solution can be configured to provide structured decision making functionality or it can integrate with an external system.

Q23: Assuming Redmane is not going to be open to allowing another vendor to reconfigure the new SDM into their proprietary solution, if your preferred mode of configuration is to have the new SDM be custom coded into the Redmane solution, to what extent will Redmane be providing the configuration and customization resources?

A23: RedMane service technicians will configure SDM or integrate with an external system upon request from MDCPS

Q24: Please clarify if the first one-year contract can be for a maximum of \$3M or if that \$3M is for the initial contract and inclusive of renewal contracts?

A24: The \$3M is for total cost of the project

Q25: Is there additional monies for ongoing licensing available beyond the \$3M for Development, Design, Implementation and Certification of an Evidenced Based SDM model?

Q25: The state will incur the cost of ongoing licensing and certification

Q26: If so, do licensing fees need to be shared within the budget, and are those monies considered separate from the \$3M budget stated in the Request for Petition?

A26: The state will incur the cost of ongoing licensing and certification

Q27: Can the State provide a cloud-based data repository for the SDM records and result to be stored?

A27: Yes

Q28: If so is this within or outside of Redmane's CCWIS solution?

A28: Records would be stored within the RedMane solution.

Q29: Does the State have an analytics or reporting tool to report on SDM data as a whole versus SDM case recommendations (e.g., Tableau)?

A29: The state has multiple reporting tools including Tableau and Power BI

Q30: In an attempt to reduce licensing costs, if so would this tool be available to use or support this data?

A30: Yes

Q31: By certifying the logic and algorithms within the CCWIS as being designed and built are you referring to CCWIS compliance? Please explain.

A31: No, SDM is not required for CCWIS compliance. See section 2.2.

Please acknowledge receipt of Amendment One by completing and returning Acknowledgement of Amendment Form (Attachment H) with your proposal package no later than July 25, 2023, 12:00 p.m., CT.

SAMPLE BUDGET

	Year 1	Years 2 through 5				Total Costs	Explanatory Notes
	2023-2024	Year 2 - 2024/2025	Year 3 - 2025/2026	Year 4 - 2025/2026	Year 5 - 2026/2027		
Service/Unit Category 1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Service/Unit Category 2	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Service/Unit Category 3	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Service/Unit Category 4	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Grand Total -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	