

SBE 04: Illinois State-Based Exchange UAT Support Request for Proposals

Responses to Questions

This document supplies responses to the questions provided by interested Offerors. These questions have been entered into this document as received.

#	Page	Reference	Question	State Response
1			Is Security Testing in Scope of Work?	Acceptance review of the tools, reports, and results is in scope. Actual performance of the security testing is not in this RFP's scope.
2			Is Performance Testing in the Scope of Work?	Acceptance review of the tools, reports, and results is in scope. Actual planning and execution of the performance testing is not in this RFP's scope.
3			What is the Tech Stack for the Scope of SBE 02 RFP	The SBE system is a proprietary SaaS solution development, implemented, and maintained by GetInsured. It relies on some third-party point solutions such as IBML, Sisense, etc.
4			Has any tool already been identified for performance and security testing? Or will it be expected to be suggested by the Offeror?	Acceptance review of the tools, reports, and results is in scope. Actual performance of the security testing is not in this RFP's scope. Acceptance review of the tools, reports, and results is in scope. Actual planning and execution of the performance testing is not in this RFP's scope.
5			Is the EDI Test plan and Testing in the Scope of work for UAT?	While EDI testing is not explicitly tested, it is a byproduct of UAT functionality testing's test cases (e.g. confirmation that an enrollment transaction was received and processed correctly, etc.)
6			Is the Carrier Plan Certification Plan expected to happen in July and September in the Scope of work?	Carrier Plan Certification work would be performed by GetInsured in collaboration with GCI. Therefore, tasks related to the Carrier Plan Certification Plan is not in this RFP's scope of work.
7			Is there software development in Scope for Mail Operations (Mailroom) that needs to be considered for UAT?	There is software functionality throughout the SBE solution that relates to and supports the mailroom operations. The UAT Vendor will also be required to validate that the physical and operational aspects of the mailroom meet the contractual requirements. Validation can be performed virtually.
8			Are the "pre-built reports necessary to efficiently run the operation, reports that	Yes

#	Page	Reference	Question	State Response
			support the monitoring of SLAs and any other measures, and reports that will enable the State to operate successfully and efficiently" in the Scope of work for UAT?	
			Is Web Analytics (Google Analytics) reporting on the scope of work for UAT?	No
9			Are both SOW 1 & 2 of SBE 02 RFP in Scope? Or SOW1 alone? Or SOW2 alone?	SOW2 is not in scope at this time. When it becomes in scope the State will request a change order to the contract.
10			Under the Scope of Work for SBE 03 SOW, Do you need the UAT support for Phase 2 (TPO) and Phase 3 (M&O) as well?	Assuming the intended reference was for SBE 02, not SBE 03, the UAT support is expected to continue after the initial go-live UAT(s). The overall SBE04 UAT support contract envisions ongoing UAT support for the term of the contract.
11			If the post-implementation UAT support is in-scope during TPO and M&O, will there be a chance for a change request if a new development request comes up? Or will it be treated with a new SoW?	Per Section 7.2.1.2.8.b & c of the RFP and as priced in the Cost Response Template rows 2 and 3 address situations where a new development request will undergo UAT. The Cost Response Template has been revised to correct a reference in row 3 of the cost table.
12			If the post-implementation UAT support is in scope during TPO and M&O, will there be a chance for a change request for platform upgrades / maintenance / migration requests? Or will it be treated with a new SoW?	Per Section 7.2.1.2.8.b & c of the RFP and as priced in the Cost Response Template rows 2 and 3 address situations where a "platform upgrades / maintenance / migration requests" will undergo the appropriate level of UAT by the Selected Offeror.
13			Can you share the high-level plan produced during the DDI Stage 1 of SOW1 and SOW2?	The Project Plan and associated documentation will be shared with the Selected Offeror.
14			Regarding scoring-could you elaborate on the weightage assigned to Technical versus Financial evaluation	Section 6.1 Evaluation Criteria, Exhibit 2 Scoring Approach provides detail on the scoring approach. Technical has 800 of the total 1,000 points, Financial has 200 of the 1,000 points.
15	3	1.2.3	Will DOI consider making the significant experience in UAT of the SBE Customer Support Center technology a preferred	The RFP has been modified to read, "All Key Staff must have significant experience and expertise in UAT of both SBE systems and Healthcare or Health Insurance related Customer Support Center technology. Significant

#	Page	Reference	Question	State Response
			requirement rather than a mandatory requirement?	experience and expertise with similar eligibility, enrollment, and customer support technology systems, such as Medicaid or the FFM, will be considered but may not be accepted as a substitute qualification.”
16	19	7.1.2	Please provide an estimated number and frequency of meetings that the UAT/QA selected offeror should expect to attend.	The State does not have a pre-determined estimate of the number or frequency of meetings the Selected Offerors should expect to attend. The Offerors should use their own experience in similar engagements for this estimate.
17	20	7.2	Please clarify what levels of access the UAT/QA selected offeror will have to Jira and the UAT environment.	The levels of access the Selected Offeror feels it needs to fully and successfully accomplish its contractual obligations will be discussed and agreed upon post contract award in collaboration with GetInsured.
18	21	7.2.1.4	Is there an estimated number of deliverables that will require quality assurance reviews?	There will be approximately 10, plus or minus 5, Deliverables that are UAT related deliverables that will require quality assurance review.
19	24	8.1.6	Will the UAT/QA selected vendor have input into how Jira is configured for the RTP and reporting purposes?	The Jira configuration will be discussed and agreed upon post contract award in collaboration with GetInsured.
20	25	9.2.1	Section 9.2.1 of the RFP states that the term of the contract is for five years. Section 9.2.2 states that the total term of the contract will not exceed 10 years. However, in Section 1.1 on page 2, the RFP states that the contract shall have an initial term of two years and will not exceed nine years. Please clarify the initial term of the contract and the number of total years for the contract.	The maximum term of the contract is nine (9) years. The nine years is comprised of an initial two (2) year term, followed by seven (7) optional years. The RFP has been amended in Sections 9.2.1, 9.2.2, and 9.3.1.
21		7.3.5	Would the state be open to providing approval for offshore testing resources, if all state rules and regulations for such access are met and complied with?	Yes, offshore testing resources can be used if all Federal and State rules and regulations for secure access, data protection, and all other rules, regulations, and policies are met. The State reserves the right to rescind such approval in cases where English proficiency, working hours, or other programmatic or logistical issues burden the State.
22		General	Would the state please provide an extension to the due date of this RFP by	The RFP has been amended to reflect a new “Submission of Proposals” due date of 12/20/24 @ 12:00 PM Central Time.

#	Page	Reference	Question	State Response
			two weeks?	
23		4.15	<p>Would the state consider responses with a BEP vendor who is registered in IL under different codes other than NIGP codes 920-76 and 920-65?</p> <p>For example: NIGP 948-43: Health Information Services, NIGP 918-32: Consulting Services (Not Otherwise Classified),</p> <p>NIGP 918-71: IT Consulting (Not Otherwise Classified), NIGP 918-21: Business Consulting, NIGP 918-58: Governmental Consulting, NIGP 918-75: Management Consulting. NIGP 962-58: Professional Services (Not Otherwise Classified).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State will only honor original solicited NIGP codes.
24		Cost Response Template	Would the state clarify that the Status and Progress Reports is 5% of the sum of the costs of Tasks 1 and 2, spanned over the 24-month period?	For Task 1 the 5% is to the total cost of Task 1. For Task 2 the 5% is for each time GCI requests a Task 2 to be performed.
25		Cost Response Template	Would the state clarify that for each individual task (UAT Plan, Data Migration Test Plan, UAT Procedures, UAT Results, and Requirements Traceability), is the percentage of the cost for each release or for the total two-year duration?	For Task 1 the percentage associated with that task is to the total cost of Task 1. For Task 2 the percentage associated with that task is for each time GCI requests a Task 2 to be performed.
26		Cost Response Template	The cost response table row 3 for the 700 Hours of UAT labor references Section 7.2.1.2.9.c should the reference be to 7.2.1.2.8.c?	Yes, the correct reference for row 3 should be 7.2.1.2.8.c. The Cost Response template has been updated with the correct reference.