



**SOLICITATION AMENDMENT #2**

<p align="center"><b>YH21-0004</b> MES Modernization Roadmap Consultant RFP</p>	<p align="center">Solicitation Due Date:  <b>Friday, June 4, 2021, 3:00 pm Arizona Time</b></p>	<p>Procurement Officer: Meggan LaPorte  Email: <a href="mailto:procurement@azahcccs.gov">procurement@azahcccs.gov</a></p>
---	---	---

**A signed copy of this amendment must be submitted with your solicitation response.**

This Solicitation is amended as follows:

The attached Answers to Second Round Questions are incorporated as part of this solicitation amendment.

<p><b>OFFEROR HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGES RECEIPT AND UNDERSTANDING OF THIS SOLICITATION AMENDMENT.</b></p>	<p><b>THIS SOLICITATION AMENDMENT IS HEREBY EXECUTED ON THIS DAY, IN PHOENIX, AZ.</b></p>
<p>SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED INDIVIDUAL:</p>	<p>SIGNATURE:  <b>SIGNATURE ON FILE</b></p>
<p>TYPED NAME:</p>	<p>TYPED NAME: <b>Meggan LaPorte, CPPO, MSW</b></p>
<p>TITLE:</p>	<p>TITLE: <b>Chief Procurement Officer</b></p>
<p>DATE:</p>	<p>DATE:</p>



**ANSWERS TO VENDOR QUESTIONS  
ROUND #2**

**MES Modernization Roadmap Consultant RFP #YH21-0004**

Question #	VENDOR NAME	Paragraph # or Title	Vendor Question	AHCCCS Response
1.	Random Bit LLC	Clarification of response to Questions #48 and #66	<p>“The kickoff meeting will be virtual, and the state expects around 20 participants. Meeting may be hosted on either party’s video conferencing software, as mutually agreed upon.</p> <p>The Offeror shall assume that most, if not all, meetings will be held virtually until late 2021 or early 2022 at which time the parties can discuss the best method of meeting, as mutually agreed upon. If any meeting is held in person, the AHCCCS conference rooms are available for use in Phoenix, and any COVID protocols in place at that time will be communicated to the parties. “</p> <p>Other than meetings, does AHCCCS have expectations of onsite presence for the work performed?</p>	Not at this time.
2.	Briljent, LLC	Question 16	Can you please confirm that the vendor will be expected to both identify the business processes and map them (as seems to be indicated in Question 5)?	Yes, the vendor will be expected to both identify the business processes and map them
3.	Briljent, LLC	Question 39	Is there an expectation that the vendor will complete and update any missing or out-of-date documentation as part of this project?	In general, the vendor will not be expected to update existing documentation, however, the vendor will be expected to produce all the deliverables and complete the scope of work in the RFP. Furthermore, the vendor will be expected to share documentation generated during the course of the project or used in its execution.
4.	Briljent, LLC	Question 20	If no budgetary parameters are being provided, can you tell us how price will be weighted compared to other selection criteria? Which of the evaluation criteria listed in the RFP will be most important?	Evaluation Criteria are listed in the Special Instructions to Offerors, Paragraph 3, in relative order of importance, with cost being listed last. The Offeror’s Technical Proposal will hold most weight.



**ANSWERS TO VENDOR QUESTIONS  
ROUND #2**

**MES Modernization Roadmap Consultant RFP #YH21-0004**

Question #	VENDOR NAME	Paragraph # or Title	Vendor Question	AHCCCS Response
5.	Public Consulting Group	Page 12, Section 5.7	<p><b>Original Question asked by Netlogx:</b> Is there a Requirements Traceability Matrix template that AHCCCS prefers the Contractor to use?</p> <p><b>Follow Up Question:</b> Is there a preferred or existing tool (Excel, MS) that the State prefers the vendor use or do you want vendors to suggest the tool? If applicable, can tool costs be included in the cost estimate if needed?</p>	The State does not have a preferred tool for collection of the information. The vendor is free to propose any tool, however, the final deliverable shall be submitted to the State in excel or PDF format, (or other non-proprietary format as agreed to by the State). The deliverable for 5.7 is a firm fixed price so the cost of the tool should be included in your proposal and not a separate line item.
6.	Public Consulting Group	General	<p><b>Original Question asked by Netlogx:</b> The RFP calls for a 3-year contract and 2 one-year extensions. What services are anticipated during the extension period?</p> <p><b>Follow-up Question:</b> Does the extension period apply to Section 5.6 and also 5.7?</p>	Yes applies to Section 5.6 and also 5.7
7.	Public Consulting Group	Section 5.7, page 11	<p><b>Original Question asked by North Highland:</b> Could the State confirm that the requirements compiled into the RTM would be developed/defined as part of the work described in Section 5.6 - Scopes of Work, and the work described in Section 5.7 - Development of Specifications involves compiling and maintaining those requirements in the RTM?</p> <p><b>Follow Up Question:</b> Interpretation of this is that an RTM would be built as part of the initial phase of the project (SS-A/Roadmap) which will elicit many requirements for the future modules. Additional work would commence at a later date to include RFP/SOW development and additional detailed requirements gathering (JAD) sessions for specific modules/solutions?</p> <p>"Development of Specifications" would seem to be an activity that also occurs as part of yet to be defined Scopes of Work?</p> <p>Is 5.7.1 Requirements Traceability Matrix then optional as well, and how should we reflect that in Attachment A Cost Proposal?</p>	No, the RTM in Section 5.7 is not optional. The deliverable for 5.7 should be a firm fixed price in the Cost Proposal.