

RFP 1001251153

Clinical Program Initiatives to Improve the Quality and Consistency of Evaluations and Early Intervention Services for the New York State Early Intervention Program

All questions received by the New York State Department of Health (Department) by the June 21, 2010 deadline are included. The Department is not responsible for any errors or misinterpretation of any questions received. The responses to questions included herein are the official responses by the State to questions posted by potential bidders and are hereby incorporated into RFP 1001251153 Clinical Program Initiatives to Improve the Quality and Consistency of Evaluations and Early Intervention Services for the New York State Early Intervention Program issued on June 7, 2010. In the event of any conflict between the RFP and these responses, the requirements or information contained in these responses will prevail.

QUESTION 1. Will the bidder be responsible for providing the space for panel meetings in Albany, or will space be provided by the State?

RESPONSE: See Section C2e of the RFP. The bidder will be responsible for all meeting arrangements for panel meetings, including securing and paying for meeting rooms, meals, lodging, and honorariums for panelists.

QUESTION 2. The RFP requires that the bidder “publish” guidelines. Are the guidelines required to be published in peer-reviewed literature?

RESPONSE: No. The bidder will be responsible for preparing and printing the guidelines for distribution in three formats in which the guidelines are currently published: the Quick Reference Guide, Report of the Recommendations, and Technical Report.

QUESTION 3. How many printed copies of the revised guidelines (summaries or full guideline with accompanying research) and the evaluation tool guideline will be required for stakeholders and the State?

RESPONSE: The State will require 25,000 printed copies of the Quick Reference Guides, 15,000 printed copies of the Reports of the Recommendations, 3,000 printed copies of the Technical Reports, and 20,000 Compact Discs containing all three documents, for each revised guideline. The State will require 15,000 printed copies and 20,000 Compact Discs of the evaluation tool guideline.

QUESTION 4. What was the total value and time period for the contracts to develop the six existing guidelines?

RESPONSE: The total value of the contracts to develop the six existing guidelines was approximately \$3.2 million. The guidelines were developed over a three-year period (two guidelines per year). However, it is important to recognize that at the time the guidelines were developed, there were no evidence-based guidelines for young children with disabilities in existence. Research reviewed for the original guidelines spanned a twenty-year period. It

is anticipated that updating the guidelines will involve reviewing only research published since each of the guidelines were issued, involving at most a ten-year period. In addition, the panelists will be expected to use the existing guidelines and update only those recommendations and sections which are found to no longer be valid or in need of revision based on new evidence.

QUESTION 5. The introduction section of the RFP asks bidders to "...revise, update, and publish up to four of the earliest issued guidelines..." Does this mean that the first four guidelines that were developed are the ones to be updated or should the contractor update the ones needing the most revision?

RESPONSE: The Department expects that at a minimum, the guideline on autism/pervasive developmental disorders will be updated. The bidder will be required to make recommendations to the Department regarding which of the other guidelines are most in need of revision, and the feasibility and timeframes for updating additional guidelines. The Department will determine which of the guidelines the bidder should update based on these recommendations.

QUESTION 6. Can the State clarify the total number of expert panels to be convened? For example, should there be separate panels for each of the four guidelines to be revised and a fifth for the evaluation tool guideline?

RESPONSE: See Sections C2c and C2e of the RFP.

QUESTION 7. Section E(2) of the RFP states that "Prospective Bidders should note that all clarifications, including those relating to the terms and conditions of the contract, are to be raised during the Question and Answer period." However, Section E(5)(1) of the RFP states that the Department will negotiate a contract with the successful bidder. Will the State allow for negotiation with the successful bidder of any of the terms and conditions in the standard contract? If so, should bidders provide their proposed exceptions and modifications to the terms and conditions as part of their proposals?

RESPONSE: No. Bidders are required to submit an unconditional proposal responsive to the terms and conditions of the RFP. The State reserves the right to negotiate with the selected Contractor within the scope of the RFP in the best interests of the State.

QUESTION 8. Attachment 10, Appendix A - Will the State agree to negotiate a mutually agreeable limitation of liability provision that would, at a minimum, exclude consequential damages for both parties and impose a mutually agreeable cap on the Contractor's liability for direct damages?

RESPONSE: No. Appendix A contains statewide standard clauses which cannot be modified.

QUESTION 9. Attachment 10, Appendix D, Section T(1) - May the Contractor have at least thirty (30) days to cure a breach of contract?

RESPONSE: No.

QUESTION 10. Attachment 10, Appendix D, Section T(2) - May the Contractor have at least thirty (30) days to cure an action that impairs or prejudices the interests of the Department?

RESPONSE: No.

QUESTION 11. We request that the State provide the names of organizations submitting letters of intent and those submitting questions.

RESPONSE: The Lewin Group submitted a Letter of Intent and questions within the timeframe outlined in the Schedule of Key Events.

QUESTION 12. There appears to be a discrepancy between the Eligible Bidders qualifications as outlined on page 8 of the RFP and the required attestation called for in Attachment 7. Could the Department clarify what the required minimum bid qualifications are for this RFP?

RESPONSE: The qualifications on page 8 of the RFP are correct. The first attestation on Attachment 7 should read, "The bidding entity has a minimum of two years of successful work experience developing clinical practice guidelines for programs offering disability services. Evidence of this experience is demonstrated in the enclosed proposal."