1. Section 2.1.3 – Existing System Description and Section 3.2 – Preferred Qualifications

Part A: Can the state clarify what expectations it has regarding how a vendor would employ any previous Curam experience? We understand NYEIS is built on the Curam platform, however, if the selected vendor is not providing any development services, but only working in the user interface of the system, what is the need for Curam experience? Can this preference be eliminated from the RFP?

   a. NYEIS is based upon both the technical and functional components of IBM Curam’s Version 4.5 software application used for human services. The application is implemented mostly in Curam and PL/SQL. The contractor will be required to provide support to NYEIS end users for duration of the contract, which may include future Curam version upgrades, so experience with the product is helpful. Since the experience is not a mandatory requirement, it is a preference, the requirement will not be removed from the RFP.

Part B: Our firm has direct and long experience in navigating and utilizing the NYEIS system, and we have years of experience providing system user support services to other state agency clients with systems of similar complexity, including other statewide early intervention case management systems. Would this knowledge of the NYEIS user interface and functionality meet the expectation for understanding the Curam platform under “3.2 Preferred Qualifications,” especially in combination with experience providing system user support services for other large-scale statewide early intervention case management systems?

   a. The preference is only related to the Curam platform itself. Preference will be given to a vendor who demonstrates knowledge of a Curam-based application user interface and functionality, and/or implemented a Curam software-based application.
2. **Section 4.1.1 NYEIS End User Support Services Contractor Task**
   Please clarify whether by responding directly to items D.2.1-D.2.9 of section 6.2 of the Technical Proposal the bidder will be also satisfying the tasks laid out in section 4.1.1 of the RFP. That is, so long as the Bidder appropriately answers the items under D. Technical Proposal Narrative of section 6.2, there is no need to separately respond to each of the tasks listed in 4.1.1 elsewhere in the proposal? This question is related to proposal structure rather than substance.

   a. By responding to Section D.2.1 – D.2.6 of Section 6.2, the bidder is being responsive to the requested content, no separate response beyond what is requested is needed.

3. **Section 6.2 Technical Proposal**
   On page 21 of the RFP, items D.2.1 – D.2.9 are missing items D.2.3, D.2.6, and D.2.8. Can the state clarify if there are missing tasks/deliverables or if this is just in error?

   a. There was an error in the numbering of the Section 6.2.D. This has been corrected and an amendment to the RFP has been posted. See Amendment #1.

4. **Section 4.3 – Reporting Requirements**
   “Unlimited view access accounts” – due to the user license-based nature of our call tracking platform, can the state please clarify whether “unlimited” accounts refer to about a hundred, several hundred, or above one thousand accounts? We have different solutions based on the approximate amount, so a high-level estimation would help shape our response.

   a. Under 100