**STATE OF MAINE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS**

**RFP SUBMITTED QUESTIONS & ANSWERS SUMMARY**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RFP NUMBER AND TITLE:** | RFP #202506081 - Electronic Death Investigation Case Management System |
| **RFP ISSUED BY:** | Office of Chief Medical Examiner |
| **SUBMITTED QUESTIONS DUE DATE:** | July 25, 2025 |
| **QUESTION & ANSWER SUMMARY ISSUED:** | July 31, 2025 |
| **PROPOSAL DUE DATE:** | August 8, 2025, no later than 11:59 p.m., local time |
| **PROPOSALS DUE TO:** | [Proposals@maine.gov](mailto:Proposals@maine.gov) |

**Provided below are submitted written questions received and the Department’s answer.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General | Does the State have a required or desired page limit for responses? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General | Does the State have a preferred timeline for initial system implementation? When ideally does the State want to go live? |
| **Answer** | |
| Ideally, State will go live on October 1, 2025 | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General | What costs has the State incurred for the initial set up, ongoing maintenance, hosting, software licensing, support, and enhancements (i.e., “change orders”) over the lifetime of the current system(s) to be replaced by the new solution? |
| **Answer** | |
| The budgeted amount for the system is $54,000 annually. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General | What presentations, software demonstrations and/or estimates / quotes have the State received related to this project and from whom? |
| **Answer** | |
| The RFP is how the state receives this information from vendors. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **5** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General | Please inventory all data sources, file formats, and size of the current data sets to be converted and migrated into the new system. |
| **Answer** | |
| 1,810GB of storage, which is 62,336 cases, 480,346 photos, 118,305 documents (PDF, Word, email uploads), 16 audio files, and 231 videos. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **6** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General | What is the State’s budget for the initial system implementation? |
| **Answer** | |
| The budgeted amount for the system is $54,000 annually. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **7** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General | What, if any, amount of the budget is subject to expire by a certain timeframe and when? Please elaborate. |
| **Answer** | |
| None | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **8** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General | What amount is budgeted for ongoing support, software licensing, hosting, and support of the new DICMS? |
| **Answer** | |
| The budgeted amount for the system is $54,000 annually. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **9** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General | Does the State desire to have the option for staff to be trained in application administration to make changes, updates, and add new capabilities to the system after go-live? Or is the State anticipating that the vendor will perform future updates and changes (such as form configuration, business rule changes, etc.) to the system? |
| **Answer** | |
| Vendor will perform such duties. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **10** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General | Please provide an approximate number of standard email/letter/document templates that will be used by the State that are to be integrated and automated by the system. |
| **Answer** | |
| 3 templates. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **11** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General | Given the complexity of the RFP, can the response due date be extended by at least 2-4 weeks? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **12** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Introduction – A. Purpose and Background: Page 6 | The RFP states, “The System must support a dynamic user base—estimated at 75 to 95 users (12 State employees and others external) —including internal Department personnel, forensic consultants, grant abstracters, and contracted professionals.” Can the State provide a rough breakdown (count) of the 75 – 95 users by role, describing the role and whether the user type is internal or external? |
| **Answer** | |
| **Administrator** Read/write access to all cases in jurisdiction with ability to assign personnel, unpublish cases, export media, create inventory, and delete cases.  **Administrator/Pathologist** Read/write access to all cases in jurisdiction with ability to be assigned as case pathologist.  **Autopsy Service** Read access to all cases, write access to pathology forms, and the ability to assign/change pathologists. This permission set allows facilities that perform autopsies for other jurisdictions to do their job.  **Autopsy Technician** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to pathology forms on all cases in jurisdiction.  **Clerk** Read/write access to all cases in jurisdiction.  **Consultant** Read only access to specific case(s) assigned by office.  **Investigator** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to investigator forms and documentation on their cases only.  **Investigator** Unrestricted Read access on all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to investigator forms on their cases only.  **Limited Access** Read/write access to forms associated with the MDI Worksheet and DC Worksheet.  **Morgue** Read/write access to Body Tracking, Case Notes, and Identification form. Used for checking bodies in/out of facility.  **Morgue with Property/Evidence** Read/write access to Body Tracking, Case Notes, **Property/Evidence**, and Identification form. Used for checking bodies in/out of facility.  **Pathologist** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to pathology forms on their cases.  **Pathologist Restricted** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction except for Documentation. Write access to pathology forms on their cases only.  **Pathologist Visiting** Read/write access to their cases only.  **State Office** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction including the Autopsy Report and Toxicology Report. No access to create/edit cases, view photos, track user changes, or view county reports.  **Abstractor Access** Read access on all cases in jurisdiction.  **Administrator Limited view** Read/write access to all cases assigned to them with ability to assign personnel, unpublish cases, export media, create inventory, and delete cases.  **Investigator Limited View** No access on all cases in jurisdiction. Read/Write access to investigator forms on their cases only.  **Technical Staff** Permission set specifically for Director of Lab and Medical Examiner Assistants  Safe Sleep Death Review Read only access to specific case(s) as assigned by office." | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **13** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Functional Requirements, Case Management Capability 1.c: Page 9 | This Functional Requirement reads, “Track case progress with reminders and alerts for required actions or certification renewals." Can the State an overview of the certification renewal use case as it related to the DICMS? |
| **Answer** | |
| National Association of Medical Examiner (NAME) accreditation certification renewal | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **14** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Functional Requirements, Case Management Capability 1.d: Page 9 | This Functional Requirement reads, “Support cross-county case assignment and sharing with appropriate access controls.” What access controls are desired on a cross-county basis? Who are the county-level contacts who require access, and how does the State desire their access to be managed? |
| **Answer** | |
| Permission sets are the access controls. County level access is through appointed field personnel. Their access should be managed through a specific permission set. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **15** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Functional Requirements, Case Management Capability 2.a: Page 9 | This Functional Requirement reads, "Automated integration with NMS Labs and AIT Laboratories for toxicology reporting." Does the State have specifications for these integrations containing the information listed in General/Technical Requirement 1.3.3 on Page 31? Understanding the format, direction, and nature of the data exchanged will assist vendors in properly scoping these integrations into the project. |
| **Answer** | |
| Decedent name, sample type, collection date/time, test order number, analytes identified. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **16** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Functional Requirements, Case Management Capability 2.b: Page 9 | This Functional Requirement reads, "Ability to interface with the State of Maine’s Vital IQ Electronic Death Registration System (administered by VitalChek)." Does the State have specifications for this integration containing the information listed in General/Technical Requirement 1.3.3 on Page 31? Understanding the format, direction, and nature of the data exchanged will assist vendors in properly scoping these integrations into the project. |
| **Answer** | |
| No, this is a future feature that the system should be capable of. The receiving agency has not upgraded their system yet. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **17** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Functional Requirements, Case Management Capability 2.c: Page 9 | This Functional Requirement reads, “Future optional feature: toxicology order submission from within the system.” Can the State provide an overview of the toxicology order submission process to assist vendors in understanding this requirement? Understanding answers to the following questions will be especially helpful:   * What information is typically contained within the toxicology orders? * To whom are toxicology orders submitted? * How does the State envision coordinating the processing of the submitted orders with the recipients? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, the current process is to document the type of sample collected:   * Sample type, collection date/time, test requested, submitting pathologist * The current vendor is NMS Labs * System based with electronic tracking. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **18** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Functional Requirements, Case Management Capability 3.a: Page 9 | This Functional Requirement reads, "Generate both standard and custom reports (including the two current reports: Investigative Summary and Exam Sheet)." What information is contained in the Investigative Summary and Exam Sheet? Can the State provide a generic sample of these reports for vendor review? |
| **Answer** | |
| The Investigative Summary includes: decedent demographics, death date/time and location information, cause and manner of death information, injury information, and assigned Investigator and Personnel information. The Exam Sheet includes decedent and case information, decedent medical interventions, identifiable marks, biometric information, and a narrative section. No, a sample will not be provided. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **19** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General/Technical Requirement 1.12.3: Page 36 | This requirement reads, "If determined necessary through the data migration analysis (Section 1.12.1), the Bidder shall be required to perform additional data migration tasks as part of the system implementation. This shall include but not be limited to: […] File System Data (e.g., scanned forms, attachments, or multimedia." Can the State describe how files relevant to the DICMS are currently stored and indexed to case records? |
| **Answer** | |
| Currently uploaded and attached to individual case file in the existing system. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **20** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| General/Technical Requirement 1.12.3: Page 36 | This requirement reads, "If determined necessary through the data migration analysis (Section 1.12.1), the Bidder shall be required to perform additional data migration tasks as part of the system implementation. This shall include but not be limited to: […] ETL Processes." Can the State describe its current ETL processes? |
| **Answer** | |
| The current ETL process varies based on the data, services, and locations. However, the chosen ETL process must comply with: https://www.maine.gov/oit/sites/maine.gov.oit/files/inline-files/DataExchangePolicy.pdf | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **21** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II (p. 9) & Appendix E, 1.3 (p. 22) | In relation to the required third-party interfaces: Does the State have established technical points of contact at NMS Labs, AIT Laboratories, and VitalChek (for the EDRS) with whom the awarded vendor will be expected to coordinate? Do they have published endpoint documentation for APIs that can be provided to bidding vendors? If not, what mode of transport will they use to provide data, and at what frequency (e.g., hourly, daily, monthly)? |
| **Answer** | |
| The state does have technical points of contact. The mode of transportation will be wireless with an SFTP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **22** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, 1.1.2 (p. 21) | For the Active Directory SSO requirement: Can the State confirm if it uses Active Directory Federation Services (ADFS) and if the necessary SAML 2.0 endpoints are readily available for vendor integration? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, currently use ADFS, and necessary endpoints are readily available. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **23** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, 1.3.6 (p. 22) | Regarding the mobile UI for field investigators: Can the State clarify if there is a requirement for the application to be functional in an offline or disconnected state, with data syncing once a connection is re-established? |
| **Answer** | |
| The application cannot be offline or disconnected. It must be operational 24/7 with instant data syncing. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **24** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, 1.5.1 (p. 22) | To better understand the scope of the configurable workflow engine: Could the State provide a high-level overview or diagram of the primary stages in its current death investigation process? |
| **Answer** | |
| Information gathered and entered to include biometrics, circumstances, and locations. From there, additional information may be added to the case file including attachments, autopsy information, external examination narratives. Once cause of death is determined, the system is updated and the Investigative Summary (a snapshot of the case) is printed. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **25** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, 1.10 (p. 23) | Regarding the annual SOC 2 Type II audit requirement: Would the State consider accepting a current, healthcare-specific security accreditation such as EHNAC for the first year of the contract, to allow time for the full SOC 2 audit process to be completed post-award? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **26** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, 1.12 (p. 23) | Regarding the legacy data migration specified: Could you please describe the format of the source data (e.g., is it in a relational database, flat files, or another format)? |
| **Answer** | |
| It is in a relational database. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **27** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, 1.12 (p. 23) | To aid in the data migration analysis required: Is there an existing data dictionary for the legacy source system(s) that can be shared? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **28** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, 1.12 (p. 23) | In support of the data migration requirements: Would it be possible for the State to provide a representative, de-identified sample of the legacy data? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **29** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, 1.12 (p. 23) | To accurately scope the data migration effort detailed: Could you please characterize the quality of the 20 years of legacy data? For instance, would the legacy data pass all current business rules if it were re-validated today, or are there known data quality issues—such as incompleteness, invalid formats, or logical inconsistencies—that the vendor will be responsible for remediating as part of the migration? Any existing analysis or summary of known issues would be helpful. |
| **Answer** | |
| The quality of the legacy data is good throughout and all data is consistent. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **30** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, 1.14 (p. 24) | Given the CDC's data modernization initiative for Medical Examiner and Coroner offices: What is the State's strategic direction regarding the 'Medicolegal Death Investigation FHIR Implementation Guide (MDI FHIR IG)' for the EDRS integration and other vital records IGs, and will additional consideration be given during the proposal evaluation to vendors that propose a standards-based, FHIR-native architecture in alignment with these national priorities? Said simply, is future proofing the system to align to national data exchange standards of interest to the state? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **31** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I, Section A Paragraph 2 | Please provide a bit more detail regarding the user base, including roles (investigator, law enforcement, funeral home, livery, etc.) and relationship to the agency (employee, other state agency, sub-contractor, etc.). |
| **Answer** | |
| **Administrator** Read/write access to all cases in jurisdiction with ability to assign personnel, unpublish cases, export media, create inventory, and delete cases.  **Administrator/Pathologist** Read/write access to all cases in jurisdiction with ability to be assigned as case pathologist.  **Autopsy Service** Read access to all cases, write access to pathology forms, and the ability to assign/change pathologists. This permission set allows facilities that perform autopsies for other jurisdictions to do their job.  **Autopsy Technician** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to pathology forms on all cases in jurisdiction.  **Clerk** Read/write access to all cases in jurisdiction.  Consultant Read only access to specific case(s) assigned by office.  **Investigator** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to investigator forms and documentation on their cases only.  Investigator Unrestricted Read access on all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to investigator forms on their cases only.  **Limited Access** Read/write access to forms associated with the MDI Worksheet and DC Worksheet.  **Morgue** Read/write access to Body Tracking, Case Notes, and Identification form. Used for checking bodies in/out of facility.  **Morgue with Property/Evidence** Read/write access to Body Tracking, Case Notes, Property/Evidence, and Identification form. Used for checking bodies in/out of facility.  **Pathologist** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to pathology forms on their cases.  **Pathologist Restricted** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction except for Documentation. Write access to pathology forms on their cases only.  **Pathologist Visiting** Read/write access to their cases only.  **State Office** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction including the Autopsy Report and Toxicology Report. No access to create/edit cases, view photos, track user changes, or view county reports.  **Abstractor Access** Read access on all cases in jurisdiction.  **Administrator Limited view** Read/write access to all cases assigned to them with ability to assign personnel, unpublish cases, export media, create inventory, and delete cases.  **Investigator Limited View** No access on all cases in jurisdiction. Read/Write access to investigator forms on their cases only.  **Technical Staff** Permission set specifically for Director of Lab and Medical Examiner Assistants  Safe Sleep Death Review Read only access to specific case(s) as assigned by office. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **32** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E Item 1.12.1 | Provide additional details regarding legacy the systems (how many, what type of database, database size, structured and/or unstructured data, etc.). |
| **Answer** | |
| All records are currently in 1 database, structured data with relational tables. Currently using 1,810GB of storage. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **33** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Scope of Services to be Provided, Page 9 | Please confirm whether the State prefers an off-the-shelf solution that meets the requirements listed in the RFP, or if custom-developed solutions are also acceptable. |
| **Answer** | |
| The State prefers an off-the-shelf solution with customizable components but will consider all solutions. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **34** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II (F) – User Training and Documentation, Page 12 | The RFP refers to classroom-based training as one of the delivery methods. Could you please clarify whether physical/in-person classroom training is mandatory, or if fully virtual/online delivery will be acceptable? |
| **Answer** | |
| Fully virtual/online is acceptable. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **35** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
|  | Off-the-Shelf vs. Custom Development: Could you kindly confirm whether the State is specifically seeking an off-the-shelf solution that meets the outlined requirements, or if custom-developed systems will also be considered? |
| **Answer** | |
| All solutions will be considered. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **36** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
|  | Training Delivery Format: The RFP outlines that training may include various formats such as written, web-based, and instructor-led. However, it also references “classroom-based training.” Could you please confirm whether the Department requires physical/in-person classroom training sessions, or if fully virtual delivery would be acceptable? |
| Answer | |
| All solutions will be considered. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **37** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Scope of Services – Page 9 | Does the State have a preferred cloud hosting provider for EDICMS (AWS GovCloud, Azure Gov, other)? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **38** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Scope of Services – Page 9 | Does the State require State-owned tenant hosting, or is vendor-managed cloud acceptable if compliant with State policies? |
| **Answer** | |
| Vendor managed cloud is acceptable. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **39** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E – General/Technical Requirements | Will the State accept SaaS deployments for EDICMS? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **40** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Scope of Services, Data Management – Page 9 | Does the State currently utilize or prefer a Document Management System (DMS) (SharePoint, OnBase, etc.)? |
| **Answer** | |
| Does not currently utilize or prefer a DMS. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **41** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Scope of Services, Data Management - Page 9 | If no DMS, does the State intend for EDICMS to act as System of Record for documents and attachments? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **42** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Scope of Services, Data Management - Page 9 | Are there requirements for integration with a State-owned DMS for secure document management? |
| **Answer** | |
| Not if the application acts as the System of Record for documents and attachments. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **43** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Data Migration and Retention - Page 9 | Please detail current systems and data sources requiring migration into EDICMS. |
| **Answer** | |
| MDILog, relational database | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **44** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E – Data Migration | Does the State have a preferred ETL tool or framework for data migration? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **45** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E – Data Migration | Is there an existing data mapping documentation or data dictionary for current systems? |
| **Answer** | |
| This would be available from the current vendor if a new vendor is awarded. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **46** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E – Data Migration | Does the State require incremental, bulk, or phased migration of 20 years of data? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State would accept incremental migration of data. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **47** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E – Data Migration | Please confirm expected data volumes for migration planning. |
| **Answer** | |
| 1,810GB of storage, which is 62,336 cases, 480,346 photos, 118,305 documents (PDF, Word, email uploads), 16 audio files, and 231 videos. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **48** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Integration Requirements - Page 9 | Does the State currently use a preferred ESB or Integration Platform (MuleSoft, Boomi, WSO2, Azure)? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **49** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Integration Requirements - Page 9 | If not, will the vendor manage all interface connections within EDICMS? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **50** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Integration Requirements - Page 9 | Are integrations expected via REST, SOAP, SFTP, or other standards? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State would prefer SFTP | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **51** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Functional Requirements - Page 9 | Does the State use a Digital Signature Platform (DocuSign, Adobe Sign)? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State uses DocuSign | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **52** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Functional Requirements - Page 9 | Should EDICMS integrate with an existing digital signature platform, or include embedded digital signature capability? |
| **Answer** | |
| Either is acceptable. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **53** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Functional Requirements - Page 9 | Are there specific compliance standards for digital signatures (ESIGN, UETA)? |
| **Answer** | |
| State currently uses DocuSign. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **54** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Integration Requirements - Page 9 | Please confirm all external systems requiring integration (NMS Labs, AIT Labs, Vital IQ EDRS). |
| **Answer** | |
| NMS Labs, AIT Labs, Vital IQ EDRS | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **55** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Integration Requirements - Page 9 | Are there additional interfaces planned (e.g., law enforcement RMS, hospital EHR)? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **56** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Integration Requirements - Page 9 | Are standard interface specifications (HL7, NIEM) required for integration? |
| **Answer** | |
| Not required, but HL7 is encouraged. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **57** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Functional Requirements - Page 9 | Can the State provide sample forms, workflows, reports currently used for replication? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **58** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E – Mobile Accessibility | Is mobile offline data collection required for field investigators? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **59** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II – Functional Requirements - Page 9 | Does the State require public portals for limited case status lookup for stakeholders? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **60** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E – Performance | Are there performance testing thresholds beyond 5-second transactions for scalability validation? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **61** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E – Availability, Performance, Backup | Are there additional backup retention and restoration policies beyond stated RTO/RPO? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, the agency retention policy is all records must be maintained for a minimum of 52 years. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **62** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E – User Authentication | Will SSO integration be required at launch or post-State Enterprise Constituents Portal launch? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State will accept SSO post-launch. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **63** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E – User Authentication | Does the State currently have Azure AD or Okta for user authentication integration? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, the state currently uses Azure (now EntraID) for internal staff authentication and Okta for external users. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **64** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix D – technical assessment form | Can we submit Appendix D – technical assessment form as a separate attachment/excel sheet? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **65** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| APPENDIX E - GENERAL AND TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS MATRIX | Can we submit APPENDIX E - GENERAL AND TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS MATRIX as a separate attachment or should it be part of the proposed services document |
| **Answer** | |
| It can be a separate attachment. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **66** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section 2(Page 9) | Can the State list out the third-party systems that needs to be integrated? |
| **Answer** | |
| NMS Labs, AIT Labs, Vital IQ EDRS | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **67** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Can the offerors provide solutions & services from offshore? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State would prefer a stateside solution. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **68** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Has the State identified any platform for this project? |
| **Answer** | |
| No, vendor hosted is acceptable. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **69** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Can you indicate a budget for this solution? |
| **Answer** | |
| The budgeted amount for the system is $54,000 annually. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **70** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II (A) Case Management Capabilities, Page 9 | Can you let us know the volume of data that needs to be stored ? |
| **Answer** | |
| Currently: 1,810GB of storage, which is 62,336 cases, 480,346 photos, 118,305 documents (PDF, Word, email uploads), 16 audio files, and 231 videos. State must maintain 52 years of records. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **71** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II(A) 2 Integration Requirements, Page 9 | What are the current integration tools and methods the State is using currently? |
| **Answer** | |
| Integration is encouraged to adhere to HL7, wireless with SFTP. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **72** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II(A) 2 Integration Requirements, Page 9 | Does the State have a preference for direct API integrations, or is the use of middleware tools preferred for system integration? |
| **Answer** | |
| No preference. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **73** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Could you please provide details on the volume of data to be migrated, as well as the formats and sources of the existing data? |
| **Answer** | |
| Currently: 1,810GB of storage, which is 62,336 cases, 480,346 photos, 118,305 documents (PDF, Word, email uploads), 16 audio files, and 231 videos. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **74** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Could the State specify the number of internal and external users who will be accessing the system? |
| **Answer** | |
| Currently there are 17 internal users and 59 external users. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **75** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Do we need to submit resumes of key personnels along with proposal? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **76** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part I Introduction, Page 6 | Can you share more details about type of internal and external as are they agencies or public? |
| **Answer** | |
| Internal refers to state employees, while external are consultants, or appointed field personnel working on behalf of the agency. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **77** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| A.   Purpose and Background - User Count; page 6 | It is listed on Page 6 that the system must accommodate 75-95 users, 12 of which will be state employees. |
| **Answer** | |
| Correct | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **78** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
|  | How many total users will require access to the system? |
| **Answer** | |
| Currently it's 76 users but will fluctuate over time as the office grows. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **79** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
|  | To ensure accurate pricing aligned with our licensing model, please provide a breakdown of all anticipated users, including: |
| **Answer** | |
| Please see questions and answers 80-83 for additional information related to question 79 | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **80** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
|  | - Total number of users who will need access. |
| **Answer** | |
| Currently it's 76 users but will fluctuate over time as the office grows. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **81** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
|  | - User types (e.g., administrative users, full-access users, read-only users, guest/external users). |
| **Answer** | |
| **Administrator** Read/write access to all cases in jurisdiction with ability to assign personnel, unpublish cases, export media, create inventory, and delete cases.  **Administrator/Pathologist** Read/write access to all cases in jurisdiction with ability to be assigned as case pathologist.  **Autopsy Service** Read access to all cases, write access to pathology forms, and the ability to assign/change pathologists. This permission set allows facilities that perform autopsies for other jurisdictions to do their job.  **Autopsy Technician** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to pathology forms on all cases in jurisdiction.  **Clerk** Read/write access to all cases in jurisdiction.  **Consultant** Read only access to specific case(s) assigned by office.  **Investigator** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to investigator forms and documentation on their cases only.  **Investigator Unrestricted** Read access on all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to investigator forms on their cases only.  **Limited Access** Read/write access to forms associated with the MDI Worksheet and DC Worksheet.  **Morgue** Read/write access to Body Tracking, Case Notes, and Identification form. Used for checking bodies in/out of facility.  **Morgue with Property/Evidence** Read/write access to Body Tracking, Case Notes, Property/Evidence, and Identification form. Used for checking bodies in/out of facility.  **Pathologist** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to pathology forms on their cases.  **Pathologist Restricted** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction except for Documentation. Write access to pathology forms on their cases only.  **Pathologist Visiting** Read/write access to their cases only.  **State Office** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction including the Autopsy Report and Toxicology Report. No access to create/edit cases, view photos, track user changes, or view county reports.  **Abstractor Access** Read access on all cases in jurisdiction.  **Administrator Limited view** Read/write access to all cases assigned to them with ability to assign personnel, unpublish cases, export media, create inventory, and delete cases.  **Investigator Limited View** No access on all cases in jurisdiction. Read/Write access to investigator forms on their cases only.  **Technical Staff** Permission set specifically for Director of Lab and Medical Examiner Assistants  Safe Sleep Death Review Read only access to specific case(s) as assigned by office. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **82** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
|  | - Whether user access is expected to scale over time (e.g., future growth projections or phased rollouts). |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **83** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
|  | - If applicable, whether third-party contractors or external agencies will also need access. |
| **Answer** | |
| NA | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **84** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| A. Functional Requirements - 1. Case Management Capabilities (d) ; Page 9 | “Support cross-county case assignment and sharing with appropriate access controls.” - Please elaborate on the access controls you are looking for? |
| **Answer** | |
| Permission sets are the access controls. County level access is through appointed field personnel. Their access should be managed through a specific permission set. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **85** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| A. Functional Requirements - 2. Integration Requirements (a,b,c) ; Page 9 | Are there existing APIs available for these systems? Should integrations be one-way or bidirectional? Can you please give us an example with a use case scenario for these integrations? Are the integrations required prior to go-live, or can they be implemented post go-live? Will the vendor be responsible for developing and maintaining these integrations or do you only require API access? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, there are APIs available for these systems. Integrations must be bidirectional. It can be implemented post-live. Vendor will be responsible for developing and maintaining these integrations. Example: Fill in death certificate information, and it transfers data to vital records. Order toxicology through system, and report is automatically uploaded to assigned case file. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **86** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| A. Functional Requirements - 2. Integration Requirements (a,b,c) ; Page 9 | What makes up toxicology reporting, what data fields and types would we need to pull into our system? Will anything need to be pushed back out to the laboratories? |
| **Answer** | |
| Decedent name, sample type, collection date/time, test order number, analytes identified. Yes, ordering should be pushed through system to laboratory. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **87** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| A. Functional Requirements - 2. Integration Requirements (a,b,c) ; Page 9 | Please describe the desired future feature for submitting a toxicology order submission form from within the system. Can a copy of a toxicology order form be provided? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes. The order form must include Decedent name, sample type, collection date/time, test order number, at a minimum. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **88** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| A. Functional Requirements - 3. Reporting and Analytics: (a) ; Page 9 | Can you please provide a copy or header/fields for the current 2 reports? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **89** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| D. Project Management and Work Plan: Reporting and Analytics ; Page 10 | “The work plan will be created and maintained with an automated project management tool (e.g. Microsoft Project)” - We use Monday.com . Please confirm if this suffices the requirement. |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **90** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix D: NIST Requirements | The tab for NIST requirements is blank. Is it intended to be blank? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **91** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| 1.3 Interfaces and File Transfers (1.3.1); Page 32 - 33 | Who are the identified interface partners for this project? Additionally, will the department serve as a liaison between Kaseware and these interface partners? |
| **Answer** | |
| NMS Labs, Vital IQ EDRS. Yes, the agency will serve as liaison between partners. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **92** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Data Migration from Legacy Systems; Page 37 | a. How much data (in GB) is expected to be migrated (excluding attachments)? |
| **Answer** | |
| Currently: 1,810GB of storage, which is 62,336 cases, 480,346 photos, 118,305 documents (PDF, Word, email uploads), 16 audio files, and 231 videos. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **93** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Data Migration from Legacy Systems; Page 37 | b. Approximately how many files will be provided for import? |
| **Answer** | |
| Currently: 1,810GB of storage, which is 62,336 cases, 480,346 photos, 118,305 documents (PDF, Word, email uploads), 16 audio files, and 231 videos. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **94** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Data Migration from Legacy Systems; Page 37 | c. Is SFTP an acceptable method for secure data transfer? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **95** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Data Migration from Legacy Systems; Page 37 | d. Can you provide a database schema? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **96** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Data Migration from Legacy Systems; Page 37 | e. Can you provide a list of column headers for each table, or at minimum the number of columns? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **97** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Data Migration from Legacy Systems; Page 37 | f. How are records and files linked—via link tables or internal references? |
| **Answer** | |
| Relational tables | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **98** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Data Migration from Legacy Systems; Page 37 | g. Can sample data be shared (scrubbed or redacted if necessary)? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **99** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Data Migration from Legacy Systems; Page 37 | h. In what format will the data be delivered (e.g., CSV, Excel, JSON)? |
| **Answer** | |
| CSV and Excel | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **100** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Data Migration from Legacy Systems; Page 37 | i. Is the source system using a proprietary or uncommon data format? |
| **Answer** | |
| Proprietary | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **101** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Data Migration from Legacy Systems; Page 37 | j. Will the data include attachments such as images, videos, or PDFs? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **102** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Data Migration from Legacy Systems; Page 37 | k. If yes, what is the estimated volume and file types of these attachments? |
| **Answer** | |
| Currently: 1,810GB of storage, which is 62,336 cases, 480,346 photos, 118,305 documents (PDF, Word, email uploads), 16 audio files, and 231 videos. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **103** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| 1.14 Standards; Page 39 | Is NAME accreditation a mandatory requirement for this project? If a vendor does not hold NAME accreditation, will that disqualify them from consideration? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **104** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| F. User Training and Documentation; Page 11 | Would you like on-site training at an additional cost, or is virtual training sufficient? |
| **Answer** | |
| Virtual is sufficient | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **105** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| F. User Training and Documentation; Page 11 | Would you like on-site business analysis at an additional cost, or is virtual business analysis sufficient? |
| **Answer** | |
| Virtual is sufficient | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **106** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | We respectfully request a two-week extension to the proposal submission deadline (from August 8, 2025, to August 22, 2025), to allow for additional solution design discussions, stakeholder input, and refinement of the cost proposal based on your responses to our questions. |
| **Answer** | |
| Unfortunately that cannot happen. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **107** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Can the State please clarify what legacy systems or file formats are in use for the 20 years of historical case data to be migrated? Are these exported databases, spreadsheets, scanned documents, or another system (e.g., MDILog)? |
| **Answer** | |
| All data is currently housed in MDILog. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **108** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Is the State’s centralized Enterprise Constituents Portal currently live? If not, what is the anticipated go-live timeline, and would the awarded vendor be expected to integrate upon contract start or at a later milestone? |
| **Answer** | |
| No, not currently live, and the awarded vendor could integrate at a later milestone. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **109** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Can the State provide documentation or specifications for integrating with the VitalIQ Electronic Death Registration System (administered by VitalChek)? What is the expected direction of data flow? |
| **Answer** | |
| Data flow is bidirectional and no, no, documentation can be provided at this time as they have not finalized their system upgrade. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **110** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Will the State accept cloud-hosted (SaaS) solutions using secure, U.S.-based FedRAMP-compliant environments, or is there a preference for State-hosted deployments? |
| **Answer** | |
| The State would accept cloud-hosted environments. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **111** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | The RFP requires mobile accessibility. Is a responsive browser-based mobile experience sufficient, or does the State require native iOS/Android apps? |
| **Answer** | |
| Browser-based is sufficient. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **112** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | For performance testing and system architecture planning, does the State anticipate all 95 users to be active concurrently, or should vendors plan for a peak concurrency threshold? |
| **Answer** | |
| All 95 users should be capable of being active concurrently. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **113** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Does the State have a preferred reporting tool or BI engine (e.g., SSRS, Power BI, JasperReports), or should vendors propose a self-contained reporting capability? |
| **Answer** | |
| Vendors should propose a self-contained reporting capability. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **114** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Can the State provide additional details on the desired workflow for case closure and data archival (e.g., auto-archive rules, manual review, audit trails)? |
| **Answer** | |
| All actions on a case file should be logged, records must be maintained for a minimum of 52 years. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **115** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Does the State have a preferred technology stack or architecture (e.g., .NET, Java, PHP, SQL Server, PostgreSQL), or is the vendor free to propose any stack that meets the functional and security requirements? |
| **Answer** | |
| The vendor is free to propose any stack that meets the functional and security requirements. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **116** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| N/A | Is the Department of the Attorney General or the Office of Information Technology currently using low-code platforms such as Salesforce, Microsoft Power Platform (Power Apps), or others? If so, is there a preference for using these platforms to deliver this solution? If we use a low code platform, should the cost include the cost of licenses? |
| **Answer** | |
| Not currently using low-code platforms. Yes, please include cost of licenses. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **117** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, Section 1.20 | Does the State prefer a vendor-hosted (SaaS) solution, or is deployment within the State’s own infrastructure preferred? |
| **Answer** | |
| Vendor hosted is preferred. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **118** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, Section 1.20 | The State may be eligible for discounted government pricing if it buys licenses from Microsoft instead of a Cloud Service Provider. Is the State open to purchasing licenses separate from this agreement? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **119** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, Section 1.20 | If the solution is hosted by the vendor, is a dedicated tenant required, or are multi-tenant SaaS offerings acceptable? |
| **Answer** | |
| Multi-tenant SaaS offerings are acceptable. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **120** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section A.2 | Can the Department provide more information about the structure, format, and condition of the legacy data to be migrated (e.g., database types, schemas, file formats)? |
| **Answer** | |
| Relational database with PDF attachments | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **121** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section A.2 | Are there any known data quality issues in the legacy system (e.g., missing values, duplicates, unstructured formats)? |
| **Answer** | |
| Data quality is good throughout. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **122** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section A.2 | Will the Department provide access to legacy system experts or documentation to assist with mapping and migration validation? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **123** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section A.3 | Can the Department share samples of the standard reports (e.g., Investigative Summary, Exam Sheet) to better estimate effort for customization? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **124** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section A.3 | Is there a preferred reporting platform (e.g., Crystal Reports, Power BI, Tableau), or can vendors propose embedded reporting tools? |
| **Answer** | |
| Vendors can propose embedded reporting tools | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **125** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section A.3 | Are users expected to build their own reports, or will report creation be centralized among admin users? |
| **Answer** | |
| Users are expected to build their own reports as needed. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **126** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section A | Can the Department provide a breakdown of expected user roles (e.g., pathologists, investigators, admin, consultants), including approximate counts? |
| **Answer** | |
| **Administrator** Read/write access to all cases in jurisdiction with ability to assign personnel, unpublish cases, export media, create inventory, and delete cases.  **Administrator/Pathologist** Read/write access to all cases in jurisdiction with ability to be assigned as case pathologist.  **Autopsy Service** Read access to all cases, write access to pathology forms, and the ability to assign/change pathologists. This permission set allows facilities that perform autopsies for other jurisdictions to do their job.  **Autopsy Technician** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to pathology forms on all cases in jurisdiction.  **Clerk** Read/write access to all cases in jurisdiction.  **Consultant** Read only access to specific case(s) as assigned by office.  **Investigator** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to investigator forms and documentation on their cases only.  **Investigator Unrestricted** Read access on all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to investigator forms on their cases only.  **Limited Access** Read/write access to forms associated with the MDI Worksheet and DC Worksheet.  **Morgue** Read/write access to Body Tracking, Case Notes, and Identification form. Used for checking bodies in/out of facility.  **Morgue with Property/Evidence** Read/write access to Body Tracking, Case Notes, Property/Evidence, and Identification form. Used for checking bodies in/out of facility.  **Pathologist** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction. Write access to pathology forms on their cases.  **Pathologist Restricted** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction except for Documentation. Write access to pathology forms on their cases only.  **Pathologist Visiting** Read/write access to their cases only.  **State Office** Read access to all cases in jurisdiction including the Autopsy Report and Toxicology Report. No access to create/edit cases, view photos, track user changes, or view county reports.  **Abstractor Access** Read access on all cases in jurisdiction.  **Administrator Limited view** Read/write access to all cases assigned to them with ability to assign personnel, unpublish cases, export media, create inventory, and delete cases.  **Investigator Limited View** No access on all cases in jurisdiction. Read/Write access to investigator forms on their cases only.  **Technical Staff** Permission set specifically for Director of Lab and Medical Examiner Assistants  Safe Sleep Death Review Read only access to specific case(s) as assigned by office. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **127** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, Section 1.2 | Are there regional jurisdiction boundaries that need to be enforced programmatically in the system? |
| **Answer** | |
| Jurisdiction is state-wide. No other jurisdictional boundaries exist. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **128** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, Section 1.6 | Will users outside the State of Maine network require remote access via mobile or offline capabilities? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, users outside the State of Maine network require access | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **129** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section A.2 | Can the Department share the interface specifications (e.g., endpoints, protocols) for NMS Labs, AIT Labs, and Vital IQ EDRS? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **130** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, Section 1.3 | Will vendors be responsible for establishing and maintaining secure connectivity to third-party systems, or will the State broker those connections? |
| **Answer** | |
| Vendor responsibility | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **131** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, Section 1.3 | Are any of the required integrations real-time, or are batched/scheduled data exchanges acceptable? |
| **Answer** | |
| The system must work in real time. Delayed exchanges are discouraged. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **132** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section D | Is there a target go-live date for the production system or preferred timeline for major milestones like UAT, training, and phased rollout? |
| **Answer** | |
| 10/01/2025 is the target date. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **133** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section D | Would the Department be open to a phased implementation (e.g., jurisdiction by jurisdiction or module by module)? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **134** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section D | Will there be a blackout period or transition window during which the old system must be shut down? |
| **Answer** | |
| The downtime must be minimal and would best be done overnight. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **135** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part V, Section B | Are there any functional areas that the Department considers high-priority or ‘must-have’ within the system? |
| **Answer** | |
| Ability to upload and store photos and documents, sample and evidence documentation, and ability to document in narrative form every action taken on a case. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **136** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part VI, Section A | Will the Department allow reasonable redlines to standard contract language during negotiation, or must all terms be accepted as-is? |
| **Answer** | |
| Department is open to negotiation of contract language with vendor awarded the bid. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **137** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section A | Is the Department open to vendors proposing optional enhancements (e.g., AI-assisted triage, analytics dashboards, or public portals) as add-ons? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **138** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, Section A | Are there future initiatives or strategic goals (e.g., modernization, public transparency) that the vendor should consider addressing in the proposal? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **139** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Information Security Standards – S2 | Does Microsoft’s role as a platform provider count as a subcontractor? If so, what attestations are required from them directly? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **140** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Information Security Standards – S1 | For the security plan, is a shared responsibility model (common in SaaS) acceptable, where Microsoft manages infrastructure-level security and the vendor manage application-layer security? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, a shared responsibility model could be acceptable. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **141** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E – 1.12.3. -Page 35 | ·         Data Migration from Legacy Systems  o   Can you provide what the estimated size in GB will be for the File System Data migration (e.g., scanned forms, attachments, or multimedia)? |
| **Answer** | |
| Currently: 1,810GB of storage, which is 62,336 cases, 480,346 photos, 118,305 documents (PDF, Word, email uploads), 16 audio files, and 231 videos. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **142** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E – 1.12.1. -Page 34 | ·         Data Migration from Legacy Systems, could you clarify how the legacy data is currently stored? What formats are used? Approximately how many fields are involved? Do you have any samples or examples? |
| **Answer** | |
| Legacy data currently is: 62,336 cases, 480,346 photos, 118,305 documents (PDF, Word, email uploads), 16 audio files, and 231 videos. The database format is relational tables that can be exported to Excel. Looking at approximately 300 fields currently in use. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **143** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix F - Pricing Schedule B - Annual Operating Costs – Page 40 | ·         User Load  Out of the referenced 75 -95 users, how many concurrent users are expected to be using the system at the same time? |
| **Answer** | |
| System should have the capability to allow all users access concurrently. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **144** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part ll – Scope of Services to be Provided – Functional Requirements -1- d. -Page 8 | ·         Cross-County Case Assignment and Access Control o    Do you expect users from different counties to access the CME solution? o    Should access to information be restricted based on the user’s county or role? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, the agency has statewide jurisdiction, so access to all counties is required. Access to information should be restricted by user role. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **145** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part ll – Scope of Services to be Provided – Functional Requirements -1- d. -Page 8 | ·         Support cross-county case assignment and sharing with appropriate access controls, what is the expected scope? Does this refer to granting restricted access to users from other counties so they can view certain data? Or is it about integrating data across different applications from multiple counties? |
| **Answer** | |
| Agency has statewide jurisdiction, so access and ability to assign cases to a county is required. Access to information should be restricted by user role. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **146** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part ll - Scope of Services to be Provided- Integration Requirements – Page 8 | ·         AIT Laboratories Integration o    Could you provide the API documentation or any technical details regarding the integration expectations? |
| **Answer** | |
| No AIT is not a current vendor. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **147** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Does the State already have a case management system in place? If so, please answer EACH of the following:   1. What is the name of the underlying software product, and who is the vendor who built/created it? 2. What tech stack does the existing solution use? (esp. the native coding language that was used to build the product) 3. What are the pain points, if any, with the existing case management system? Why is the State wanting to replace its case management system at this time? 4. Would the State be interested in entertaining offers to modernize/expand/enhance the existing solution, without wholesale replacement? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes   1. MDILog 2. MDILog uses 22 different technologies, including Google Tag Manager, Apple Mobile Web Clips Icon, and SPF 3. No pain points in the current system. RFP may be recompete if the current vendor submits a proposal. 4. Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **148** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Can you confirm that this contract is not a recompete, and that the result of the project is meant to be a wholly new system implementation? |
| **Answer** | |
| No, the current vendor can submit a proposal. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **149** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | What is the anticipated amount of funding and/or budget allocation for each fiscal year of the contract? It would be quite helpful to at least have some sort of ballpark sense of this factor. This would enable bidders to right size their proposals and also would enable bidders to feel confident that sufficient funding will be made available. |
| **Answer** | |
| Currently budgeted for $54,000 annually. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **150** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Is the State aware of any existing off-the-shelf, out-of-the-box products that might satisfy the stated functional needs and specifications that have been expressed in the RFP? |
| **Answer** | |
| MDILog | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **151** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Has the State previewed any products or otherwise received any previous demonstrations of solutions that would be suitable? |
| **Answer** | |
| The current vendor is MDILog | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **152** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Is the State open to a custom-built solution, or would preference be given to an off-the-shelf product that already exists? |
| **Answer** | |
| Open to all solutions. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **153** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Should the proposed solution have a demonstrated history of prior use in other States/locales? |
| **Answer** | |
| Doesn’t have to. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **154** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Does the solution need to be fully operable by a particular date? If so, please specify the mandatory timeline. |
| **Answer** | |
| 10/01/2025 is preferred go-live date. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **155** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Will the system need to expose functionality for new account requests and/or new user registration? If so, how would the State want this capability to work? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, each user should be assigned a permission set. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **156** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Would it be necessary to provide user interfaces with suitable functionality for all of the following? At minimum, please indicate yes/no for each, or if the State has a particular scope of functionality in mind for each user group, please list/specify the pertinent aspects of functionality that would be expected/anticipated/desired.  a.       Chief medicolegal officials (medical examiners and their designees)  b.       Forensic pathologists.  c.       Families of the deceased.  d.       Incident witnesses and/or parties who might have been present/involved at time of death  e.       Law enforcement and legal justice entities.  f.        Organ and tissue procurement organizations.  g.       Hospitals, trauma and other health centers.  h.       Forensic science and other research communities.  i.         Insurance and benefit providers.  j.         Public health and public safety organizations.  k.       Funeral homes  l.         Policy makers.  m.     Industrial analysts and academic researchers  n.       Media. |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. No 4. No 5. No 6. No 7. No 8. Yes 9. No 10. No 11. No 12. No 13. No 14. No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **157** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Will it be necessary for the system to handle institutional accounts and/or accommodate operational administration (or user affiliation) at the institutional level (ex. a senior official at a hospital who would manage user authorizations for the organization; or perhaps a senior official from a media entity that would perform a similar function for affiliated staff/reporters)? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **158** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Would the system need to include any functionality to support operational auditing and/or institutional (or office) certification? If so, please explain the sorts of functionality that would need to be accommodated in these regards. |
| **Answer** | |
| It would be great to integrate, or at least track National Association of Medical Examiners accreditation standards. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **159** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Will it be necessary for the system to provide death certification functionality? Or would the certification be accomplished through a separate system? |
| **Answer** | |
| Currently done through a separate system but should have integration capabilities with state's electronic death registry system. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **160** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Will the system need to include any workforce management functionality? If so, please explain.  a.       Records of individual workers/staff  b.       Assignments and tasking  c.       Pay rates of workers/staff (to allow for estimation of operating costs)  d.       Qualifications and credentials of staff (training, certifications)  e.       Office/work locations  f.        Work schedules  g.       Will the system need to handle, or maintain awareness of, investigation workloads? (active cases per individual; or perhaps cases by professional area/function/specialty)  h.       Will the system need functionality to help with identification of any areas where bottlenecks might be occurring, and/or where additional staffing might be necessary/warranted? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes   1. User list 2. No 3. No 4. No 5. No 6. No 7. System should have capability to query personnel assigned to cases to determine workload 8. Not required but would be a nice feature. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **161** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Please provide some sense of the scope of data (and meta data) that would be deemed “core” to each case record. |
| **Answer** | |
| Decedent name, biometric information, the "who, what, when, where, how" of death circumstances, and who is assigned as Investigator and Pathologist. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **162** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Will the system need to incorporate any functionality to allow for tracking and monitoring of resourcing by case? If so, which of the following types of functionalities would be necessary?  a.       Financial accounting functionality? (i.e., dollars spent)  b.       Timeclock functionality? (i.e., hours devoted)  c.       Physical asset functionality? (i.e., Materials and equipment expended)  d.       Other? |
| **Answer** | |
| No   1. NA 2. No, but it would be a nice feature. 3. NA 4. NA | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **163** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Would any analysis or reporting need to be done on a geographic basis? If so, please explain the relevant types of analysis/reporting, and the associated types of scoping that the system would need to support (ex. state, county, municipality, zips, mileage radius, etc.). |
| **Answer** | |
| System should have a queryable data at location level to include zip code, city, or county. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **164** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Please describe the scope of integrations that would be required in relation to:  a.       Death Certification  b.       Missing person systems  c.       Health data systems  d.       Law enforcement systems  e.       Court / Judicial / Justice systems  f.        Drug/overdose reporting systems  g.       Federal systems  h.       Other |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. None currently. Would need capability to integrate bidirectionally with state's electronic death registry system. 2. None 3. None 4. None 5. None 6. None required, would be nice to integrate with the National Violent Death Reporting System (NVDRS) 7. None 8. None | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **165** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Are appropriate APIs already being exposed by each of the systems that will need to be targeted for integration? In any specific cases where this would not be the case, please identify the system in question, and explain how the State expects the awardee to achieve the corresponding integration and data exchange(s) that would be required. |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **166** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Please provide some sense of the expected timings for the mandatory exchanges/transmissions of data. We suspect that some of the necessary integrations would probably need to be event driven (ex. whenever XX occurs, proceed to exchange data with the targeted system). Other integrations might need to be done on a scheduled basis (ex. every evening, synchronize data with the targeted system). If the State could provide a straightforward list of required integrations and associated timings/triggers/intervals, it would be quite helpful. |
| **Answer** | |
| When death certificate page is completed, exchange should be initiated. Toxicology is ordered weekly, so a weekly exchange would be appropriate for ordering. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **167** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Please explain any expected workflow requirements in relation to:  a.       Chain of custody  b.       Organ and tissue donation  c.       Evidence collection  d.       Insurance and benefit providers  e.       Death certification  f.        Family member notifications  g.       Autopsies  h.       Drug/overdose reporting |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. Documentation of materials, when released, and released to whom 2. None 3. Documentation of materials, when released, and released to whom 4. None 5. Documentation of cause of death, manner of death, injury date/time, injury location and how injury occurred. 6. Documentation 7. Date/time, who was in attendance, height/weight of decedent, type of exam (full, limited) 8. Toxicology samples collected, toxicology findings after testing | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **168** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | What types of trend reporting would the system need to accommodate? |
| **Answer** | |
| Trends in workflow, bottlenecks, demographic trends, or location trends. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **169** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Will the system need to provide functionality for email blasts? If so, please provide pertinent functional specifications/expectations. |
| **Answer** | |
| No, but would be a nice feature. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **170** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Will the system need to provide dynamic, situationally specific functionality for particular causes and circumstances of death? If so, please explain and/or provide some examples of what might need to be supported/accommodated. |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **171** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Regarding the FHIR-driven integrations that would be required:  a.       Please provide some sense of the quantity of other discrete systems that would need to be targeted for integration, in order to achieve the desired integration outcomes. (ex. a single Statewide health exchange system, vs. multiple separate systems belonging to many independent medical providers); If the targeted systems can be named or specifically identified at this time, please do so.  b.       Does the solution need to comply with a specific version of MDI FHIR?  c.       Does the solution need to Support both JSON & XML formats?  d.       Will it be necessary to provide the full FHIR server implementation or just a FHIR-formatted data exchange? |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. 1 2. No 3. Supporting one is acceptable. 4. FHIR formatted data exchange | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **172** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Will the solution be subjected to FHIR compliance auditing? If so, please answer EACH of the following:  a.       Will the State be conducting the audit? Or will the audit be done by a State-selected third party?  b.       Please confirm that the awardee of this contract will not be responsible for the cost(s) of the audit. |
| **Answer** | |
| No   1. State would be conducting audit 2. Correct | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **173** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Do we need to include functionality that would enable private citizens (family member) access to autopsy reports? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **174** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Will the new system need to provide functionality that would accommodate “consults” for situations where forensic pathologists provide law enforcement representatives with opinions or interpretations regarding injuries that have been sustained by still-living individuals? |
| **Answer** | |
| While not required, this would be a desirable feature. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **175** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | We are under the impression that integration with court/judicial systems, and/or possibly also law enforcement systems, would likely be necessary. However, the RFP makes no mention of CJIS compliance. Please confirm that CJIS compliance be a mandatory solution characteristic. |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **176** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | With regard to the technologies used to build the solution, please answer EACH of the following:  a.       Does Maine OIT have any interest in hosting and/or maintaining the solution after launch, or would the State prefer a fully vendor-hosted, vendor-maintained solution?  b.       Does the State have any preferences in terms of the native technology with which the solution is built (i.e., the native coding language, in terms of C#, .net, Java, PhP, etc.)?  c.       In the event that the State wishes to maintain the system themselves, please provide a rough/estimated/approximated skills breakdown of current staff and resources, in terms of familiarity common coding languages, such as c#, .net, Java, PHP, etc. (ex. PhP – 10 people, .net 45 people, etc.)  d.       On a scale of 1-10 (10 highest), please characterize the State’s openness to introducing a platform that might represent a new framework or language into the State’s present IT portfolio? |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. State would prefer vendor-hosted, vendor-maintained solutions. 2. No preference. 3. State does not wish to maintain the system themselves. 4. 10 - The State is open to exploring new frameworks or languages. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **177** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Will the State accept cloud hosting for the solution, or will the solution need to allow for internal hosting by the State? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **178** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Please clarify any expectations pertaining to on-site performance. Will remote performance by the contractor be deemed generally acceptable? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **179** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Would the system need to support electronic document signing, through a legally admissible platform like Docushare? |
| **Answer** | |
| It would be desirable. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **180** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | What sorts of reminders/prompting would you want the system to provide? |
| **Answer** | |
| Examples: Notices of how long cases have been open (NAME accreditation standards), and when an open case is approaching 60 days and 90 day windows. Alerts or prompts when a case is over those thresholds. Prompts when toxicology is received. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **181** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section 1.12.1, page 35 | It is understood that there would be ~20 years of records to migrate into the system. Please respond to EACH of the following:  a.       How many records has the state accumulated during the 20-year period?  b.       How many different systems and data formats were used during the 20-year period?  c.       Can we assume that all legacy data has been conformed to one consistent format? If so, can the state please provide some sense of the format (data schema)?  d.       Would it be necessary/desirable to clean the legacy data, or otherwise execute any procedures to assure data hygiene? Or would it be acceptable/sufficient to assume that all records could simply be migrated “as is.”  e.       Would all records need to be maintained in an active and fully queryable state? Or could some records be archived for purposes of performance improvement? |
| **Answer** | |
| 1. Currently: 1,810GB of storage, which is 62,336 cases, 480,346 photos, 118,305 documents (PDF, Word, email uploads), 16 audio files, and 231 videos. 2. 2 systems with at least 3 different file formats 3. Relational tables 4. Migrate "as is" 5. All records should remain active and fully queryable. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **182** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Section 1.7.1, Page 33 | SOW item 1.7.1 references “low code configurability.” What exactly is the scope of configurability that the State would hope to have available in the solution? (changes in objects, data relationships, fields, workflows, automations, something else?) |
| **Answer** | |
| Changes in data relationships, queryable data, automations, custom reporting | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **183** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | Would the system need to include audit trail functionality (history of all entries, edits, actions taken, etc.) |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **184** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix D, Technical Assessment Form (Excel Workbook), Data Compliance Tab | Should we assume that compliance with all of the standards listed on the “Data Compliance” tab of the Technical Assessment Form is a requirement? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **185** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Appendix E, pages 28-39 | In terms of the requested Y/C/N responses, would a response of Y receive a higher score than a response of C? |
| **Answer** | |
| Not necessarily. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **186** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | If the published answers give rise to additional questions and needs for clarification, would the State be willing to allow a very brief round of follow-on inquiries? Maybe a very brief 24-48 hour window? |
| **Answer** | |
| No | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **187** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| n/a | If at all possible, please ensure that the schedule affords bidders a period of at least 10 business days to prepare responses subsequent to Q&A being published. |
| **Answer** | |
| Not possible | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **188** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| 1.12, page 35 | Can the State provide the current database size? Within this, is there any idea of the size of file attachments? Is it correct to assume new file attachments, videos/docs/etc will be added to the system on a consistent basis? |
| **Answer** | |
| Currently: 1,810GB of storage, which is 62,336 cases, 480,346 photos, 118,305 documents (PDF, Word, email uploads), 16 audio files, and 231 videos. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **189** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| 1.12, page 35 | Can the State provide more information on the legacy systems that would be involved in the data migrations – how many systems, what type of databases (SQL, Oracle, Postgres, etc.) and the sizes of each? |
| **Answer** | |
| 1 database, currently MDILog. Currently: 1,810GB of storage, which is 62,336 cases, 480,346 photos, 118,305 documents (PDF, Word, email uploads), 16 audio files, and 231 videos. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **190** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, A.1., page 9 | Does the State currently have integrations in place with NMS Labs and AIT Laboratories? Can the State confirm that these entities are ready and capable of creating interfaces utilizing standardized data formats such as HL7? |
| **Answer** | |
| Yes, the current vendor is NMS, and entities are capable of interfacing. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **191** | **RFP Section & Page Number** | **Question** |
| Part II, A.1., page 9 | Does the State currently have an integration in place with Vital Records? Can the State confirm that the Vital Records application is ready and capable of sending and receiving data via standardized data formats such as HL7? |
| **Answer** | |
| No, the State does not currently have integration with Vital Records; they have not upgraded their system to receive the integration. This feature should be available for a future integration. | |