



SAN FRANCISCO HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM

Affordable, Quality Benefits & Well-Being

ADDENDUM NO. 1

RFP for EAP Case Management Software Solution Request for Proposals (RFPQHSS2023.W1)

February 23, 2023

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR

EAP Case Management Software Solution for the San Francisco Health Service System

RFPQHSS2023.W1

CONTACT: patrick.chang@sfgov.org, cc: michael.visconti@sfgov.org

This Addendum is being issued to modify the requirements in the above-referenced Request for Proposals (RFP). One or more additional addenda will be issued by or before March 7, 2023 in response to questions received by or before the updated Deadline for RFP Questions on Thursday, February 23, 2023 (1:00 PM Pacific Time). Please review the terms of the RFP and this Addendum carefully. If there are any inconsistencies between the RFP and the terms of this Addendum, then the terms of this Addendum will prevail. Section references below are to the RFP and are provided for reference.

A. Modifications to RFP

- 1. RFP Section II (Key Dates and Deadlines) and Section V.02 (Questions and Requests for Clarification).**

The Deadline for RFP Questions is hereby modified to be Thursday, February 23, 2023 (1:00 PM Pacific Time).

B. Questions & Answers

- 1. Can SFHSS provide a copy of the RFP in either an editable Adobe PDF or Microsoft Word format?**

HSS Response:

A Microsoft Word (.docx) version of RFP Appendix A (Vendor Response Form) is posted to <https://sfhss.org/RFPs> and also available at https://sfhss.org/sites/default/files/2023-02/Appendix%20A_Vendor%20Response%20Form_RFPQHSS2023W1.docx.

- 2. Is ISO 27001, in addition to SOC 2 Type 2, a required for the selected Respondent (selected vendor/contractor) to the RFP?**

HSS Response:

No. In accordance with City rules and regulations for procuring technology-related services and/or goods, approval must be first provided by the City's Department of Technology via an assessment by the Chief Information Officer (CIO). For more information, see

<https://sfgov.org/oca/sites/default/files/DT%20CIO%20Review%20Policy.pdf>.

For the selected vendor's products to be procured and identified as in-scope, one of two documents will need to be requested from the vendor to support the assessment:

- SOC2 Type II report (preferred); or
- If the vendor does not have a SOC2 Type II report for the product, they will need to complete a City Risk Assessment (CRA). A copy of the standard CRA is posted to <https://sfhss.org/RFPs> for reference.

3. How many users will require access to the system?

HSS Response:

A sufficient number of licenses for up to four (4) users is required pursuant to RFP Appendix A, Sec.4 (Respondent Cost Quote) [see requirement for up to four (4) user licenses].

4. Will the 136,000 SFHSS Members (active employees, retirees, dependents) require access to the system?

HSS Response:

No. Access to the system will be limited to the four (4) HSS staff. See also the answer to Question 3 re: user licenses. No other City employees, retirees or other SFHSS Members or SFHSS staff will have access to the system.

5. When will you anticipate awarding the contract if the system is due to go live January 1st, 2024?

HSS Response:

The start date for any contract resulting from this RFP will depend on the overall implementation timeline, including, but not limited, the transfer of any and all existing case data, user acceptance testing, and staff training. SFHSS has budgeted a sufficient amount of time between (a) the selection of a vendor as a result of this RFP, compliance with City Approved Supplier requirements, and execution of an agreement, and (b) the go-live date of January 1, 2024, to accomplish any necessary data migration, testing and training. This timeline is based on the timeline for the transition of EAP case data in 2019 for a January 1, 2020 go-live date with the current/incumbent vendor.

6. If the incumbent vendor bids on the RFP, how will other bidders' costs be evaluated, given that the incumbent will not have costs associated with implementation, testing and training? What was the cost and timeline for implementation of the current/incumbent solution?

HSS Response:

One-time costs, such as the costs associated with implementation, testing and training, will not be compared to the incumbent. One-time costs associated with implementation, testing, training and associated go-live services will only be

compared to non-incumbent bidders. The current/incumbent solution required conversion and migration of data from a software that was both out-of-date and no longer supported by the providing vendor in any way. As such, though not a direct comparison, the prior conversion took place over approximately four months (largely due to the bandwidth and availability of our SFHSS staff and competing commitments), and cost approximately \$9,000, which included some customizations requested by SFHSS of the current/incumbent vendor.

- 7. On Appendix A-Vendor Response Form Questionnaire, can you please describe in more detail what should be included as a Standard Software Feature? For example, should we include declarative non-code items as Standard Software Features, such as syncing calendar data to Microsoft Outlook, even though they would still require non-code configuration/implementation cost to setup?**

HSS Response:

Pursuant to RFP Appendix A, Sec.4 (Respondent Cost Quote), please indicate in your quote any features, functionalities, and other characteristics your software is capable of and its associated pricing. If you are indicating a feature that is standard for all customers and requires no additional costs, indicate that under Column A (“Standard Software Feature”). For example, any features that are currently fully developed, available for implementation off-the-shelf, and included in your base price should be marked under Column A (“Standard Software Feature”).

Any functionality and/or feature requiring additional cost to configure and/or implement would be indicated under Column C (“Currently Unavailable, Requires Customization, and/or at an Additional Cost”). If a functionality or feature requires customization, please include any timeline(s) for implementation in excess of the standard solution. If a third-party solution or feature requires an additional cost, that information must be included as well. Please include that cost in Appendix A, Sec. 4 (Respondent Cost Quote) under “Description of any additional services requiring additional fees or one-time costs”.

Any standard functionality and/or feature your software possesses that is not represented in Appendix A, Sec. 3 (Vendor Response Form Questionnaire) can also be indicated in Appendix A, Sec. 4 (Respondent Cost Quote) under “Description of any additional services requiring additional fees or one-time costs” with costs noted as “Included”.

8. On Appendix A-Vendor Response Form Questionnaire should 3rd party solutions, such as a text messaging application for example, be included in column C, or Column A if no code is required and it is a simple part of our total solution we are presenting?

HSS Response:

See response to Question 7.

9. For the 24/7 Emergency Technical Assistance requirement, should we include a plan for what this would cost to sign up for? Or is the question is if this is included standard at no cost?

HSS Response:

See response to Question 7. All costs should be clearly delineated in your response including a 'sign up', go-live, or implementation fee. A description of each is also highly recommended.

10. Has your team received demos or been in communication with vendors prior to this posting? If so, could you share who with?

HSS Response:

Yes, the SFHSS Contracts team has conducted a four (4) month review of both the current incumbent solution and the one (1) other respondent (Harting EAP, <https://hartingeap.com/>) to the 2019 RFP (see https://sfhss.org/sites/default/files/2019-05/Request%20for%20Quote_SFHSS%20EAP%20Software_5.16.2019_2.pdf). The SFHSS Contracts team has also reviewed several other EAP software solutions online so as to better inform the development of this RFP.

However, as the SFHSS Contracts team will not be members of, or contributors to, the evaluation panel or final scoring, pursuant to RFP Section IX, each qualified Respondents to this RFP will be required to provide a live demonstration of its solution to an independent RFP evaluation panel. While the SFHSS Contracts team will be in attendance at these demonstrations to administer the process and ensure any time limitations are adhered to, the SFHSS Contracts team will not provide input into the panel's scoring and evaluation of the demonstrations.