July 18, 2016

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
ORANGE COUNTY, FLORIDA

ADDENDUM #2
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS #Y16-1042-MG

ELECTRONIC PATIENT CARE REPORTING SYSTEM

The above Request for Proposals (RFP) is changed as follows:

1. The acceptance date has been changed as follows: Sealed bid offers will be accepted up to **2:00 PM** (local time), **Thursday, July 28, 2016.**

2. The deadline for questions has been changed as follows: Questions will be accepted via email to maria.guevara-hall@ocfl.net up to **5:00PM** (local time), **Tuesday July 19, 2016.**

The following are questions, with respective answers, for the above Request for Proposals:

1.   QUESTION – Will a non-browser based solution be considered, one that is application-based and fully functional in a disconnected or connected state?

 ANSWER – No, require a web based system.

2.   QUESTION – Can you please elaborate on the desired compatibility with Emergency Reporting fire software?

 ANSWER – The desire is to have the user of the Electronic Patient Care Reporting System (EPCR) to be able to complete the National Fire Incident Reporting System (NFIRS) module of Emergency Reporting through the EPCR.

3.   QUESTION – Regarding the requirement for interagency interoperability, would the transfer of patient information be within the same ePCR system or between different systems? Would this data transfer happen in the field from the mobile device, or after PCR completion at the server level?

 ANSWER – The transfer could occur between different systems or the same. The data transfer would happen from the mobile device in the field.

4.   QUESTION – Would the County clarify the requirements in PROPOSAL FORMAT, Section 4, on page 12 of the RFP? Specifically, (i) are section numbers, for example, Sections 1.1 and 1.2 in PHASE ONE WRITTEN PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS, (ii) subsection numbers, for example, Sections 1.1.1 and 1.2.1, but not 1.2.1.A and (iii) should Proposers restate each question in their Proposals?

ANSWER – Each question should be answered in your proposal. It is not required to restate each question however each question must be addressed and numbered accordingly to match what is in the RFP.

5. QUESTION – The requirements state one (1) page per response. For question 1.4.1 b) you request a work plan with a timeline and milestones. Do you just want a Gantt chart? If not, the details will be much more than one page.

   ANSWER – Narrative responses are limited to 1 page. Page limits do not apply to documentation, samples, exhibits, pictorials or reference materials.

6. QUESTION – The requirements state one (1) page per response. For question 1.4.2 1) you request attach samples of all standard system reports, clearly labeled. Do you really want all? We have well over 50 and secondly, regardless of how many we show we are not able to keep this to one page. Please advise on how you would like this handled?

   ANSWER – Page limits do not apply to samples. The quantity and quality of your submission will be a consideration of this evaluation. Omission of a report may be interpreted as a report that is unavailable, which may negatively impact your evaluation.

7. QUESTION – What is the annual run volume?

   ANSWER – 110,000

8. QUESTION – Are you looking for a vendor or self-hosted solution?

   ANSWER – As stated on page 25 of the RFP, we are looking for a consultant hosted solution.

9. QUESTION – With EMSTARS moving to NEMSIS 3 in FL, we are not providing a NEMSIS 2 to solution because of that pending transition. What are you requirements for NEMSIS 3? We did not see any details regarding the NEMSIS 3 dataset/ICD10.

   ANSWER – We request the most current and up to date NEMSIS solution which shall be in compliance with specifications found at www.nemsis.org as stated on page 37 of the RFP.

10. QUESTION – Could we have clarification around what an automatic upload data to EMSTARS would require?

    ANSWER – Automatic data upload through the system to EMSTARS performed at regular intervals (example – monthly).

11. QUESTION – Who is your current Billing Vendor??

ANSWER – Our current billing vendor is Intermedix Corp.

12. QUESTION – Define file format, integration specifications required for ESO Health Data Exchange and/or equivalent. Is there an option to propose an alternative to ESO's Health Data Exchange?

ANSWER – The Health Data Exchange requires a valid NEMSIS 2 or NEMSIS 3 xml file along with a corresponding PDF for each incident. There is no acceptable alternative to ESO's Health Data Exchange.

13. QUESTION – Is the term "grading" mentioned in Methodology question 4 equivalent to CQI scoring?

ANSWER – Yes, similar. Describe how the program allows quality assurance to score/grade or otherwise document the level of acceptance in regards to quality of the report.

14. QUESTION – Is automatic update to EMSTARS State reporting system a requirement?

ANSWER – Yes.

15. QUESTION – Is there specific steps or processes the County would like regarding the paper PCR that flows with the ePCR dashboard?

ANSWER – The paper PCR should match the ePCR in relation to data fields to allow for efficiently completing the electronic report.

16. QUESTION – Will the LifeNet software - Physio Cloud Integration be a requirement?

ANSWER – The Cloud Integration is not a requirement.

17. QUESTION – Regarding question 9 in the demo section (Phase 2), are you referencing they should be able to include customizable quick treat lists?

ANSWER – Customizable fields based on protocol and treatment, able to make fields match our language and requirements of the protocols.

18. QUESTION – Regarding question 11 in the demo (Phase 2) section, we would like more information on what exactly the County would like a third party to be able to do.

ANSWER – Seamless database sharing with local participating hospitals through ESO's Health Data Exchange. This would include database sharing in real time.

19. QUESTION – Regarding question 12 in the demo (Phase 2) section, how would we be expected to retrieve a patient that is currently in our system? Would this require moving legacy data into our system? What data are you referring to? Standard NEMSIS files, signatures, attachments, etc.? Please clarify.

    ANSWER – Demonstrate how to retrieve past patient data that already exists in the proposer's database, for example, a previous patient. We would like to look at a closed incidents report's NEMSIS file, signature and attachments.

20. QUESTION – Question 24 in the demo section mentions EMSTARS and NEMSIS reporting capabilities. Is the County looking for NEMSIS 2 or 3?

    ANSWER – NEMSIS 3 with the most current compliance please refer to question number 9 in this addendum.

21. QUESTION – In the Scope of Services section, question 5 mentions customization. Does this mean customization by the County administrator or would you prefer the vendor to make those specific changes?

    ANSWER – Customization to meet our needs, the changes can be made by the vendor or Orange County Fire Rescue Department.

22. QUESTION – In the Scope of Services question 9, Quick Treat lists are mentioned. This is an ESO product feature, we would like more definition as to what that is.

    ANSWER – This references an efficient quick way to document treatment procedures.

23. QUESTION – Is the translation tool something that is necessary for product functionality?

    ANSWER – The translation tool is a feature requested.

24. QUESTION – Question 32 in the Scope of Services references a bi-directional NEMSIS/HL7 transformation engine. Earlier in the requirements, there is a reference to ESO's Health Data Network. Is the County looking for entirely new functionality or are you looking for an interface to ESO's Health Data Network?

    ANSWER – The RFP is for a new electronic patient care reporting system that must include the ability to interface with ESOs Health Data.

25. QUESTION – Question 34 in the Scope of Services says the County is looking for interagency interoperability. What are the other agencies the County would require interoperability with?

    ANSWER – Orlando Fire Department, Rural Metro Ambulance, and Winter Garden Fire Department

26.   QUESTION – Regarding question 40 in the Scope of Services, we would like clarification on what compatibility we need with Emergency Reporting, fire reporting software.

ANSWER – The desire is to have the user of the EPCR to be able to complete the NFIRS module of Emergency Reporting through the EPCR.

27.   QUESTION – Regarding CAD data, is it a one way or two way to CAD, cardiac, fire records, hospital medical records, and billing applications?

ANSWER – This is always one-way from CAD to the new application. We never write to the CAD database. All other information sharing should be one-way also.

All other specifications, terms and conditions remain the same

<u>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ADDENDA</u>

a.   The proposer shall acknowledge receipt of this addendum by completing the applicable section in the solicitation or by completion of the acknowledgement information on the addendum. Either form of acknowledgement must be completed and returned not later than the date and time for receipt of the proposal.

b.   Receipt acknowledged by:

_____   _____
Authorized Signer   Date Signed

_____
Title

_____
Name of Proposer