



**Request for Information (RFI) No. N22787
Healthcare Enforcement and Licensing Modernized Solution (HELMS)
For Washington State Department of Health**

Posting Date: May 22, 2017

Event Timeline: This Request for Information (RFI) is issued by the Washington State Department of Health under the following schedule. The response deadlines are mandatory and based on Pacific Daylight Time.

- Question & Answer Period Begins: May 22, 2017
- Vendor Pre-Response Conference Call: June 22, 2017 12:30 – 1:00 p.m. Pacific Time. Attendance is optional. Email RFI Coordinator to register.
- Question & Answer Period Ends: June 30, 2017 5:00 p.m.
- Vendor Responses Due: July 31, 2017 5:00 p.m.

Washington State Department of Enterprise Services (DES) maintains Washington Electronic Business Solution (WEBS), which is the solution that WA Agencies are required to use for posting solicitations. This procurement, any subsequent amendments to it and all future procurements related to HELMS will be posted and conducted via WEBS. For information on how vendors register for WEBS, access the DES website: <http://des.wa.gov/services/contracting-purchasing/doing-business-state/webs-registration-search-tips>.

The system is self-maintained and Bidders are responsible for the accuracy of the information in WEBS for updating/maintaining registration information, and checking with their assigned account administrators regarding notifications. In order to receive notifications you must select “yes” for Bid notifications. If you do not download bid documents, you will not receive any subsequent notifications regarding this solicitation.

Regardless of the method by which you obtained this solicitation or notice of this solicitation, failure to register in WEBS per the guidance in this section may result in potential Bidders not receiving further updates, notifications or amendments to this solicitation which may further result in the potential Bidders bid to be non-responsive. DOH assumes no responsibility for potential Bidders who do not register in WEBS.

Commodity Codes used for this RFI include:

- 208-10 through 208-94 Computer Software For Microcomputers (Preprogrammed)
- 209-11 through 209-95 Computer Software For Mini And Mainframe Computers (Preprogrammed)
- 918-71; 918-88; 918-90 Consulting Services

- 920-02 through 920-96 Data Processing, Computer, Programming, And Software Services

As a supplemental communication channel, Washington State Department of Health has also posted this RFI on the HELMS project website:

<http://www.doh.wa.gov/LicensesPermitsandCertificates/HealthcareEnforcementandLicensingModernizationSolution>.

Costs of Proposal Preparation: The State will not be liable for any costs incurred by the Respondent in the preparation and presentation of information submitted in response to this RFI including, but not limited to, costs incurred in connection with the Respondent's participation in demonstrations

RFI Coordinator: Upon release of this RFI, all vendor communication concerning this RFI must be directed to the RFI Coordinator listed below. Vendors shall rely only on written statements issued by the RFI Coordinator. Written Responses to this RFI should be submitted electronically to the RFI Coordinator listed below. Vendor email must include "DOH RFI N22787" in the subject of the email.

Stephanie Goebel, RFI Coordinator and HELMS Project Manager, HELMS@doh.wa.gov

Written responses should not exceed 60 pages in length. Concise responses are preferred.

Department has structured this RFI to 1) gather information that will be used to refine the requirements referenced herein as Exhibits in advance of publication of an anticipated RFP and finalization of a legislative budgetary decision package, 2) prepare the vendor marketplace for the anticipated RFP and 3) minimize the work impact to responding vendors by asking questions pertaining to the set of requirements, not specific to the individual requirements. Responses to individual requirements will be requested and evaluated at the time of the anticipated RFP.

Introduction

The mission of the Department is to protect and improve the health of people in Washington State. As part of this essential public health service, the Department regulates licensing and enforcement of healthcare providers, educational programs and facilities.

The Department's Division of Health Systems Quality Assurance (HSQA) and Chiropractic, Medical and Nursing Care Commissions are responsible for the licensing and enforcement of over 430,000 healthcare professionals, 1,800 educational/training programs, and approximately 7,000 facilities. Each year nearly 9,800 complaints are received and thousands of facility inspections are conducted. The Health Law Judges in the Department's Adjudicative Services Unit preside over and decide cases from the Department Disciplinary Authorities, providing an impartial, fair and uniform legal process for decisions and orders.

A Healthcare Enforcement and Licensing Modernized Solution (HELMS) is required to support the demands of Washington's governmental public health system.

Current Solution

The Integrated Licensing and Regulatory System (ILRS) is the current solution used for licensing and enforcement of healthcare providers and facilities. ILRS is comprised of eleven applications and eighteen databases. The prime component of ILRS, eLicense, is a highly-customized Commercial off the Shelf (COTS) product that was implemented in 2008.

While ILRS aligned with provider licensing requirements, the enforcement modules required significant modification by the vendor. Even with customizations, ILRS does not effectively support enforcement needs or educational programs. As the department's business needs have evolved, ILRS's gap to business requirements has widened.

Business Environment

Disciplinary Authorities are entities with legislative authority to regulate healthcare providers, facilities, or educational programs. Disciplinary Authorities that are stakeholders of the HELMS project include The Secretary of Health, twelve governor-appointed boards, and five governor-appointed commissions. HELMS will also support eleven governor-appointed committees, which serve in an advisory capacity, but do not have disciplinary authority.

HELMS Business Units are entities who perform business functions in support of one or more Disciplinary Authority. Examples of Business Units supported by HELMS include Legal Services and Customer Service. Staff in the Business Units are Department employees.

HELMS Administrative Units are organizations that provide administrative support for Disciplinary Authorities, with the exception of the Adjudicative Services Unit¹. The Adjudicative Services Unit presides over and decides cases coming from the various Disciplinary Authorities. Business Units align within an Administrative Unit. Administrative Units to be supported with HELMS include Adjudicative Services Unit, Chiropractic Commission, Health Services Quality Assurance Division, Medical Commission

¹ See Exhibit A, HELMS Business Requirements, for a matrix of Program Areas and Administrative Units for more information on responsibility for various business functions.

and Nursing Care Commission. The three Commission Administrative Units support the single commission for which they are named. The Health Services Quality Assurance Division supports the balance of the Disciplinary Authorities.

The commissions for Chiropractic, Medical and Nursing Care have established independent budgetary authority and autonomy in many of their business operations; meanwhile all Business Units within the Department share the responsibility for data integrity and accurate reporting to common and unique reporting audiences. As the landscape of healthcare disciplinary authority has evolved, demands for technology that enables autonomy in workflow configurations and issuance of more granular security permissions in a system with shared and commonly maintained data have elevated and surpassed the capabilities of technology currently in place.

Business Needs

The healthcare Disciplinary Authorities for Washington State include: The Secretary of Health, twelve governor-appointed boards, and five governor-appointed commissions. These disciplinary authorities are responsible for licensing and enforcement of 28 types of educational and training programs, 85 professions and 19 facility types. To effectively do so, it is critical that data be shared and commonly governed across the functions of licensing and enforcement. To enable this today, both licensing and enforcement functions are performed in a shared system. Technology in place supports profession licensing business requirements fairly effectively. It does not effectively support enforcement or educational program requirements:

- The exchange of secure data with disciplinary authority appointees is manual and in paper form. This is because the current technology does not provide a satisfactory user experience to appointees. User-friendly technology that complies with technology security requirements is needed in a modernized solution
- User-defined fields are used to manage the unique needs of enforcement, educational programs and the variable needs for the 348 license types administered. Ad hoc reporting is not feasible today. Because the current system does not have a data warehouse, reports must be run outside of core business hours and require significant manipulation to provide meaningful data analysis of the poorly indexed data.
- There are many cases when staff have to enter the same data multiple times because it does not persist throughout the system, which presents unnecessary risk of human error and a slowed response rate.

Business Opportunities

The HELMS project presents many business opportunities for the Department, providers, business partners and staff, including:

Improved Customer Service

Modern technology will automate workflows for licensing and enforcement, which will in turn, reduce response time to providers and facilities and reduce risk of human error during re-entry of data and manual processing.

Modern technology will enable more granular security permissions; as a result, user roles can be extended to providers and facilities so that applications, renewals and contact updates can be captured

at the source and status of licensing and enforcement activities can be viewed in real time by authorized providers and facilities.

Increased Efficiency

Modernized data management will vastly improve reporting and analytical capabilities, enabling more rapid and continual improvement to operations and customer support.

Modern, configurable software will decrease cost and time needed to implement improvements in operations and customer support to include reaction time to new legislative mandates.

More granular security permissions will also reduce the potential for users to incorrectly change or delete data due to system access inappropriate to their user role.

More Meaningful Work

A modern solution will reduce unnecessary re-work, data entry, and other system workarounds, allowing staff to spend more time performing tasks that directly contribute to patient safety and access to care, resulting in increased job satisfaction

Customer Service staff manually enter paper application data into the system and perform an initial validation of application content before it is passed along for a secondary, more complex validation, for example an assessment of attached transcripts or resumes to validate satisfaction of educational criteria. Pushing initial validations to the user interface means that Customer Service staff will have an opportunity to perform more meaningful tasks.

Functional Services within Scope for HELMS:

- Licensing/credentialing/approval of providers, facilities, educational/training programs
 - Application
 - Renewal
 - Construction review
- Enforcement
 - Inspections
 - Complaints
 - Case management
 - Investigations
 - Legal actions
 - Adjudicative services
 - Compliance
- Policy/Administration
 - Boards, Commissions, Committees
 - Business rule engine
 - Certificate of Need
 - Community Health Systems
 - External stakeholder portals

Project Background

The HELMS Analysis project began in April, 2016. The goal of the HELMS Analysis project is requirements documentation that defines the ideal modernized solution to support health care educational program, provider and facility licensing and enforcement activities in Washington State.

Deliverables produced throughout the project include:

1. Inventory of core business process to be supported by HELMS
2. Current process flows for core business processes
3. Future, desired-state requirements for HELMS, baselined, Exhibits A and C
4. Feasibility study conducted by a vendor

Responses to this RFI will be used to vet and revise the baselined requirements to arrive at a final set of requirements for publication in a possible RFP and 2018-2019 legislative supplemental budgetary decision package.

It is anticipated that the RFP will be posted third quarter of 2017.

It is also anticipated that the RFP will require a Prime respondent, meaning that a single vendor will be required to respond as lead, or Prime. A Prime may have one, multiple or no subcontractors. Subcontractors may partner with one or more Prime respondent.

HELMS requirements documentation efforts will continue following posting of the RFP. The Department intends to

5. Conduct external stakeholder outreach
6. Conduct a current-state analysis of data: assigning all data elements a definition, tracing them back to source business rule (RCW, WAC), and identifying repetition
7. Configuration requirements: documenting the hierarchy of programs, license types, transactions and data required for each, tracing them back to the source business rule (RCW, WAC)

Technical Requirements

The Technical Requirements embedded as Exhibits B and C are intended to provide a starting point; any solution advanced under this RFI should satisfy these Technical Requirements. However, the Technical Requirements as set forth herein may be refined in subsequent solicitations.

Complexity Sizing Information

The following data provide vendors insight to the complexity of the Department’s needs so that RFI responses are appropriately scaled and provide accurate data for influence on the anticipated decision package and refinement of the anticipated RFP.

License types	348
Facility types	19
Disciplinary Authorities	18
Disciplinary Advisory Committees	11
Administrative Units	5
External data exchanges currently in place	35
Total future external data exchanges desired	85
External application interfaces currently in place	15
Total future external application interfaces desired	31
Databases supporting current technology ²	18

Transaction volumes of current system:

Year	Applications Started	Applications Renewed	Complaints Rcvd	Active Licenses	Investigations Started	Disciplinary Actions Entered
2014	89,768	340,686	10,537	456,056	4,826	1,215
2015	96,367	347,960	12,091	479,525	5,034	1,373
2016	100,978	364,021	13,475	499,448	4,740	1,347

No Award

No contract will be awarded via this RFI. This is solely an information gathering process.

Public Records

Materials – including the response to this RFI – provided to the Department are subject to the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW.

To the extent consistent with the Public Records Act, the Department shall maintain the confidentiality of your information clearly marked confidential or proprietary. If a request is made to view your proprietary information, the Department will notify you of the request and of the date that the records will be released to the requester unless you obtain a court order enjoining that disclosure. If you fail to obtain the court order enjoining disclosure, the Department will release the requested information on the date specified in its notice to you.

The Department’s sole responsibility shall be limited to maintaining the above data in a secure area and to notify you of any request(s) for disclosure for so long as the Department retains your information in its records per state law.

² See Exhibit D, Current-State Database Complexity for more details

Failure to clearly mark confidential or proprietary materials, or failure to timely respond after notice of request for public records has been given, shall be deemed a waiver by you of any claim that such materials are exempt from disclosure.

Requested Information

It is requested that vendors participating in the RFI submit a concise Written Response to the items below. Please begin each response with the item to which you are responding. The information received may assist in the development of a subsequent RFP that the Department may issue.

1. Exhibit A contains business requirements for HELMS. Vendors are requested to validate and proof the business requirements for items they believe have been overlooked. Please provide a list of additional business requirements you recommend we consider for inclusion in an anticipated RFP.
2. Also pertaining to business requirements in Exhibit A, please identify any requirements you believe to be non-standard. In other words, identify any requirements that you believe are uncommon, difficult to fulfill, or for any other reason contribute significant cost and/or time to the project and explain why.

Exhibit B contains security requirements. (HELMS will include data ranging from category 1 through 4.) Exhibit C contains general technical requirements for HELMS.

Taking into consideration the Exhibits provided, A – D and the complexity measures included in the body of the RFI, please respond to the following questions based upon the end-to-end solution that you would recommend to satisfy the requirements of the Department:

3. Is your recommended solution PaaS/SaaS? If not, why?
4. What technology stack do you recommend for this solution and why?
5. What architectural design that incorporates the following would you recommend: service oriented architecture (SOA), integration services, service bus, application program interface (API) management, business/data warehouse(s), reporting engines and rules engines, model driven architecture and methodology (business process modeling notation (BPMN), unified modeling language (UML), etc.)?
6. What approach do you recommend to accommodate the Department's dependencies upon integration of the recommended solution to other Department enterprise solutions and Washington State enterprise solutions, for which release/maintenance schedules are not under the control of the Department?
7. What approach do you recommend for master data management throughout the recommended solution?
8. What approach do you recommend for management of the external data exchanges that are required of/by the Department?
9. What system support roles and responsibilities do you recommend be allocated to vendor(s) versus roles and responsibilities allocated to the Department for i) the implementation project and ii) maintenance and operations?

10. What level of involvement from vendor(s) is required to support your recommendation for i) the implementation project and ii) maintenance and operations?
11. What level of involvement from the Department is required to support your recommendation for i) the implementation project and ii) maintenance and operations?
12. What type of access to the system, code and data is available and/or accessible to the Department for the recommended solution?
13. What approach do you recommend for migration to the recommended solution for data?
14. Describe skill sets and training needed to perform common functions in the system, including but not limited to: external customer support, transaction processing, building business process models, creating tasks, ingesting and implementing work flows.
15. Do you have experience with government implementations? If yes, what obstacles have you experienced with them and how do you recommend the Department prepare for similar obstacles?
16. How do you recommend the Department quantify measures of solution manageability for evaluation purposes in a future RFP? Manageability here meaning the ability to effectively coordinate with a vendor for preventative maintenance and improvements in accordance with ITIL best practices, ensuring that the Department is able to evolve, or influence the evolution of, the solution to satisfy emerging needs?
17. How do you recommend the Department quantify measures of solution maintainability for evaluation purposes in the future RFP? Maintainability here meaning the degree to which system functionality can be repaired and enhanced with minimal user impact.
18. Please provide a timeline estimate for implementation of the recommended solution, based upon your recommendations associated with previously asked questions.
19. Please provide a cost estimate for implementation and maintenance of the recommended solution. Show annual costs over implementation timeframe. Detail as annual line items: hardware purchase or lease; software purchase or lease; personal services contract; software maintenance and operations; training for staff at all levels. Also specify how cost varies based upon the degree to which vendor supports operations versus operations supported by the Department (related to question 9)?
20. The Exhibits herein, updated based upon external stakeholder outreach and RFI responses, are intended to be the format and content to which vendors will be asked to respond to for the RFP. Is the level of detail and content provided sufficient in order for you to provide an accurate proposal? What recommendations do you have to refine RFP content to promote accurate proposal responses?
21. What activities or milestones do you recommend the Department accomplish to be prepared to sign a vendor contract and begin an implementation project?

Attachments:

Exhibit A RFI N22787 HELMS Business Requirements

Exhibit B RFI N22787 HELMS Security Requirements

Exhibit C RFI N22787 HELMS Technical Requirements

Exhibit D RFI N22787 HELMS Current-State Database Complexity