



*Delaware Health
And Social Services*

**DIVISION OF PUBLIC HEALTH
PROCUREMENT**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL HSS-26-078, RURAL HEALTH
TRANSFORMATION PROGRAM SUPPORT SERVICES
FOR
DIVISION OF PUBLIC HEALTH**

May 29, 2026

TO: ALL OFFERORS
FROM: RICK WILLIAMSON
MANAGEMENT ANALYST III
SUBJECT: ADDENDUM #1 TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL HSS-26-078, RURAL HEALTH
TRANSFORMATION PROGRAM SUPPORT SERVICES

All other terms and conditions remain the same.

If you have any questions, please contact me at Ricky.Williamson@Delaware.gov.

ADDENDUM #1

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

The purpose of this addendum is to provide answers to written questions submitted in response to this solicitation.

- Q1.** What is the estimated budget or budget threshold for the Coordination component outlined in the Scope of Work (Appendix B, Section C)?
- A1.** The RFP does not identify a budget threshold for either component. Vendors should propose a budget that is reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.
- Q2.** What is the estimated budget or budget threshold for the Monitoring & Evaluation component outlined in the Scope of Work (Appendix B, Section C)?
- A2.** The RFP does not identify a budget threshold for either component. Vendors should propose a budget that is reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.
- Q3.** In Appendix B, Section C of the RFP, it states that there is a 10-page limit for the Technical Proposal. If an offeror is pursuing both the Coordination component and the monitoring & evaluation component, would that still be 10 pages total? or would it be 10 pages for the coordination component and 10 pages for the evaluation component?
- A3.** The Technical Proposal should generally not exceed 10 pages, regardless of whether a vendor is proposing for one or both components. Vendors are encouraged to provide concise, focused responses, as succinctness is preferred. However, if additional space is necessary to adequately address both components, vendors applying to both may include up to three (3) additional pages.
- Q4.** I am writing to find out if a consulting / management firm outside the US can apply for this RFP on Rural Health Transformation Grant?
- A4.** Vendors must comply with all applicable requirements identified in the RFP, including Section 21 (Vendor Activity), which states that no activity may be executed in an offshore facility or by a foreign office or division of the vendor, and that vendors must attest that no activity will take place outside of the United States.
- Q5.** Can the State provide an anticipated budget range or funding envelope for each component separately — (1) Coordination and (2) Monitoring & Evaluation — to help vendors develop appropriately scoped proposals?
- A5.** The RFP does not identify anticipated budget ranges or funding envelopes by component. Vendors should propose a budget that is reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the

proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

- Q6.** We reviewed Delaware's RHTP budget narrative and noticed specific funding called out for the Grant Program Oversight and Evaluation Entity (GPOEE) as well as several initiative-level oversight, reporting, and evaluation contracts (e.g., external evaluation for community health hubs, program oversight, reporting and evaluation for rural health workforce education). Are these initiative-level contracts also within the scope of work for the vendor(s) selected under this RFP, or will those be procured separately?
- A6.** This RFP is intended to support program-wide coordination, monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and related grant management activities associated with the overall RHTP award, as described in the RFP. Certain initiative-specific services, procurements, technical assistance activities or implementation functions may be procured, managed, or administered separately based on initiative needs, operational requirements, procurement status, and funding structure.
- Q7.** Under the general evaluation requirements listed on page 4 of the RFP, DHSS lists "location (geographical)" as one of the evaluation criteria for the opportunity (section III.B.4). Could the state please elaborate on how the location will factor into the evaluation process?
- A7.** "Location (geographical)" is not intended to establish a preference for a particular geographic location independent of the vendor's ability to perform the scope of work described in the RFP. Vendors must comply with applicable RFP requirements, including requirements related to vendor activity occurring within the United States. Evaluation will otherwise be conducted in accordance with the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP.
- Q8.** For vendors located outside of the state, what action or documentation is required to fulfill the requirement to initiate the business license application process prior to award (e.g., paying an application fee, registering with the Department of Revenue, etc.)?
- A8.** Vendors are responsible for complying with all applicable State of Delaware business licensing, registration, and procurement requirements identified in the RFP and applicable State guidance. Vendors should review the applicable State requirements regarding business licensure and registration prior to contract award.
- Q9.** Firms of different sizes often have different levels of insurance coverage. As a small business, our insurance broker has set the limits based on their underwriting policies. If a smaller business was interested in pursuing the opportunity, would DHSS consider allowing lower minimum coverage limits, such as \$1,000,000 per occurrence/\$2 million aggregate rather than the \$1,000,000 per occurrence/\$3,000,000 aggregate stated in the RFP for general liability, or

\$1,000,000 per occurrence/\$1 million aggregate for Professional Liability Errors & Omissions? (This is in reference to section G.8 on pages 21 and 22 of the RFP).

- A9.** Vendors are expected to comply with the insurance requirements identified in the RFP.
- Q10.** Could the state provide some guidance on how the state is defining "partnerships" in the Partnership and Coordination Strategy required in the technical proposal on page 48 of the RFP? Also, does the answer differ depending on which component a firm is responding to?
- A10.** For the purposes of this RFP, "partnerships" generally refers to coordination, collaboration, and engagement activities with DPH, DHSS divisions, State agencies, subrecipients, contractors, healthcare providers, community-based organizations, and other keyholders involved in RHTP implementation. The proposed Partnership and Coordination Strategy should align with the selected component(s) and the vendor's proposed approach. The nature of coordination and partnership activities may differ between the Coordination Component and the Monitoring & Evaluation Component based on the scope of work associated with each.
- Q11.** Does "the line-item budget" referenced in Appendix B (page 48 of the RFP document) need to be more detailed than what Appendix F shows, which is a dollar amount per program component?
- A11.** The line-item budget should provide sufficient detail to clearly explain the proposed costs associated with the vendor's approach, activities, and deliverables. Vendors may use Appendix F for this purpose or submit budget information in an alternate format, provided all required budget and Budget Narrative elements identified in the RFP are clearly addressed.
- Q12.** Are the attachments (item 5 on page 48 of the RFP) limited only to the items listed is other content that is relevant to the scope of work allowable (e.g., project descriptions)?
- A12.** The attachments referenced in the RFP are not limited solely to the examples provided. Vendors may include additional supporting materials relevant to the proposed scope of work, such as project descriptions, sample deliverables, reporting templates, organizational charts, or resumes, as appropriate. Vendors are encouraged to include only materials that are directly relevant to the proposal.
- Q13.** Can the state confirm that appendices C, E, and F are excluded from the page limits discussed on pages 47 and 48 of the RFP?
- A13.** Yes. The page limits referenced on pages 47 and 48 apply to the narrative portions of the proposal. Appendix C forms and Appendix E templates are excluded from the page limit. Appendix F budget

documents remain subject to the budget page limitations identified in the RFP.

Q14. Will vendors who propose providing both coordination and M&E services be favored, compared to vendors who propose providing one or the other?

A14. No, vendors proposing for both components will not receive additional preference or weighting solely for proposing both components. Each component will be evaluated and scored independently using the applicable RFP evaluation criteria and associated weights.

Q15. Would the M&E vendor be responsible for M&E across all sub-recipients, from the Hope Centers to the statewide HIT initiative? Or should we propose to conduct M&E functions for specific sub-recipients?

A15. The Monitoring & Evaluation Component is intended to support activities across the RHTP award and associated initiatives, as described in the RFP. Vendors should propose approaches capable of supporting monitoring, evaluation, reporting, tracking, and related activities associated with all RHTP initiatives and applicable subrecipients under the selected component(s).

Q16. When DPH says it wants the vendor to design and implement a comprehensive monitoring framework, is it open to multiple methods (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus group discussions?) How much appetite might there be to go above and beyond the usual data collection and CMS reporting requirements?

A16. The RFP does not prescribe a specific monitoring or evaluation methodology. Vendors may propose approaches, methodologies, and tools, they believe are appropriate to support monitoring, evaluation, reporting, performance measurement, stakeholder engagement, and related activities associated with the selected component(s). Vendors should ensure their proposed approach aligns with the scope of work, reporting requirements, and objectives described in the RFP.

Q17. The Technical Proposal is limited to 10 pages; however, the Scope of Services states that “vendors may propose to deliver services for one or both program components” (pg. 46). Further, the proposal selection criteria states that the State “shall assign up to the maximum number of points for each Evaluation Item to each of the proposing vendor’s proposals.”

For vendors bidding on both program components, does the 10-page limit apply to each component separately (i.e., one proposal, 10 pages per component)?

A17. No. The Technical Proposal should generally not exceed 10 pages total, regardless of whether a vendor is proposing for one or both components. Vendors are encouraged to provide concise, focused responses, as succinctness is preferred. However, if additional space is necessary to

adequately address both components, vendors may include up to three (3) additional pages.

Q18. If vendors bidding on both program components are limited to 10 pages, will each component be scored independently, including the application of criteria weights?

A18. A17b) Yes. Each component proposed by a vendor will be evaluated and scored independently using the applicable RFP evaluation criteria and associate weights. Vendors should clearly distinguish responses for each component within the proposal.

Q19. If vendors bidding on both program components are limited to 10 pages total, may vendors submit separate proposals for each program component (i.e., two distinct proposals) to ensure each proposal is evaluated independently and based upon its own merits?

A19. A17c) No. Pursuant to the RFP, a primary vendor may not participate in more than one proposal in any form. Vendors proposing for both components should submit a single proposal that clearly distinguishes responses for each component.

Q20. The Executive Summary is limited to 2 pages. For vendors bidding on both program components, does the 2 page limit apply to each component separately (i.e., one proposal, 2 pages of Executive Summary per component)?

A20. The Executive Summary should generally not exceed two (2) pages total, regardless of whether a vendor is proposing for one or both components. Vendors are encouraged to provide concise, focused responses. If additional space is necessary to adequately address both components, vendors may include up to one (1) additional page.

The Budget and Budget Narrative is limited to 8 pages; however, the Scope of Services states that “vendors may propose to deliver services for one or both program components” (pg. 46). Further, the proposal selection criteria states that the State “shall assign up to the maximum number of points for each Evaluation Item to each of the proposing vendor’s proposals.”

Q21. For vendors bidding on both program components, does the 8 page limit apply to each component separately (i.e., one proposal, 8 pages per component)?

A21. The Budget and Budget Narrative should generally not exceed eight (8) pages total, regardless of whether a vendor is proposing for one or both components. Vendors are encouraged to provide concise, focused responses. If additional space is necessary to adequately address both components, vendors may include up to two (2) additional pages.

Q22. If vendors bidding on both program components are limited to 8 pages, will each component be scored independently, including the application of criteria weights?

A22. Yes. Each component proposed by a vendor will be evaluated and scored independently using the applicable RFP evaluation criteria and associated weights, including the Budget and Budget Narrative criteria. Vendors should clearly distinguish budget information for each component

within the proposal.

Q23. If vendors bidding on both program components are limited to 8 pages total in this section, may vendors submit Budget/Budget Narratives for each program component (i.e., two distinct proposals) to ensure each proposal is evaluated independently and based upon its own merits?

A23. No. Vendors proposing for both program components should submit a single proposal and a single budget and budget narrative section that clearly distinguishes costs and budget information for each component. Each component will be evaluated and scored independently using the applicable RFP evaluation criteria an associated weights.

Q24. Has the State contracted with any other vendors to support the Delaware Rural Health Transformation Program? If yes, can the State provide a list of these vendors, associated scopes of work, and current budget amounts?

A24. DPH has engaged and may continue to engage vendors, contractors, subrecipients, and other entities to support various RHTP initiatives and implementation activities. Additional procurements, contracts, and implementation activities may occur throughout the contract period based on initiative needs and operational requirements. Relevant information necessary for contract performance and coordination activities will be provided to the selected vendor(s) as appropriate during contract implementation.

Q25. What is the anticipated budget for each of the program components outlined in the RFP?

A25. The RFP does not identify anticipated budgets by program component. Vendors should propose a budget that is reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q26. Appendix B, Scope of Services, Coordination Component, Item #1 indicates the vendor will “provide program coordination across selected initiatives.” Please confirm if the selected vendor will support coordination across all 15 initiatives. If not, which initiatives are included within this scope of services?

A26. Vendors proposing for the Coordination Component should propose approaches capable of supporting coordination activities across all 15 RHTP initiatives associated with the component scope of services. The RFP does not identify a limited subset of initiatives for vendor support under this component.

The Scope of Services states vendors must “conduct periodic audits to ensure alignment with project goals and approved budget;” however, no specific auditing standards or frameworks (e.g.,

AICPA or GAGAS) have been indicated.

Q27. Can the State clarify whether there is an expectation for a specific standard or framework to be followed, or provide additional details on the expected scope and requirements of the periodic audits? Alternatively, would the contractor have the flexibility to propose and define the scope and methodology for procedures to best align with the State's objectives for the project?

A27. The RFP does not prescribe a specific auditing standard or framework for these activities. Vendors should describe their proposed approach, methodology, scope, tools, validation processes, and monitoring activities associated with periodic audits, budget monitoring, compliance review, and related activities described in the RFP.

Q28. Does the state currently have a grants manual and required oversight process this program would be following?

A28. A23b) The RFP does not prescribe a separate grants manual or standardized oversight process specific to the RHTP award. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to oversight, monitoring, compliance, reporting, coordination, and related activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q29. Appendix B, Scope of Services states that vendors must "assist DPH with the development and maintenance of data visualization and tracking tools using the Achieveit platform, including both public-facing dashboards and internal (private-facing) reporting tools, to support program monitoring, transparency, and decision-making" (pg. 46). However, the Scope of Services requires vendors to provide their "technology approach (as applicable), including proposed data visualization and dashboarding."

Does the State expect vendors to leverage the Achieveit platform for all contracted services or may vendors propose alternative technology solutions?

A29. The RFP identifies the Achieveit platform for activities related to data visualization, tracking, reporting, and dashboard support as described in the Scope of Services. Vendors may describe additional tools, technologies, or approaches that support their proposed services; however, vendors should ensure their proposed approach aligns with the requirements identified in the RFP.

Q30. Will the State be providing access to and/or licensing for this platform, or will vendors be required to secure their own access/licensing?

A30. DPH anticipates providing access to the Achieveit platform for activities associated with the RHTP award, as applicable to the selected component(s).

Q31. Appendix B, Scope of Services indicates the selected vendor will coordinate with DHSS' DPH, the Governor's Office, and other relevant state agencies to ensure oversight (e.g., DPH, DE Healthcare Commission, DE State Housing Authority).

Additionally, it is stated that the vendor will coordinate with “various state agencies, departments, bureaus, and sections that manage specific initiatives under RHTP.” Please confirm whether DPH Bureau of Grant Acquisitions will be the direct point of contact for all services delivered under this contract, or will the vendor also report directly to an assigned state staff member for each agency that is leading an initiative?

A31. DPH will maintain overall administrative oversight of the contract. The selected vendor(s) may also be expected to coordinate and communicate with DPH program staff, other state agencies, initiative leads, subrecipients, contractors, and other relevant stakeholders involved in RHTP implementation, as applicable to the selected component(s).

Q32. The Scope of Services states that if vendors are “applying for both components, budgets must be separated for each component.” As vendors delivering services for both components may realize project efficiencies, may vendors provide: (1) a cost proposal for component one if awarded independently; (2) a cost proposal for component two if awarded independently; and (3) a cost proposal reflecting the efficiency and price discount if awarded both components?

A32. Vendors proposing for both components may provide separate cost proposals for each component, as well as pricing reflecting efficiencies or reduced costs associated with being awarded both components. Vendors should clearly distinguish and describe any combined pricing assumptions within the budget submission and Budget Narrative.

Appendix F (Project Cost Template), states that the project cost forms represent the “deliverables and activities per the project presented in Appendix B.” While deliverables are listed in subsection “iv” (Deliverables), project activities do not appear to be clearly identified. Moreover, Column 1 of the project cost forms references Appendix B.N, which does not appear to be included in the Scope of Services.

Q33. Can the State please provide additional clarity regarding its expectations for completion of the project cost forms. For example, are there specific activities referenced in the Scope of Services that should be included, are vendors permitted to propose activities that they believe would directly align with the deliverables stated in subsection “iv,” etc.

A33. Vendors may propose activities that they believe appropriately support the required deliverables and overall scope of services for the selected component(s). The activities included in Appendix F do not need to mirror specific subsections of the Scope of Services, provided the proposed activities, deliverables, and costs clearly align with the vendor’s proposed approach and the

requirements of this RFP.

Q34. Can the State please clarify if pricing in Appendix F is to be provided by activity, deliverable, and total for each component or just total price for each component.

A34. Vendors should provide sufficient detail in Appendix F to clearly identify proposed activities, deliverables, and associated costs for each proposed component. Vendors may determine the level of detail and structure that best reflects their proposed approach, provided the pricing is clear and supported by the Budget Narrative.

Q35. To support vendors' projected level of effort and associated costs, can the State provide additional detail regarding the following:

A35. The number of subrecipients anticipated across each of the selected Delaware Rural Health Transformation Program funded initiative.

- a.** The number of subrecipients across the RHTP initiatives may vary based on initiative scope, procurement outcomes, funding availability, and program needs. The RFP does not establish a fixed number of subrecipients by initiative. Vendors should propose approaches and levels of effort appropriate to supporting the scope of services identified in the RFP.
- b.** The anticipated frequency of "regular meetings" with subrecipients to ensure cross-initiative communication and knowledge sharing (e.g., weekly, monthly, quarterly).
- c.** The frequency of meetings and coordination activities may vary based on initiative needs, implementation status, operational priorities, and the vendor's proposed approach. Vendors should propose reasonable coordination and communication structures appropriate to supporting cross-initiative collaboration, reporting, and stakeholder engagement activities across the RHTP initiatives.
- d.** The anticipated number of "periodic audits" per subrecipient, per year. The frequency and scope of periodic audits or monitoring activities may vary based on initiative needs, funding structures, subrecipient risk, compliance requirements, and operational priorities throughout the contract period. Vendors should propose approaches appropriate to support monitoring, oversight, and compliance activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q36. Would the state accept the federal CPARS (Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System) records in lieu of providing traditional Business References (Appendix C, Attachment 6)? A CPARS report provides a comprehensive, government-verified overview of past performance that covers the scope, quality, and outcomes of the work and remains accessible regardless of staff turnover at the contracting agency. Would this satisfy the reference requirement?

A36. No, vendors are expected to provide the Business References required by the RFP. Vendors may

also include additional past performance materials, such as CPARS reports, as supplemental information if desired.

Q37. Can the State clarify whether evaluation services may include activities before full implementation of initiatives, such as formative or readiness evaluation, or if the evaluation scope is intended to focus only on implementation processes and outcomes once initiatives are underway?

A37. The evaluation scope may include activities occurring prior to full implementation of initiatives, including planning, readiness, baseline, formative, coordination, or implementation support activities associated with the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and related activities across varying stages of initiative implementation and operational maturity.

Q38. Is there an estimated budget range or not-to-exceed amount for this contract—either in total or by component (Coordination vs. Monitoring & Evaluation)?

A38. The RFP does not identify an estimated budget range or not-to-exceed amount. Vendors should propose a budget that is reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q39. Please clarify whether the State prefers a fixed-fee, time-and-materials, or milestone-based pricing structure, or whether the vendor may propose the approach it deems most appropriate using the Project Cost Template (Appendix F).

A39. Vendors should provide a cost proposal in accordance with the instructions identified in the RFP. Vendors may propose the pricing approach they believe is appropriate to support the scope of work and deliverables associated with the selected components.

Q40. The RFP references a potential holdback of up to 25% of contract monies until acceptable performance is demonstrated (Section V.G.14). Please clarify the conditions and timeline for holdback release, and whether this applies to each invoice or cumulatively.

A40. Any holdback provisions, including the amount, timing, conditions for release, and application to invoices or contract performance, will be administered in accordance with the terms and conditions of the final contract and applicable state requirements. Specific contract administration processes may be addressed during contract negotiations and implementation.

Q41. The Technical Proposal is limited to 10 pages (Appendix B, Section v.3). Please confirm whether charts, tables, graphics, and organizational charts count toward this limit, or whether those are considered part of the Attachments section (no page limit).

A41. Charts, tables, graphics, and organizational charts included within the Technical Proposal will

count toward the page limit. Vendors are encouraged to incorporate such materials concisely within the proposal narrative. Attachments and appendices specifically identified outside of the Technical Proposal requirements are excluded from the page limit.

Q42. For the Monitoring & Evaluation Component, does the State or CMS have pre-defined performance measures, logic models, or evaluation questions for any of the 15 initiatives, or is the vendor expected to develop these from the ground up in collaboration with DPH?

A42. Certain performance measures, reporting requirements, program goals, or evaluation expectations may already exist or continue to evolve throughout implementation of the RHTP initiatives. Vendors may also be expected to support development, refinement, coordination, validation, tracking, reporting, and related monitoring and evaluation activities associated with the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach within their proposal.

Q43. Please clarify whether the comprehensive evaluation framework (listed as a deliverable) is expected to be a unified framework across all 15 initiatives or individual frameworks tailored to each initiative's design and outcomes.

A43. The comprehensive evaluation framework is intended to support monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and related activities across the RHTP award and associated initiatives. The specific approach may include program-wide and initiative-specific components based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach within their proposal.

Q44. Please confirm whether vendors may propose only one program component (Coordination or Monitoring & Evaluation), or whether vendors may propose both components in a single submission.

A44. Vendors may propose for either the Coordination component, the Monitoring & Evaluation component, or both components within a single proposal submission. Vendors proposing for both components should clearly distinguish responses and budget information for each component within the proposal. In accordance with the RFP, a primary vendor may not submit more than one proposal or participate as a primary vendor on multiple proposals.

Q45. Please clarify whether the State anticipates awarding to one prime vendor or whether awards may be made to multiple vendors by component, consistent with Section IV.B.17 (Multiple Source Contracting).

A45. The State reserves the right to make one or multiple awards under this solicitation, including awards by components, if determined to be in the best interest of the State, consistent with the

provisions of the RFP. Vendors may propose for one or both components.

Q46. Please clarify the expected role of the vendor versus DPH staff in conducting programmatic audits of subrecipients (e.g., advisory support versus formal compliance reviews).

A46. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support monitoring, review, coordination, validation, reporting, and related oversight activities associated with the selected component(s). DPH will retain overall oversight and decision-making authority related to program administration, compliance, and contract management activities associated with the RHTP award.

Q47. How many subrecipients do you expect to have?

A47. The number of subrecipients, contractors, and implementation partners may vary across the initiatives based on initiative structure, operational needs, procurement activities, funding arrangements, and stages of implementation.

Q48. How many initiatives are included in the scope and should the vendor provide oversight or full management related to each initiative?

A48. There are 15 RHTP initiatives. Vendors proposing for a selected component should propose approaches capable of supporting the full scope of RHTP activities associated with that component across the RHTP initiatives. The specific level of oversight, coordination, monitoring, evaluation, reporting, or management activities may vary by initiative and component, as described in the RFP.

Q49. Please clarify whether CMS reporting templates, performance metrics, and guidance are already defined, or whether the vendor is expected to support refinement and alignment of reporting artifacts.

A49. Certain CMS reporting requirements, measures, templates, guidance, or related reporting expectations may already exist or continue to evolve throughout implementation of the RHTP initiatives. Vendors may also be expected to support refinement, alignment, tracking, validation, reporting, and related monitoring and evaluation activities associated with selected component(s).

Q50. Please clarify whether travel within Delaware is anticipated for stakeholder meetings or site visits, or if work is expected to be primarily remote

A50. Work is expected to be performed primarily remotely. Limited in-person meetings, stakeholder engagement activities, site visits, or other implementation-related activities within Delaware may occur on an as-needed or ad hoc basis depending on operational needs, initiative activities, and

the selected component(s).

Q51. What is the expected frequency of the reporting (monthly, quarter or another cadence)?

A51. Reporting cadence and deliverable timelines may vary based on the reporting requirement, CMS guidance, operational needs, and the selected component(s), and may include monthly, quarterly, annual, or other reporting activities as applicable.

Q52. Is the vendor expected to build dashboards or just provide support?

A52. The RFP does not require the selected vendor(s) to independently develop a separate dashboard platform. As described in the RFP, vendors may be expected to support reporting, tracking, and dashboard-related activities within AchieveIt as part of the selected components.

Q53. To support appropriate proposal development and staffing assumptions, can DPH clarify the anticipated operational relationship between internal DPH staff and the selected contractor for RHTP grant management activities including the following activities: scope of work refinement of future proposals, negotiation of proposed program budgets, assessment of proposed project deliverables and KPIs for evaluation, contracting with RHTP vendors directly, program monitoring for contractual compliance, review of budget and expenditures and allowable cost monitoring, and program monitoring for federal and state compliance including Uniform Guidance compliance monitoring?

A53. DPH will maintain overall programmatic and administrative oversight responsibilities for the RHTP award, including responsibilities related to procurement, contracting, and compliance oversight. The selected vendor may be expected to support coordination, monitoring, reporting, budget tracking, performance management, KPI tracking, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s) as described in the RFP. The specific allocation of responsibilities between DPH and the selected vendor(s) may vary based on operational needs, initiative structure, and selected component(s).

Q54. Regarding grant oversight, what is the level of fiscal oversight expected?

A54. The selected vendor's role may include fiscal monitoring, budget tracking, reporting, invoice review support, and other grant management oversight activities associated with the selected component(s), as described in the RFP. The specific level of fiscal oversight activities may vary by initiative, funding structure, and operational need throughout the contract period.

Q55. What role will the contractor be involved in CMS interactions and communications?

A55. DPH, as the recipient and administrator of the RHTP award, will maintain primary responsibility for communications and interactions with CMS. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support coordination, reporting, tracking, monitoring, and related grant management activities

associated with the selected component(s), including support related to CMS reporting and communication processes as applicable.

Q56. Are there existing advisory committees or steering committees? If yes, what is the structure and role of this advisory committee and what level of facilitation support is expected?

A56. The RFP does not prescribe a specific advisory committee or steering committee structure. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to stakeholder coordination, facilitation, communication, meeting management, and related engagement activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q57. What systems (including grant management systems, client data management, others), dashboards (i.e. PowerBI), or reporting tools are currently in use by DPH?

A57. RHTP implementation activities may involved a variety of systems, reporting tools, dashboards, and data management platforms based on initiative needs and operational requirements. As identified in the RFP, vendors may be expected to support activities involving systems or platforms such as AchieveIt, as applicable to the selected component(s). Additional systems, reporting tools, dashboards, and data processes may vary across initiatives and evolve throughout the contract period.

Q58. Is it expected that the proposing vendor will be extended licenses by DPH to utilize the systems, dashboards, and reporting tools currently in use by DPH or utilize its own?

A58. DPH may provide access to certain systems, platforms, dashboards, or reporting tools as necessary and appropriate for contract performance. Vendors should clearly describe any vendor-provided systems, tools, dashboards, licenses, or related capabilities proposed as part of their approach to the selected component(s).

Q59. What analytical tools are currently in use by DPH?

A59. Analytical tools, reporting processes, and technologies may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, existing systems, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach, methodologies, analytical tools, technologies, and resources for supporting monitoring, evaluation, reporting, analysis, and related activities associated with the scope of work described in the RFP.

Q60. Is it expected that the proposing vendor will receive a license to these tools by DPH or utilize its own analytical tools?

A60. DPH may provide access to certain systems, platforms, dashboards, or reporting tools as necessary and appropriate for contract performance. Vendors may also propose the use of vendor-provided analytical tools, reporting tools, or related capabilities as part of their proposed

approach to the selected component(s).

Q61. What gaps prompted issuance of this RFP?

A61. The RFP was issued to obtain coordination, monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and related grant management support services necessary to support implementation and oversight of the CMS-funded Rural Health Transformation Program (RHTP) initiatives. The RFP is intended to support statewide coordination, program management, reporting, stakeholder engagement, and implementation activities associated with the RHTP award.

Q62. What are the required CMS reporting metrics?

A62. CMS reporting metrics and templates have not been finalized at this time. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting reporting alignment, metric tracking, validation, and related activities as CMS reporting requirements continue to be finalized.

Q63. Which KPIs are considered the highest priority by Delaware leadership?

A63. The RFP does not identify a specific prioritized set of KPIs across all initiatives. KPIs, performance measures, reporting requirements, and program goals may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, CMS requirements, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting KPI development, refinement, tracking, reporting, and related performance measurement activities associated with the scope of work described in the RFP.

Q64. Are there specific RHTP initiatives already identified for intensive evaluation support?

A64. The Monitoring & Evaluation Component is intended to support activities across the RHTP award and associated initiatives, as described in the RFP. The level and type of evaluation support may vary across initiatives based on operational needs, initiative structure, reporting requirements, implementation status, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and related activities across initiatives with varying scopes and stages of implementation.

Q65. To support appropriate proposal development and staffing assumptions, can DPH clarify the anticipated operational relationship between internal DPH staff and the selected contractor for RHTP evaluation activities, including expectations regarding leadership of evaluation design, data analysis, performance monitoring, reporting, and stakeholder engagement functions?

A65. DPH will maintain overall programmatic and administrative oversight of RHTP activities. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to coordinate and collaborate with DPH staff and other stakeholders in support of evaluation, reporting, performance monitoring, stakeholder engagement, and related activities associated with the selected component(s) as described in the RFP. Vendors should describe their proposed approach, roles, and responsibilities related to

these activities within their proposal.

Q66. What reporting cadence is expected (monthly or quarterly)?

A66. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support recurring reporting, tracking, monitoring, and related grant management activities throughout the contract period. Reporting cadence and deliverable timelines may vary based on the reporting requirement, CMS guidance, operational needs, and the selected component(s), and may include monthly, quarterly, annual, or other reporting activities as applicable.

Q67. Can DPH clarify the anticipated data governance and data-sharing framework for the selected contractor, including whether existing interagency data-sharing agreements will extend to contractor-supported evaluation activities or whether the contractor will be expected to independently establish Data Use Agreements, Business Associate Agreements, or other required legal/data-sharing arrangements?

A67. Applicable data governance, data-sharing, confidentiality, and security requirements associated with the RHTP award and contract activities will be addressed in accordance with State and federal requirements, as applicable. The specific structure of data-sharing processes, agreements, system access, and related requirements may vary based on the selected component(s), data involved, operational needs, and applicable legal or regulatory requirements throughout the contract period.

Q68. Are there interoperability challenges currently affecting reporting?

A68. DPH anticipates that reporting, data collection, interoperability, and related operational processes may vary across initiatives, systems, vendors, and subrecipients throughout the contract period. Vendors should describe their approach to supporting coordination, reporting, data management, monitoring, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q69. What CMS audit preparedness activities are anticipated? Are there accelerated deliverables tied to CMS deadlines?

A69. CMS reporting, monitoring, audit readiness, and related compliance activities may occur throughout the contract period based on applicable federal requirements, reporting timelines, operational needs, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting reporting, documentation, monitoring, coordination, and related audit preparedness activities associated with the RHTP award.

Q70. What is the extent of in-person engagement (vs virtual) required? Any existing mandatory in-person meeting schedules to assist in budget planning?

A70. The RFP does not establish mandatory recurring in-person meeting schedules. Work is expected to be performed primarily remotely. Limited in-person meetings, stakeholder engagement

activities, site visits, or other implementation-related activities may occur on an as-needed basis depending on operational needs, initiative activities, and the selected component(s).

Q71. What is the identified budget for this entire project?

A71. The RFP does not identify a total project budget for this solicitation. Vendors should propose a budget that is reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q72. Is there a not-to-exceed amount for the contract management component? Is there a not-to-exceed amount for the program evaluation component?

A72. The RFP does not identify not-to-exceed amounts for either component. Vendors should propose a budget that is reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q73. Can the State provide sample quarterly/annual reporting templates or additional detail regarding anticipated CMS reporting deliverables and reporting cadence?

A73. Quarterly and annual CMS reporting activities are anticipated as part of the RHTP award; however, reporting templates and related requirements may continue to evolve throughout implementation and applicable federal guidance. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting reporting, tracking, validation, coordination, and related activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q74. Can the State provide additional details regarding the maturity and current utilization of the AchieveIt platform, including whether the selected contractor will be expected to configure/manage the platform or primarily support reporting activities within an existing environment?

A74. The RFP identifies use of the AchieveIt platform for activities related to data visualization, tracking, reporting, and dashboard support associated with the RHTP award. Vendors may be expected to support reporting, tracking, coordination, dashboard support, and related activities within the platform environment associated with the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting these activities within their proposal.

Q75. Approximately how many active initiatives and subrecipients does the State anticipate the selected contractor coordinating and/or monitoring throughout the period of performance?

A75. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support coordination, monitoring, reporting, evaluation, and related activities across all initiatives. The number of subrecipients, contractors, and implementation partners may vary across the initiatives based on initiative structure,

operational needs, procurement activities, funding arrangements, and stages of implementation.

Q76. Does Delaware anticipate requiring onsite support in Dover, Kent County, Sussex County, or provider locations, and if so, at what approximate frequency?

A76. Work is expected to be performed primarily remotely. Limited in-person meetings, stakeholder engagement activities, site visits, or other implementation-related activities within Delaware may occur on an as-needed or ad hoc basis depending on operational needs, initiative activities, and the selected component(s).

Q77. Does the State anticipate issuing supplemental solicitations for additional RHTP support functions during the contract term?

A77. DPH reserves the right to issue additional procurements, solicitations, contracts, or amendments related to RHTP implementation activities if determined necessary to support program needs, funding requirements, or operational priorities throughout the contract period.

Q78. Is there an anticipated budget range for evaluation services? Is there an anticipated budget range for grant program oversight?

A78. The RFP does not identify an anticipated budget range for either component. Vendors should propose a budget that is reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q79. If an applicant is asked to provide a presentation, is it expected that this will occur in-person? Is a hybrid model acceptable, whereby some of the applicants might appear in-person and some virtually?

A79. If presentations are requested as part of the evaluation process, additional instructions regarding format, logistics, and participation requirements will be provided by the State at that time. The State may permit virtual, hybrid, or in-person participation, as determined appropriate for the procurement process and operational needs.

Q80. Can Delaware clarify the intended emphasis of the Monitoring & Evaluation component across areas such as CMS reporting support, program performance monitoring, initiative implementation oversight, and outcome measurement? How does the State envision balancing these activities across the 15 RHTP initiatives?

A80. The Monitoring & Evaluation Component is intended to support program-wide monitoring, evaluation, reporting, performance tracking, implementation support, and related activities associated with the RHTP award across all initiatives, as described in the RFP. This may include support related to CMS reporting, performance monitoring, implementation tracking, outcome measurement, data validation, coordination, and related evaluation activities. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to balancing and supporting these activities across initiatives

with varying scopes, structures, and stages of implementation.

Q81. What categories of data are anticipated to support the Monitoring & Evaluation component (e.g., program operational data, grant reporting data, claims/utilization data, workforce data, or other sources), and what level of access will the vendor have (e.g., system access, raw datasets, or pre-aggregated reports)?

A81. The categories of data and reporting sources supporting the Monitoring & Evaluation Component may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, data availability, and the selected component(s). This may include programmatic, operational, reporting, performance, implementation, workforce, utilization, or other data associated with RHTP activities. The level and type of access available to the selected vendor(s) may vary based on applicable approvals, system access requirements, operational need, data governance considerations, and the selected component(s).

Q82. Does Delaware envision the selected vendor supporting enterprise-level reporting and cross-initiative dashboards within the AchieveIt platform, or primarily supporting initiative-specific reporting processes using existing State tools and structures?

A82. DPH envisions support for program-wide and cross-initiative reporting, tracking, dashboard support, and related activities associated with the RHTP award within the AchieveIt platform environment. The specific approach to reporting, dashboards, and coordination activities may vary based on operational needs, initiative structure, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting these activities within their proposal.

Q83. Should vendors anticipate access to identifiable data, protected health information (PHI), or other sensitive datasets as part of the Monitoring & Evaluation component, or will reporting primarily rely on aggregated and/or de-identified information?

A83. The type of data available to the selected vendor(s) may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, applicable approvals, and the selected component(s). Reporting and monitoring activities may involve aggregated, de-identified, limited, confidential, or other sensitive information associated with RHTP implementation activities as applicable. Vendors must comply with all applicable federal, State, confidentiality, privacy, security, and data management requirements identified in the RFP.

Q84. How does Delaware envision responsibilities being shared between State staff and the selected vendor(s) for activities such as subrecipient monitoring, KPI validation, CMS reporting preparation, and performance management?

A84. DPH will maintain overall programmatic and administrative oversight responsibilities for the RHTP award. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support activities such as subrecipient monitoring, KPI tracking and validation, CMS reporting support, performance monitoring,

coordination, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s), as described in the RFP. The specific allocation of responsibilities between DPH and the selected vendor(s) may vary based on operational needs, initiative structure, and the selected component(s).

Q85. To what extent have initiative-specific metrics, reporting processes, and data collection mechanisms already been defined for the 15 RHTP initiatives?

A85. Initiative-specific metrics, reporting processes, data collection mechanisms, and implementation activities may be in varying stages of development and definition across the 15 RHTP initiatives at the time of contract award. Certain reporting requirements, metrics, or processes may already exist, while additional refinement, development standardization, validation, tracking, and coordination activities may occur throughout the contract period. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting these activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q86. Does Delaware anticipate that individual RHTP initiatives and subrecipients will maintain independent reporting structures and tools, or is the State seeking a more centralized reporting and performance management approach across initiatives?

A86. The RHTP includes multiple initiatives and subrecipients that may utilize different operational processes, reporting structures, and tools based on initiative needs and implementation requirements. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support coordination, tracking, monitoring, reporting, and related grant management activities intended to support broader oversight and performance management across the RHTP initiatives associated with the selected component(s).

Q87. Does the State have an anticipated Year 1 budget or not-to-exceed amount for this RFP, either in total or by component?

A87. The RFP does not identify an anticipated Year 1 budget or not-to-exceed amount. Vendors should propose budgets that are reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q88. Does the State have an anticipated Year 1 budget or not-to-exceed amount for this RFP, either in total or by component?

A88. The RFP does not identify an anticipated Year 1 budget or not-to-exceed amount. Vendors should propose budgets that are reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q89. How should vendors price the period from September 15, 2026, through October 30, 2026, compared with the remainder of the first contract year?

A89. Vendors should propose pricing based on their proposed approach, workplan, staffing, activities, and deliverables during the applicable period of performance. Contract periods and associated

budgets are intended to align with the applicable CMS RHTP budget and spending periods.

Q90. Should vendors assume pricing must cover services for all 15 RHTP initiatives? Can DHSS confirm whether vendors are expected to provide services for all 15 RHTP initiatives?

A90. Vendors should propose services based on their proposed approach to the selected component(s) and the scope of services identified in the RFP. Vendors are not required to propose activities or services specific to all RHTP initiatives unless included as part of the vendor's proposed approach.

Q91. Does the State expect vendors to include costs for any grants management system, technology solution, platform configuration, dashboards, or technical administration in their cost proposals?

A91. Vendors should include any costs necessary to support their proposed approach and deliverables under the selected component(s). This may include grants management systems, technology solutions, platform configuration, dashboards, technical administration, or related tools, if proposed by the vendor as part of their approach.

Q92. Does the State intend to award one integrated contract, separate contracts by component, or reserve the right to do either?

A92. The State reserves the right to award one integrated contract, separate contracts by component, or multiple contracts, if determined to be in the best interest of the State, consistent with the provisions of the RFP.

Q93. Would DHSS consider extending the page limit for vendors responding to both components of this RFP? If so, what would the revised page limit be?

A93. The State will permit a limited page extension for vendors proposing for both program components. The Technical Proposal should generally not exceed 10 pages total; however, vendors may include up to three (3) additional pages if necessary to adequately address both components. Vendors are encouraged to provide concise, focused responses, as succinctness is preferred.

Q94. Can the State clarify the expected division of responsibilities between the selected contractor and DHSS with respect to subrecipient monitoring? Specifically, which functions are expected to be led by the contractor versus retained by DHSS, including compliance oversight, financial review, performance tracking, reporting validation, site-based monitoring, and audit-related activities?

A94. DPH will maintain overall programmatic and administrative oversight responsibilities for the RHTP award. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support subrecipient monitoring, financial tracking, performance monitoring, reporting support, coordination, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s) as described in the RFP. The

specific allocation of responsibilities between DHSS/DPH and the selected vendor(s) may vary based on operational needs, initiative structure, compliance requirements, and the selected component(s).

Q95. For CMS quarterly and annual reporting, can DHSS provide additional details on vendor responsibilities, such as whether the vendor will be expected to draft the full report, provide consolidated inputs, or only support data collection and validation?

A95. The selected vendor's role may include supporting quarterly, annual, and other reporting activities associated with the RHTP award and applicable CMS requirements, as described in the RFP. Specific responsibilities related to report development, data collection, validation, tracking, analysis, drafting support, and coordination activities may vary based on the reporting requirement, operational needs, CMS guidance, and the selected component(s).

Q96. Please clarify the expected scope of "periodic audits," including whether this refers to desk reviews, fiscal/programmatic monitoring, 2 CFR Part 200 subrecipient monitoring, site visits, formal audit services, or another type of review.

A96. Periodic audits as referenced in the RFP may include monitoring, review, validation, reporting, coordination, compliance, or related oversight activities associated with the selected component(s). The RFP does not prescribe a specific audit framework, methodology, or format for these activities. Vendors should describe their proposed approach within their proposal.

Q97. Will the State provide AchieveIt licenses and administrator access, or should vendors include platform, configuration, dashboard, and technical administration costs in their proposals?

A97. DPH anticipates providing access to the AchieveIt platform for activities associated with the RHTP award, as applicable to the selected component(s).

Q98. Does DHSS expect the selected contractor to propose a grants management system or technology solution to support subrecipient tracking, monitoring, and reporting, or will the contractor be expected to leverage existing State systems, such as AchieveIt or other platforms?

A98. The RFP identifies the AchieveIt platform for activities related to data visualization, tracking, reporting, and dashboard support associated with the RHTP award. Vendors may describe additional tools, technologies, or approaches that support their proposed services; however, vendors should ensure their proposed approach aligns with the requirements, systems, and

platforms identified in the RFP.

Q99. What protected data types will the vendor access, and should vendors assume that a BAA, DTI terms, IRS 1075 controls, or other security requirements will apply?

A99. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to access data, systems, or reporting information necessary to support the selected component(s) and associated RHTP activities, subject to applicable State and federal requirements. Applicable confidentiality, privacy, security, system access, and data-sharing requirements, including any required agreements or security standards, will be addressed as appropriated based on the nature of the data, systems, and services involved.

Q100. Is there a not-to-exceed amount or estimated funding range for this contract, either per component or overall?

A100. The RFP does not identify a not-to-exceed amount or estimated funding range, either overall or by component. Vendors should propose a budget that is reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q101. What criteria will the State use to determine whether to exercise the four optional one-year extensions?

A101. Exercise of optional contract extensions will be at the sole discretion of the State and may be based on factors including vendor performance, operational needs, funding availability, compliance with contract requirements, and continued alignment with RHTP program goals and grant requirements.

Q102. When are the deliverables expected to be due to CMS?

A102. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support ongoing quarterly, annual, and other reporting activities associated with the RHTP award and applicable CMS requirements throughout the contract period. Specific deliverable timelines and reporting deadlines may vary based on CMS guidance, operational needs, and the selected component(s).

Q103. How far in advance of CMS submission deadlines are deliverables due to the State for review, and how many review cycles does the State anticipate per submission?

A103. Deliverable review timelines and review processes may vary based on the reporting requirement, CMS deadlines, operational needs, and the selected component(s). Vendors should propose approaches capable of supporting recurring reporting timelines, coordination, revisions, and related grant management activities associated with quarterly, annual, and other required reporting.

Q104. Are there CMS-prescribed or State-developed templates and formatting requirements for the quarterly and annual reports, or will the vendor be responsible for developing these?

A104. CMS is expected to provide reporting guidance and related reporting requirements associated

with the RHTP award; however, certain reporting templates and processes may not yet be finalized. Vendors should describe their approach to supporting reporting, tracking, monitoring, evaluation, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q105. Will annual reports provide a summary of the preceding year only, or is there also an expectation for cumulative, cross-year analysis demonstrating program impact to date?

A105. Annual reporting expectations may include activities related to year-specific reporting, cumulative tracking, program implementation progress, outcomes, metrics, and broader RHTP performance monitoring, consistent with CMS guidance and applicable reporting requirements throughout the contract period.

Q106. Will annual reports provide a summary of the preceding year only, or is there also an expectation for cumulative, cross-year analysis demonstrating program impact to date?

A106. Annual reporting expectations may include activities related to year-specific reporting, cumulative tracking, program implementation progress, outcomes, metrics, and broader RHTP performance monitoring, consistent with CMS guidance and applicable reporting requirements throughout the contract period.

Q107. Will data collection from the various initiative-level sources be the sole responsibility of the vendor, or will the State support the data collection process?

A107. Data collection responsibilities may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, existing processes, data availability, and the selected component(s). DPH, subrecipients, contractors, partner agencies, and selected vendor(s) may all have roles in supporting data collection, reporting, validation, coordination, and related monitoring and evaluation activities associated with the RHTP award. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting these activities within their proposal.

Q108. Are there State data environment requirements governing where and how evaluation data must be stored and analyzed?

A108. Vendors must comply with all applicable federal, State, confidentiality, privacy, security, records management, and data management requirements identified in the RFP and contract documents. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to data storage, access, security, analysis, governance, and related monitoring and evaluation activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q109. Is the AchieveIt platform already procured and configured for use, or will the vendor be responsible for initial procurement, setup, and/or configuration?

A109. The AchieveIt platform has been procured and related implementation and tracking activities may already be established or underway at the time of contract award. The selected vendor may

be tasked with assisting with revisions to the platform architecture, dashboard development, workflow design, and reporting configuration.

Q110. Approximately how many subrecipients does DPH anticipate funding for each of the 15 RHTP initiatives?

A110. The number of subrecipients, contractors, and implementation partners may vary across the initiatives based on initiative structure, operational needs, procurement activities, funding arrangements, and stages of implementation.

Q111. Are there caps on administrative costs for the requested work?

A111. Proposed administrative and indirect costs should not exceed 9.1%. Vendors should clearly identify and justify any proposed administrative or indirect costs within the budget submission.

Q112. Page 46 of attachment 1 indicates that vendors can propose services aligned with the Coordination Component, Monitoring and Evaluation Component, or both. Can DPH estimate the level of effort anticipated for each of the program components?

A112. The RFP does not identify a prescribed level of effort for either component. Vendors should propose staffing structures, levels of effort, and approaches that are appropriate to the selected component(s), proposed activities, deliverables, and overall scope of services identified in the RFP.

Q113. Page 46 of attachment 1 reflects that the vendor will “oversee subrecipients’ budget adherence and program compliance with assistance from DPH.” Can DPH provide additional information regarding how DPH will support this activity?

A113. DPH will maintain overall programmatic and administrative oversight responsibilities for the RHTP award. As described in the RFP, the selected vendor(s) may support activities related to subrecipient budget adherence, program compliance monitoring, reporting, and related grant management functions, with assistance and coordination from DPH. DPH involvement may include review, oversight, communication, coordination, and collaboration related to monitoring and compliance activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q114. Page 46 of attachment 1 indicates that vendors pursuing the Monitoring and Evaluation Component should anticipate using AchieveIt for data visualization and tracking. Should vendors include the cost of AchieveIt in their budgets, or does DPH anticipate that vendors will access AchieveIt through software rights already purchased by the state?

A114. DPH anticipates providing access to the AchieveIt platform for activities associated with the RHTP

award, as applicable to the selected component(s).

Q115. Can DPH clarify the expected allocation of effort between the Coordination Component and Monitoring & Evaluation Component (e.g., % split or relative priority)?

A115. The RFP does not prescribe a specific allocation of effort, percentage split, or relative priority between the Coordination Component and Monitoring & Evaluation Component. Vendors should propose approaches, staffing, and levels of effort appropriate to the selected component(s), proposed activities, deliverables, and overall scope of services identified in the RFP.

Q116. Are vendors expected to support all 15 initiatives, or can scope be limited to selected initiatives within a component?

A116. Vendors proposing for a selected component should propose approaches capable of supporting the full scope of RHTP activities associated with that component across all 15 RHTP initiatives. Vendors should clearly describe their proposed approach, activities, and level of support for the selected component(s).

Q117. What level of direct operational involvement vs. oversight is expected with subrecipients (hands-on vs. audit/QA role)?

A117. The selected vendor's role may include a combination of coordination, monitoring, reporting, evaluation, oversight, and other grant management support activities associated with the selected component(s) as described in the RFP. The specific level of operational involvement may vary by initiative, subrecipient, and operational need throughout the contract period.

Q118. What is the expected frequency and depth of "periodic audits" (risk-based, compliance-only, financial + programmatic)?

A118. The frequency, scope, and level of monitoring or periodic audit activities may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, risk considerations, implementation status, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting monitoring, review, validation, compliance, reporting, and related oversight activities within their proposal.

Q119. What escalation protocols exist for underperforming subrecipients and budget deviations? Or are these protocols to be defined by the awarded vendor?

A119. The RFP does not prescribe specific escalation protocols or corrective action processes for underperforming subrecipients or budget deviations. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to oversight and issue escalation activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q120. Will the vendor have authority to enforce corrective actions, or is this advisory only?

A120. DPH will retain overall oversight and decision-making authority related to program

administration, compliance, and contract management activities associated with the RHTP award.

Q121. How will roles be delineated between DPH internal staff vs. vendor vs. other contractors?

A121. DPH will maintain overall programmatic and administrative oversight responsibilities for the RHTP award. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to coordinate with DPH staff, other State agencies, contractors, subrecipients, and other relevant stakeholders in support of the selected component(s) as described in the RFP. Roles and responsibilities among DPH, the selected vendor(s), and other contractors may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, and the scope of work associated with each contract or initiative.

Q122. Are there existing audit findings or risk areas from Year 1 funding?

A122. RHTP implementation activities are currently in the early stages of implementation. The RFP does not identify specific existing audit findings or risk areas.

Q123. What are the key compliance risks DPH is most concerned about?

A123. Compliance considerations may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, funding requirements, implementation status, and the selected component(s). This may include activities related to reporting, documentation, allowable costs, spending limitations, monitoring, data management, coordination, and compliance with applicable federal, State, contractual, and program requirements associated with the RHTP award.

Q124. What is the current state of the AchieveIt platform implementation (configured vs. greenfield)?

A124. The AchieveIt platform has been procured and related implementation and tracking activities may already be established or underway at the time of contract award. The selected vendor may be tasked with assisting with revisions to the platform architecture, dashboard development, workflow design, and reporting configuration.

Q125. Who is responsible for data input vs. data validation vs. reporting outputs?

A125. Responsibilities related to data input, validation, reporting, tracking, and reporting outputs may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, existing processes, system access, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting data collection, validation, reporting, quality assurance, coordination, and related activities associated with the scope of work described in the RFP.

Q126. What data systems will subrecipients use — and are integrations required?

A126. The data systems, reporting tools, and processes used by subrecipients may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, existing systems, and the selected component(s). The RFP does not specifically require integrations between subrecipient systems and State platforms.

Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting data collection, reporting, coordination, validation, and related activities associated with the scope of work described in the RFP.

Q127. Are there standardized KPIs already defined, or is vendor expected to design them?

A127. KPIs, metrics, reporting requirements, and program goals may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, CMS requirements, and the selected component(s). Vendors may be expected to support KPI development, refinement, tracking, monitoring, validation, reporting, and related performance measurement activities associated with the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting these activities within their proposal.

Q128. What level of data quality issues currently exists (e.g., missing, inconsistent, delayed reporting)?

A128. As RHTP implementation activities are in varying stages of development and implementation, data collection and reporting processes may continue to evolve throughout the contract period. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting data validation, quality assurance, reporting consistency, and related monitoring activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q129. Will DPH provide data governance policies, data dictionaries, and reporting templates?

A129. DPH may provide certain reporting requirements, templates, guidance, or related materials associated with the selected component(s) as applicable. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to data governance, reporting processes, data definitions, templates, validation activities, and related monitoring and reporting support activities within their proposal.

Q130. How many subrecipients are expected initially, and how quickly will that scale?

A130. The number of subrecipients, contractors, and implementation partners may vary across the initiatives based on initiative structure, operational needs, procurement activities, funding arrangements, and stages of implementation.

Q131. What is the range of maturity of subrecipients (large systems vs. small rural orgs)?

A131. Subrecipients, contractors, and implementation partners may vary in size, organizational structure, operational capacity, geographic coverage, and stages of implementation across the initiatives. This may include a range of organizations and entities supporting RHTP implementation activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q132. Are subrecipients contractually obligated to comply with vendor processes/tools?

A132. Subrecipient and contractor reporting, coordination, monitoring, and related requirements may

vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, contractual arrangements, and the selected component(s). DPH may establish applicable coordination, reporting, or operational expectations associated with RHTP implementation activities.

Q133. Who handles subrecipient onboarding and training?

A133. Responsibilities related to onboarding, training, coordination, technical assistance, and related implementation support activities may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, contractual arrangements, and the selected component(s). DPH, subrecipients, contractors, partner organizations, and selected vendor(s) may all have roles in supporting these activities associated with the RHTP award.

Q134. What level of budget monitoring detail is required (high-level vs. line item validation)?

A134. Vendors should propose approaches capable of supporting sufficient budget monitoring, documentation, and reporting activities necessary to support oversight of the RHTP initiatives and associated grant requirements. The specific level of budget review and monitoring activities may vary by initiative, funding structure, and operational need throughout the contract period.

Q135. Can DPH define the preferred pricing structure: Fixed Price, Time & Materials with Not-to-Exceed, Milestone-based?

A135. Vendors should provide a cost proposal in accordance with the instructions identified in the RFP. Vendors may propose the pricing approach they believe is appropriate to support the scope of work and deliverables associated with the selected components.

Q136. Are there budget caps per component or per year?

A136. The RFP does not identify specific budget caps by component or by year. Vendors should propose a budget that is reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q137. The RFP includes Appendix E – Workplan Template, and Appendix A indicates that completion of Appendix E is a minimum mandatory submission requirement. However, the Proposal Outcomes / Proposal Requirements section does not indicate where the completed Work Plan Template should be included within the proposal package. Could the State please confirm whether the completed Work Plan Template should be included within the Technical Proposal narrative or submitted as a separate attachment?

A137. The completed Work Plan Template (Appendix E) should be submitted as a separate attachment in the applicable upload location within Bonfire and does not need to be incorporated into the

Technical Proposal narrative.

Q138. If the Work Plan Template should be submitted in the Technical Proposal narrative, does the completed Work Plan count toward the Technical Proposal page limit?

A138. No, the completed Work Plan Template (Appendix E) does not count toward the Technical Proposal page limit and should be submitted separately in the applicable upload location within Bonfire.

Q139. Will pricing need to reflect multi-vendor awards, or is scope exclusive?

A139. Vendors should propose services based on their proposed approach and the scope of services identified in the RFP. As identified in the RFP, the State reserves the right to make multiple awards if determined to be in the best interest of the State. Vendors should not assume exclusivity.

Q140. What level of onsite presence vs. remote delivery is expected?

A140. Work is expected to be performed primarily remotely. Limited in-person meetings, stakeholder engagement activities, site visits, or other implementation-related activities within Delaware may occur on an as-needed or ad hoc basis depending on operational needs, initiative activities, and the selected component(s).

Q141. Are there minimum staffing requirements or roles expected (e.g., program manager, evaluator, data lead)?

A141. The RFP does not establish minimum staffing requirements or prescribe specific staff roles. Vendors should propose a staffing structure and level of effort that are appropriate to their proposed approach, selected component(s), and the scope of services identified in the RFP.

Q142. Will the State provide dedicated liaisons, or must vendor embed internally?

A142. DPH will maintain overall programmatic and administrative oversight responsibilities for the RHTP award. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to coordinate with DPH staff, other DHSS divisions, state agencies, initiative leads, subrecipients, contractors, and other relevant stakeholders throughout the contract period. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to communication, coordination, and stakeholder engagement associated with the selected component(s).

Q143. What are the expectations for transition support if multiple vendors are selected?

A143. If multiple vendors are selected, vendors may be expected to coordinate and collaborate with one another, as applicable, in support of RHTP implementation activities and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to coordination, communication, onboarding, transition activities, and continuity of operations within their proposal. DPH may facilitate coordination and communication among vendors and other

stakeholders, as needed, throughout the contract period.

Q144. How will performance be evaluated for potential contract extension (1+4 years)?

A144. Exercise of optional contract extensions will be at the sole discretion of the State and may be based on factors including vendor performance, operational needs, funding availability, compliance with contract requirements, and continued alignment with RHTP program goals and grant requirements.

Q145. Will the State define SLAs/KPIs contractually or during implementation?

A145. Specific SLAs, KPIs, reporting requirements, performance measures, and related expectations may be further refined during contract implementation based on operational needs, initiative structure, CMS requirements, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting KPI development, monitoring, reporting, and related performance measurement activities within their proposal.

Q146. Is the Technical Proposal 10-page limit applicable to vendors proposing for one component or vendor proposing for both components? If proposing for both components, does the 10-page limit apply to each component?

A146. The 10-page Technical Proposal limit applies to the proposal as a whole, regardless of whether a vendor is proposing for one or both components. Vendors proposing for both components are encouraged to provide concise, focused responses. If additional space is necessary to adequately address both components, vendors may include up to three (3) additional pages.

Q147. Will out-of-state vendors or subcontractors be considered?

A147. Yes. Vendors and subcontractors located outside of Delaware may be considered, provided they comply with all applicable federal and State of Delaware procurement, contracting, licensing, registration, and RFP requirements.

Q148. What is the identified budget for this project (either in total or separately for the Coordination and Monitoring & Evaluation components)?

A148. The RFP does not identify a total project budget or separate budgets for the components. Vendors should propose a budget that is reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q149. Are incentives for qualitative data collection (e.g., focus groups or interviews with community members or subrecipients) allowed, and if so, is there a cap on the allowable amount per participant?

A149. Reasonable participant incentives related to qualitative data collection activities may be proposed if clearly justified and allowable under applicable federal grant requirements. Vendors are responsible for ensuring all proposed costs comply with applicable CMS and RHTP funding

requirements.

Q150. Does DHSS anticipate the need for translation or interpretation of materials in languages other than English to support the rural Kent and Sussex County populations served? If yes, which languages, and is translation/interpretation expected to be included in the vendor budget or will DHSS provide it?

A150. Translation, interpretation, accessibility, and related communication needs may vary across initiatives, populations served, and operational activities throughout the contract period. Vendors should describe any proposed capabilities, approaches, or resources related to stakeholder engagement, communication, accessibility, and support for diverse populations associated with the selected component(s).

Q151. To what extent is in-person engagement expected from the project team (e.g., qualitative data collection activities, attendance at stakeholder meetings, or CMS reporting sessions)?

A151. Work is expected to be performed primarily remotely. Limited in-person engagement activities, including stakeholder meetings, site visits, coordination activities, qualitative information gathering, or other implementation-related activities within Delaware may occur on an as-needed or ad hoc basis depending on operational needs, initiative activities, and the selected component(s).

Q152. Has CMS provided specific requirements for this funding on items that must be included in the evaluation framework or the quarterly/annual federal reports?

A152. CMS reporting metrics and templates have not been finalized at this time. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting reporting alignment, metric tracking, validation, and related activities as CMS reporting requirements continue to be finalized.

Q153. To what extent will DHSS facilitate access to existing data from subrecipients or state/county agencies for evaluation and monitoring purposes?

A153. Access to data, reporting information, and related materials may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, applicable approvals, data governance considerations, and the selected component(s). DPH may facilitate coordination and access to available information, as applicable, in support of monitoring and evaluation activities associated with the RHTP award.

Q154. Approximately how many subrecipients will be funded per year?

A154. The number of subrecipients funded per year may vary based on initiative scope, procurement

outcomes, funding availability, and program needs.

Q155. Are there centralized data systems beyond AchieveIt available to the vendor for program monitoring, or will the vendor be responsible for establishing data collection infrastructure with subrecipients?

A155. The RFP identifies the AchieveIt platform for activities related to data visualization, tracking, reporting, and dashboard support associated with the RHTP award. Vendors should describe their proposed approach, technologies, and tools for supporting program monitoring, data collection, reporting, and related activities beyond the use of AchieveIt.

Q156. What is the current configuration state of AchieveIt for the RHTP? Has initiative tracking already been set up, or will the vendor be responsible for initial configuration in addition to ongoing QA and reporting support?

A156. The AchieveIt platform and initiative tracking activities may already be established or underway at the time of contract award. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting ongoing tracking, reporting, dashboard support, quality assurance, coordination, and related activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q157. Is the public-facing AchieveIt dashboard intended for broad public dissemination, and if so, are there DHSS branding or accessibility standards the vendor must follow?

A157. The public-facing dashboard is intended to support transparency and reporting activities associated with the RHTP award. The dashboard will be integrated with existing State website and AchieveIt platform environments that already incorporate applicable branding and accessibility standards. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting dashboard, reporting, and related activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q158. If we are applying for both components, should we submit one combined proposal? Do the same page limits still apply if the proposal covers both components?

A158. Vendors applying for both components should submit one combined proposal that clearly distinguishes responses and budget information for each component. The stated page limits apply to the proposal as a whole, not separately by component. Vendors proposing for both components are encouraged to provide concise, focused responses. If additional space is necessary to adequately address both components, vendors may include up to three (3) additional pages for the Technical Proposal, up to one (1) additional page for the Executive

Summary, and up to two (2) additional pages for the Budget and Budget Narrative.

Q159. Does DHSS anticipate that data provided to the vendor will include case-level or aggregate data only? What privacy and data use agreement requirements will apply?

A159. The type of data available to the selected vendor(s) may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, applicable approvals, data governance considerations, and the selected component(s). Information provided may include aggregated, de-identified, limited, confidential, or other sensitive information, as applicable. Vendors must comply with all applicable federal, State, confidentiality, privacy, security, and data use requirements identified in the RFP and contract documents.

Q160. The RFP indicates vendors may propose one or both components. Will proposals for a single component be evaluated on an equal basis with proposals for both components, or is there a preference for vendors who propose to deliver the full scope?

A160. Proposals for a single component will be evaluated on an equal basis with proposals for both components. Vendors proposing for both components will not receive additional preference or weighting solely for proposing both components. Each component will be evaluated and scored independently using the applicable RFP evaluation criteria and associated weights.

Q161. Please clarify which proposal structure is requested – the one that begins on page 47 or page 48 of the RFP?

A161. Page 47 and 48 identify the required proposal narrative content and submission requirements. Vendors may organize their proposals in a clear and logical manner, provided all required narrative sections identified in the RFP are included.

Q162. Please clarify what information is needed in Appendix F cost template. In each separate table, should we list all relevant activities and deliverables for one component, but only provide a total cost across the whole component? Should the table that has Reporting and Communication Requirements in the bottom row be used to provide budget info for reporting/communications for both components if applying for both, or should those be separate?

A162. Vendors should use Appendix F to clearly identify proposed activities, deliverables, and associated costs for each proposed component. “Reporting and Communication Requirements” costs may be presented as shared costs or allocated by component, as appropriate to the vendor’s proposed approach. Vendors should clearly describe any shared cost methodology in the Budget Narrative.

If the Appendix F template does not fully meet a vendor’s needs, vendors may submit budget information in an alternate format, provided all required budget and Budget Narrative elements

identified in the RFP are clearly addressed.

Q163. Could DPH clarify expectations regarding the development and standardization of outcome metrics across the 15 RHTP initiatives? Specifically, have program-level metrics and outcomes already been defined by DPH or the underlying funding guidance, or will the selected vendor be responsible for establishing these metrics – either independently or in collaboration with DPH and initiative stakeholders?

A163. Program-level metrics, reporting requirements, outcomes, and performance expectations may vary across initiatives based on initiative structure, operational needs, CMS requirements, and stages of implementation. Certain metrics and reporting expectations may already exist, while the selected vendor(s) may also be expected to support metric refinement, standardization, development, validation, tracking, reporting, and related performance measurement activities in collaboration with DPH and other relevant stakeholders, as applicable to the selected component(s).

Q164. In Section C.i. Coordination Component, Item 1 notes the vendor will "Provide program coordination across selected initiatives funded under this grant". How many of the 15 RHTP initiatives will fall under the vendor's coordination and/or monitoring scope? Will some initiatives be managed directly by other state agencies (e.g., Governor's Office, Healthcare Commission) and excluded from the vendor's oversight?

A164. Vendors proposing for the selected component(s) should propose approaches capable of supporting activities across all 15 RHTP initiatives associated with the scope of services identified in the RFP. The level and nature of vendor support may vary across initiatives based on operational needs, implementation structured, and State oversight responsibilities throughout the contract period.

Q165. Will the State provide the vendor with any required license(s) to support activities undertaken through AchieveIt?

A165. DPH anticipates providing access to the AchieveIt platform for activities associated with the RHTP award, as applicable to the selected component(s).

Q166. Does DPH have templates, tools, and other resources to support with program coordination and M&E activities or must those be developed and provided by the vendor?

A166. DPH may provide certain templates, guidance, reporting requirements, tools, or related resources associated with the selected component(s), as applicable. Vendors should describe their proposed approach, methodologies, tools, templates, technologies, and other resources they intend to utilize to support program coordination, monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and related

activities associated with the scope of work described in the RFP.

Q167. Does DPH have an estimated total budget for the vendor per program component? Please confirm if the required workplan is a separate component from the "technical proposal" listed under "proposal outcomes" within Section C of Appendix B.

A167. The RFP does not identify estimated budgets by program component. Vendors should propose budgets that are reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables. The required Workplan Template (Appendix E) is a separate submission component from the Technical Proposal narrative identified under the Proposal Outcomes/Proposal Requirements section of Appendix B.

Q168. Does the workplan (Attachment E) have a page limit?

A168. Attachment E (Workplan Template) does not have a page limit. Vendors are encouraged to provide an appropriately detailed workplan that clearly reflects the proposed approach, activities, timelines, and deliverables for the selected component(s).

Q169. Please clarify the vendor's AchieveIt responsibilities to "Support the configuration and effective use... QA and validation checks... outputs are clear, accessible, and health-literate". (a) What system access level will the vendor receive? (b) Is the vendor expected to build/configure dashboards or only advise?

A169. DPH anticipates providing the selected vendor(s) with appropriate access to the AchieveIt platform necessary to support activities associated with the selected component(s). As described in the RFP, the selected vendor(s) may be expected to support dashboard creation, maintenance, tracking, reporting, quality assurance, validation, and related activities within the AchieveIt platform environment.

Q170. For vendors proposing both components, please clarify how the Appendix F tables should be organized: (a) Which tables map to Component 1 (Coordination) vs. Component 2 (M&E)? (b) Should "Reporting and Communication Requirements" be a shared cost line or allocated to one component? (c) May vendors add tables if needed?

A170. Vendors should organize Appendix F tables in a manner that clearly distinguishes costs associated with each proposed component. Vendors may determine how best to structure and label budget tables to align with their proposed approach for the Coordination Component and/or the Monitoring & Evaluation Component.

Reporting and Communication Requirements costs may be included as a shared cost or allocated across components, as appropriate to the vendor's proposed approach. Vendors should clearly describe the methodology used for any shared or allocated costs in the Budget Narrative.

Vendors may add additional tables or provide the supporting budget detail, as needed, to clearly

present their proposed costs and approach. If the Appendix F template does not fully meet a vendor's needs, vendors may submit budget information in an alternate format, provided the submission clearly addresses all required budget and budget narrative elements identified in the RFP.

Q171. Is there a cap on the indirect rate, or does DPH accept the federally negotiated indirect cost rates?

A171. Proposed indirect costs should not exceed 9.1%. Vendors should clearly identify and justify any proposed indirect costs within the budget submission.

Q172. Is there a ceiling for the number of “selected initiatives” for which the applicant will be expected to serve in a program coordination role?

A172. The RFP does not establish a ceiling on the number of initiatives for which a vendor may provide coordination support. Vendors proposing for the selected component(s) should propose approaches capable of supporting the full scope of RHTP activities associated with that component across all 15 RHTP initiatives.

Q173. Will the evaluator be expected to obtain outcome data from hospitals, providers, and other local health organizations, or will the State obtain the data and then transfer them to the evaluator?

A173. Data collection responsibilities and data access processes may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, data availability, applicable approvals, and the selected component(s). DPH, subrecipients, partner organizations, contractors, and selected vendor(s) may all have roles in supporting data collection, coordination, reporting, and related monitoring and evaluation activities associated with the RHTP award.

Q174. Is the evaluator expected to analyze individual-level electronic health data from hospitals and emergency departments or other PHI data?

A174. The type and level of data available to the selected vendor(s) may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, applicable approvals, data governance considerations, and the selected component(s). Vendors must comply with all applicable federal, State, confidentiality, privacy, security, and data management requirements identified in the RFP and contract documents.

Q175. Is there a preference for a Delaware-based prime for this submission?

A175. No, the RFP does not establish a preference for a Delaware-based prime vendor. Vendors will be

evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP.

Q176. For budgeting purposes, is there an anticipated timeline for when each of the 15 initiatives will be launched, or should we plan for all to be launched by the end of year 1/ beginning of year 2?

A176. RHTP initiative implementation timelines may vary throughout the contract period based on program needs, procurement timing, readiness, and other implementation factors. Vendors should propose approaches, staffing, and budgets that are flexible and scalable to support varying levels of activity across initiatives during the contract period.

Q177. Is the evaluator able to propose new primary data collection activities (e., surveys, interviews, or focus groups) beyond the outcomes and outputs described in the RFP? Can any of those additional data collection activities be incentivized?

A177. The RFP does not prohibit vendors from proposing additional methodologies or data collection approaches that support monitoring, evaluation, reporting, stakeholder engagement, or related activities associated with the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach and methodologies within their proposal. Any proposed activities, including incentives or participant supports, must comply with applicable federal, State, contractual, and funding requirements.

Q178. Is any preference given for involving firms as subcontractors that are registered in Delaware as Minority, Women (WBE), or Veteran-owned?

A178. The RFP does not establish a specific evaluation preference for subcontractors based on Minority Business Enterprise, Women Business Enterprise, or Veteran-owned business status. Vendors will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP.

Q179. How many subawards does DE anticipate will be awarded per initiative? How many will the vendor will manage overall?

A179. The number of subawards issued per initiative may vary based on initiative scope, procurement outcomes, funding availability, and program needs. The RFP does not establish a fixed number of subawards by initiative or a fix number of subawards that the selected vendor(s) will manage overall. Vendors should propose approaches and levels of effort appropriate to the scope of services identified in the RFP.

Q180. Will the vendor be involved in the subaward solicitation, award, and negotiation process? Will the vendor be involved in the subaward close out process? Or will the vendor only be involved in the oversight of the subaward between award start date and closeout?

A180. The selected vendor's role may include support related to subaward coordination, monitoring, reporting, and other oversight activities associated with the selected component(s) as described in the RFP. The extend of vendor involvement in solicitation, award, negotiation,

implementation, and closeout activities may vary by initiative and operational need throughout the contract period.

Q181. Will the vendor be involved with any amendments/modifications to the subawards? If so, please provide a monthly estimate of the number of amendments/modifications that took place, by vendor.

A181. The selected vendor's role may include support related to subaward coordination, monitoring, reporting, and other oversight activities associated with the selected component(s), including support related to amendments or modifications, as applicable. The number and frequency of amendments or modifications may vary by initiative, vendor, funding availability, and program needs. The State is unable to provide estimated volumes at this time.

Q182. Will the vendor be involved in reviewing and processing the invoice submissions by subrecipients under the subawards, or only the progress reports submitted by the subrecipient under the subaward?

A182. The selected vendor's role may include review and oversight activities related to subrecipient reporting, monitoring, and other grant management functions associated with the selected component(s), as described in the RFP. The extent of vendor involvement in invoice review, invoice processing support, progress report review, or related activities may vary by initiative and operational need throughout the contract period.

Q183. Has the State established budget for the program? Please provide the budget allocated to Contract HSS 26-078.

A183. The RFP does not identify a specific budget allocation for this solicitation. Vendors should propose budgets that are reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q184. Vendors may propose for one or both components. Does the State anticipate making separate awards for the Coordination Component and the Monitoring & Evaluation Component, one combined award, or either approach depending on proposals received?

A184. The number and types of subrecipients may vary throughout the contract period based on initiative scope, procurement outcomes, funding availability, and program needs. Some procurements and awards may already completed or underway at the time of contract award, while others may occur during the contract period.

Q185. Please provide the anticipated number and types of subrecipients the vendor will coordinate with, including which subrecipient procurements or awards are already complete, underway, or planned for Year 1.

A185. The State reserves the right to award separate contracts for the Coordination Component and the Monitoring & Evaluation Component, a combined award, or multiple awards, if determined to be

in the best interest of the State, consistent with the provisions of the RFP.

Q186. Will the State provide the awarded project narrative, CMS award terms and conditions, reporting templates, required performance measures, and any CMS-defined data dictionary or reporting calendar to the vendor at project initiation?

A186. DPH anticipates providing applicable materials, guidance, and available documentation necessary for contract performance, as appropriate, during contract implementation. Certain program information, award materials, and related guidance are also publicly available online through CMS, DPH, and other applicable public resources. Certain reporting processes and related CMS guidance may continue to evolve or be refined throughout the contract period.

Q187. Are process and outcome metrics already defined for each of the 15 initiatives, or is the vendor expected to develop recommended metrics for State approval? If some metrics already exist, please provide them.

A187. Process measures, outcome measures, reporting requirements, and program goals may vary across the 15 initiatives based on initiative structure, operational needs, CMS requirements, and stages of implementation. Certain measures and reporting expectations may already exist, while vendors may also be expected to support metric refinement, development, validation, tracking, reporting, and related performance measurement activities associated with the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting these activities within their proposal.

Q188. Please clarify the current implementation status of AchieveIt, including whether licenses, user roles, existing dashboards, data structures, integrations, and State administrative support are already in place.

A188. The AchieveIt platform and related implementation activities may already be established or underway at the time of contract award. DPH anticipates providing access to the platform, existing dashboards, and related tracking environments necessary to support activities associated with the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting ongoing tracking, reporting, dashboard maintenance, quality assurance, coordination, and related activities within the AchieveIt environment.

Q189. What systems, data sources, or manual reporting processes will feed AchieveIt and CMS reporting, and will the vendor be responsible for creating data collection templates, integrations, or data validation rules?

A189. The systems, data sources, and reporting processes supporting AchieveIt and CMS reporting may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, existing reporting processes, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to data collection, reporting processes, validation activities, templates, tools, and related support activities

associated with the scope of work described in the RFP.

Q190. Please clarify the expected division of responsibilities between DPH, other State agencies, the Governor's Office, subrecipients, and the vendor for compliance monitoring, budget adherence, issue escalation, corrective action, and audit follow-up.

A190. DPH will maintain overall programmatic and administrative oversight responsibilities for the RHTP award. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support activities related to compliance monitoring, budget tracking, performance monitoring, reporting, issue identification and escalation, corrective action support, audit support, and related grant management functions associated with the selected component(s) as described in the RFP. The specific allocation of responsibilities among DPH, other State agencies, subrecipients, and the selected vendor(s) may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, and the selected component(s).

Q191. Does the State expect the vendor to begin supporting all selected initiatives immediately upon the estimated September 15, 2026 start date, or will onboarding and initiative support be phased?

A191. The State anticipates that vendors may be expected to begin supporting active workstreams and initiatives upon contract execution, rather than through a phased onboarding process. However, the level and timing of support may vary across initiatives throughout the contract period based on program needs and implementation status.

Q192. For pricing purposes, please provide the expected frequency, format, and approximate number of recurring meetings, stakeholder presentations, cross-initiative convenings, and ad hoc presentations per month or quarter.

A192. The frequency, format, and number of recurring meetings and presentations will vary based on the selected vendor's proposed approach, the selected component(s), and evolving program implementation needs. Vendors should propose a reasonable level of effort and engagement structure aligned with the scope of services and anticipated coordination and reporting activities described in the RFP.

Q193. Is there an anticipated budget range, ceiling, or target allocation for the Coordination Component and/or Monitoring & Evaluation Component?

A193. The RFP does not identify an anticipated budget range, ceiling, or target allocation for either component. Vendors should propose budgets that are reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q194. The RHTP is described as a five-year federal program, while the contract term is one year with four optional one-year extensions. Should vendors price only the

initial one-year term, or provide pricing assumptions for all potential renewal years?

A194. Vendors should provide pricing for the initial contract term and may include pricing assumptions or proposed pricing for optional renewal periods, as appropriate to their proposed approach. Any renewal periods will be subject to contract negotiation, funding availability, vendor performance, and applicable State approval processes.

Q195. Will the vendor have access to HIPAA-protected health information, personally identifiable information, federal tax information, or other regulated data in performing coordination, monitoring, evaluation, or dashboard activities?

A195. The type and level of data available to the selected vendor(s) may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, applicable approvals, data governance considerations, and the selected component(s). Vendors must comply with all applicable federal, State, confidentiality, privacy, security, and data management requirements identified in the RFP and contract documents.

Q196. For public-facing dashboards, reports, summaries, and presentations, what accessibility, plain language, translation, or health literacy standards must the vendor follow?

A196. Public-facing materials and communications developed under the contract are expected to comply with applicable State and federal accessibility, nondiscrimination, and communication requirements, as applicable. Vendors should describe their approach to accessibility, stakeholder communication, health literacy, and engagement with diverse populations associated with the selected component.

Q197. Does the State have expectations for onsite presence in Delaware for kickoff, stakeholder meetings, audits, or presentations, or may vendors assume services can be delivered primarily remotely?

A197. Work is expected to be performed primarily remotely. Limited in-person engagement activities, including stakeholder meetings, site visits, coordination activities, qualitative information gathering, or other implementation-related activities within Delaware may occur on an as-needed or ad hoc basis depending on operational needs, initiative activities, and the selected component(s).

Q198. When applying for both components, do the stated page limits apply per component or to the application as a whole? For example, if separate budgets are required for each component, is the 8-page Budget and Budget Narrative limit per component or total? Likewise, is the 10-page Technical Proposal limit per component or cumulative across both?

A198. The stated page limits apply to the proposal as a whole, not per component. For vendors proposing for both components, the Technical Proposal should generally not exceed 10 pages

total and the Budget and Budget Narrative should generally not exceed eight (8) pages total. Vendors are encouraged to provide concise, focused responses. If additional space is necessary to adequately address both components, vendors may include up to three (3) additional pages for the Technical Proposal and up to two (2) additional pages for the Budget and Budget Narrative. Vendors should clearly distinguish responses and budget information for each component within the proposal.

Q199. Can DPH provide additional detail regarding the anticipated scope of support expected for each component area, including the expected depth of involvement in program management, monitoring, evaluation, reporting, stakeholder coordination, and operational execution?

A199. The RFP identifies the general scope of activities expected under each component; however, the specific depth and structure of support may vary based on the vendor's proposed approach, initiative needs, and operational priorities throughout the contract period. Vendors should clearly describe their proposed level of involvement in program management, monitoring, evaluation, reporting, stakeholder coordination, and related operational activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q200. Does DPH anticipate this contract being structured as Firm Fixed Price (FFP), Cost Reimbursable, Cost Plus, Time & Materials, or a hybrid structure?

A200. Vendors should provide a cost proposal in accordance with the instructions identified in the RFP. Vendors may propose the pricing approach they believe is appropriate to support the scope of work and deliverables associated with the selected components.

Q201. Will the contract allow for progress payments, milestone-based invoicing, or monthly billing based on level of effort and incurred costs?

A201. Vendors should provide a cost proposal in accordance with the instructions identified in the RFP. Vendors may propose the pricing approach they believe is appropriate to support the scope of work and deliverables associated with the selected components.

Q202. What startup activities does DPH consider highest priority during the first 90–180 days of performance?

A202. The State anticipates that initial activities may include project planning, coordination with DPH and relevant stakeholders, establishment of reporting and communication processes, and initiation of activities necessary to support the selected component(s) and associated deliverables.

Q203. Approximately how many State Government stakeholders, program offices, agencies, or designated POCs will the selected vendor be expected to routinely coordinate with throughout execution of the program?

A203. The number of stakeholders, program offices, agencies, and designated points of contact

involved in RHTP implementation may vary throughout the contract period based on initiative structure, operational needs, and the selected component(s). Vendors should propose approaches capable of coordinating with multiple State agencies, program areas, subrecipients, contractors, and other relevant stakeholders involved in RHTP activities.

Q204. Approximately how many initiatives, grants, subrecipients, or active programs is the selected vendor expected to oversee, track, evaluate, or support during the base period of performance?

A204. The RHTP grant includes 15 initiatives and may involve multiple agreements, contracts, subrecipients, and related activities throughout the contract period. The number of active programs, subrecipients, and oversight activities may vary based on procurement outcomes, implementation status, funding availability, and program needs. Vendors should propose approaches and levels of effort appropriate to supporting the scope of services identified in the RFP.

Q205. Does DPH have an estimated staffing model or anticipated level of effort for contractor personnel, including analysts, program managers, reporting specialists, or evaluation staff expected to support this effort?

A205. The RFP does not establish a staffing model or required level of effort for contractor personnel. Vendors should propose a staffing structure and level of effort that are appropriate to their proposed approach, selected component(s), and the scope of services identified in the RFP.

Q206. Appendix A item 3 directs bidders to use the Appendix F deliverable-based pricing template, while Appendix B.v.4 also requires a "line item budget" and "budget narrative." Should bidders submit both the Appendix F template and a separate line item budget? Or is the line item budget intended to be the cost build-up that supports the fixed prices shown in Appendix F? Please clarify.

A206. Vendors may use Appendix F to provide the required line-item budget and supporting cost information. If the Appendix F template does not fully meet a vendor's needs, vendors may submit budget information in an alternate format, provided all required budget and Budget Narrative elements identified in the RFP are clearly addressed.

Q207. What level of authority will the selected vendor have in establishing governance structures, reporting processes, and standardized operating procedures across initiatives?

A207. DPH will maintain overall programmatic and administrative oversight responsibilities for the RHTP award. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support coordination, reporting, monitoring, communication, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s), including support related to governance structures, reporting processes, and operational coordination activities as described in the RFP. The specific level of vendor responsibility and authority may vary based on operational needs, initiative structure, and the

selected component(s).

Q208. Does DPH currently have an approved CMS reporting framework, KPI structure, or evaluation methodology in place, or will the selected vendor be expected to assist in developing these processes?

A208. DPH has existing CMS reporting requirements, milestones, metrics, and related grant management structures associated with the RHTP award. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support implementation, tracking, reporting, monitoring, refinement, and related evaluation or reporting activities associated with the selected component(s) throughout the contract period.

Q209. Is the AchieveIt platform already procured and partially configured, or is the selected vendor expected to support platform architecture, dashboard development, workflow design, and reporting configuration?

A209. The AchieveIt platform has been procured and related implementation and tracking activities may already be established or underway at the time of contract award. The selected vendor may be tasked with assisting with revisions to the platform architecture, dashboard development, workflow design, and reporting configuration.

Q210. How does DPH envision responsibilities being divided between State personnel and the selected vendor for program coordination, stakeholder engagement, compliance monitoring, and reporting activities?

A210. DPH will maintain overall programmatic and administrative oversight responsibilities for the RHTP award. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support program coordination, stakeholder engagement, compliance support, reporting, monitoring, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s) as described in the RFP. The specific allocation of responsibilities between DPH and the selected vendor(s) may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, and the selected component(s).

Q211. Does DPH anticipate phased implementation, prioritized initiative sequencing, or staggered funding allocations during the initial contract period?

A211. The State anticipates that implementation activities, initiative sequencing, and funding utilization may vary throughout the contract period based on program needs, procurement timing, readiness, and other operational factors. Vendors should propose approaches and budgets aligned with their anticipated activities, deliverables, and level of effort across the selected components.

Q212. Appendix B allows bidders to propose one or both program components (Coordination and Monitoring & Evaluation). Request the state clarify whether a single vendor may be awarded both components. In addition, if a bidder proposes

both components, will each component be evaluated and awarded independently, or only as a combined package?

A212. A single vendor may be awarded both components. The State also reserves the right to make separate awards by component or multiple awards, if determined to be in the best interest of the State, consistent with the provisions of the RFP. If a vendor proposes both components, each component will be evaluated and scored independently using the applicable RFP evaluation criteria and associated weights.

Q213. Please clarify whether a firm remains eligible to bid on HSS26078 if the firm (or its affiliate or named subcontractor) has bid on, won, or is delivering services on another Delaware RHTP RFP — such as HSS26075 or HSS26061?

A213. Vendors may submit proposals for this RFP regardless of whether the vendor, an affiliate, or a subcontractor has submitted proposals for, been awarded, or is currently providing services under other Delaware procurements, subject to applicable procurement requirements and any organizational conflict of interest considerations.

Q214. The Project Cost Template (Appendix F) refers to "phases" which do not appear to be directly linked back to the RFP, as the reference to Appendix B.n is unclear. In addition, the cost template includes more than two boxes, suggestion multiple phases for a single component. We request the State please clarify the intended relationship between "phases", the solicitation requirements, and the project cost template.

A214. The phases referenced in Appendix F are intended to provide vendors flexibility in organizing proposed activities, deliverables, and costs. Vendors may structure the template in a manner that aligns with their proposed approach, workplan, and selected component(s). The multiple tables included in Appendix F are provided as examples for organizing activities or deliverables and do not represent required or predefined project phases.

Q215. How many subrecipients and contracts does DPH anticipate the selected vendor(s) will oversee across the 15 initiatives during Year 1 and over the life of the program?

A215. The number of subrecipients and contracts supported across the 15 RHTP initiatives may vary throughout Year 1 and the life of the program based on initiative scope, procurement outcomes, funding availability, and program needs. The RFP does not establish a fixed number of subrecipients or contracts. Vendors should propose approaches and levels of effort appropriate to supporting the scope of services identified in the RFP.

Q216. Can DPH provide additional detail regarding CMS reporting expectations, including anticipated reporting templates, required performance measures, reporting frequency, and any federal guidance currently available to the State?

A216. Applicable CMS reporting expectations associated with the RHTP award include quarterly, annual, and other reporting activities related to program implementation, milestones, metrics,

and grant oversight. Certain reporting templates, performance measures, data specifications, and related federal guidance may continue to evolve or be refined throughout the contract period. Vendors should describe their approach to supporting reporting, tracking, monitoring, evaluation, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q217. What systems, datasets, and reporting platforms will vendors be expected to access or integrate with in support of monitoring, evaluation, dashboarding, and CMS reporting activities?

A217. Vendors may be expected to support activities involving reporting systems, datasets, tracking tools, dashboards, and other platforms associated with RHTP implementation, grant management, monitoring, evaluation, and CMS reporting activities, including AchieveIt, as applicable to the selected component(s). Specific systems, reporting requirements, and data processes may evolve throughout the contract period based on operational needs and CMS guidance.

Q218. What is the underlying system that AchieveIt is based on?

A218. The RFP does not prescribe or require a specific understanding of the underlying architecture of the AchieveIt platform. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to utilizing the platform and supporting related reporting, tracking, dashboard, and coordination activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q219. Should the staffing plan and cost proposal assume Year 1 funding levels will continue, or does the state anticipate significant scaling up/down in subsequent years?

A219. Vendors should propose staffing plans and cost proposals based on their proposed approach and the anticipated scope of services during the applicable contract period. Future funding levels, scopes of work, and optional renewal periods may vary based on program needs, funding availability, vendor performance, and applicable State and CMS requirements.

Q220. How many subrecipient awards and contracts does the Department anticipate executing in Year 1? What is the expected growth trajectory through the contract period?

A220. The number of subrecipient awards and contracts executed during Year 1 and throughout the contract period may vary based on the initiative scope, procurement outcomes, funding availability, and program needs. The RFP does not establish a fixed number of awards, contracts, or projected growth trajectory. Vendors should propose approaches and levels of effort appropriate to supporting the scope of services identified in the RFP.

Q221. Will Department staff be assigned to a group of subrecipients? What will be their role in supporting administration?

A221. DPH, as the recipient and administrator of the RHTP award, will maintain overall programmatic

and administrative oversight responsibilities. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to coordinate with DPH, other DHSS divisions, partner agencies, and other relevant stakeholders throughout the contract period in support of the selected component(s) and RHTP activities.

Q222. Has CMS provided specific reporting templates, data specifications, or performance metrics that Delaware must use?

A222. CMS has provided applicable award requirements, milestones, and related guidance associated with the RHTP award. Certain reporting templates, data specifications, and operational reporting requirements may continue to be developed or refined. Vendors should describe their approach to supporting reporting, tracking, monitoring, evaluation, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q223. Beyond the required reports, what specific performance benchmarks or milestones has CMS established for Delaware's RHTP?

A223. Applicable CMS milestones, outcomes, and program expectations associated with Delaware's RHTP award are publicly available through CMS award materials, approved application, and related program guidance. Vendors should describe their approach to supporting tracking, reporting, monitoring, evaluation, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q224. Will the Department provide contractor access to the AchieveIt platform through their licenses or does the contractor need to secure licenses for AchieveIt use? Must the dashboard integrate with existing state systems? What accessibility and security requirements apply?

A224. DPH anticipates providing access to the AchieveIt platform for activities associated with the RHTP award, as applicable to the selected component(s). The RFP does not specifically require development of integrations with existing State systems. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to dashboard support, reporting, tracking accessibility, security, and related activities with the selected component(s). Any proposed solutions or activities should align with applicable State requirements, policies, and platform environments.

Q225. What state financial and data systems will the contractor need to access? What is the typical timeline for provisioning access to these systems?

A225. The systems and platform access required for the selected vendor(s) may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, and the selected component(s). This may include access to reporting, tracking, data collection, or related systems associated with RHTP implementation activities, as applicable. Timelines for system access and provisioning may vary based on applicable approvals, security requirements, operational processes, and system access

procedures.

Q226. What baseline data tracking systems are currently in place to support required data/report submission from sub-recipients? Will the contractor need to build new tracking infrastructure or enhance existing systems?

A226. The AchieveIt platform and related tracking activities may already be established or underway at the time of contract award. Data collection, tracking, and reporting processes may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, existing processes, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting data collection, tracking, reporting, validation, and related monitoring activities, including any proposed enhancements or supporting tools associated with the selected component(s).

Q227. Will the vendor selected under this RFP be classified as a contractor or subrecipient under the CMS award agreement governing the RHTP?

A227. The selected vendor(s) will operate under a contractual relationship with the State in accordance with the terms and requirements identified in the RFP and resulting contract documents.

Q228. Regardless of classification, does DHSS intend to impose any administrative or indirect cost cap on vendors (either through contract negotiations or through the terms of DPH's CMS award agreement) and if so, what is that cap?

A228. Proposed administrative and indirect costs should not exceed 9.1%. Vendors should clearly identify and justify any proposed administrative or indirect costs within the budget submission.

Q229. Can DHSS provide prospective vendors with the terms of its award agreement with CMS, or a summary of federal award conditions that will flow down to the selected vendor, including any documentation standards, record retention requirements, and audit rights?

A229. Applicable federal award requirements, contract terms, and flow-down requirements associated with the RHTP award will be incorporated into the final contract, as applicable. Vendors are expected to comply with applicable State and federal requirements, including those related to documentation, record retention, monitoring, audit, reporting, and other grant administration activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q230. The RFP includes a Business Associate Agreement (Appendix D). Can you clarify which of the 15 RHTP initiatives will involve the vendor accessing, processing, or transmitting protected health information (PHI), and whether any involve federal tax information (FTI) subject to IRS Publication 1075 requirements?

A230. At this time, the State cannot definitively identify which initiatives may involve access to protected health information (PHI) or federal tax information (FTI), as this may vary based on the selected vendor's proposed approach, systems, and scope of services. Vendors should assume that any access to PHI or other sensitive information will require compliance with all applicable federal

and state confidentiality, privacy, and security requirements. The State does not anticipate routine access to FTI under this RFP. However, vendors are expected to comply with any applicable security and data protection requirements associated with the services provided.

Q231. Are there conflicts of interest restrictions that would prevent the selected vendor or its affiliates from receiving other DHSS or CMS funding during the term of this contract?

A231. Vendors are expected to comply with applicable State and federal conflict of interest requirements. Participation in other DHSS, CMS, or RHTP-related funding opportunities does not automatically preclude a vendor, affiliate, or subcontractor from participating in this procurement. Any actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest will be reviewed in accordance with applicable procurement requirements and contract terms.

Q232. How many subrecipients does DPH anticipate the selected Offeror supporting across the 15 initiatives, and is there an estimated maximum volume the Offeror should plan for?

A232. The number of subrecipients supported across the RHTP initiatives may vary throughout the contract period based on initiative scope, procurement outcomes, funding availability, and program needs. The RFP does not establish a maximum number of subrecipients. Vendors should propose approaches and levels of effort appropriate to supporting the scope of services identified in the RFP.

Q233. If Component 1 and Component 2 are awarded to separate vendors, what coordination mechanisms will the State put in place between those vendors? Specifically, will DPH serve as the intermediary for information sharing between the two vendors, or will the vendors be expected to coordinate directly with each other?

A233. If separate vendors are awarded the Coordination Component and the Monitoring & Evaluation Component, the selected vendors will be expected to coordinate and collaborate with one another, as applicable, in support of RHTP implementation activities. DPH will maintain overall programmatic and administrative oversight responsibilities and may facilitate coordination, communication, and information sharing among vendors and other stakeholders, as needed, throughout the contract period.

Q234. The Coordination Component references periodic audits to ensure alignment with project goals and approved budgets. What is the expected frequency of these audits, and will they encompass programmatic?

A234. The frequency, scope, and level of monitoring or periodic audit activities may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, risk considerations, implementation status, and the selected component(s). These activities may include programmatic, financial, compliance, reporting, validation, coordination, or related oversight

activities associated with the RHTP award.

Q235. Can DPH provide a target or maximum budget range for each component to ensure proposals are aligned with available resources?

A235. The RFP does not identify target or maximum budget ranges for either component. Vendors should propose budgets that are reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q236. What is the current state of the AchieveIt implementation for RHTP? Has DPH already configured the platform for this program, or will the vendor be expected to support initial configuration and setup?

A236. The AchieveIt platform has been procured and related implementation and tracking activities may already be established or underway at the time of contract award. The selected vendor may be tasked with assisting with revisions to the platform architecture, dashboard development, workflow design, and reporting configuration.

Q237. Given that CMS reporting requirements, metrics, and milestones may evolve during the contract period, what is the expected role of the selected vendor in adapting the evaluation framework as those requirements change?

A237. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support updates to reporting processes, tracking activities, metrics, milestones, and related grant management functions throughout the contract period as needed to align with evolving CMS requirements, RHTP implementation needs, and operational priorities associated with the selected component.

Q238. Can DPH provide additional detail regarding the reference check process, including whether references will be contacted by phone, email questionnaire, survey, or another method?

A238. Reference checks may be conducted using methods determined appropriate by the State, which may include phone, email, written questionnaires, surveys, or other verification methods. The State reserves the right to determine the reference review process consistent with the RFP and procurement requirements.

Q239. Is there currently a vendor or state staff performing program coordination services across the 15 RHTP initiatives that the selected vendor would be transitioning from? If so, what transition support will be expected, and will a formal knowledge transfer period be built into the contract as part of initiation activities?

A239. At the time of contract award, some RHTP coordination, monitoring, reporting, evaluation, and implementation activities may already be underway. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to onboarding, coordination, transition activities, and continuity of operations

associated with the selected component(s).

Q240. Does DPH anticipate that key personnel working under this contract will need to be physically present in Delaware on a regular basis? If so, what is the expected frequency and duration of on-site presence?

A240. The RFP does not establish a specific requirement regarding the frequency or duration of on-site presence in Delaware. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to communication, coordination, stakeholder engagement, meeting participation, and support for implementation activities associated with the selected component(s). Vendors must be able to effectively support the scope of work and coordination activities described in the RFP.

Q241. Are there any minimum qualifications or credential requirements for key personnel roles (e.g., Program Director, Grant Manager) that are not specified in the RFP but will be considered during evaluation?

A241. No minimum qualifications or credential requirements beyond those identified in the RFP have been established. Proposals will be evaluated based on the requirements, evaluation criteria, experience, qualifications, and approach described in the RFP.

Q242. The RFP requires prices to remain fixed and binding through September 14, 2027. For the four optional years, are vendors permitted to propose annual rate escalation? If so, is there a cap or index the State would apply to those escalations?

A242. Vendors may propose reasonable annual rate escalations for optional renewal periods, if applicable. Any proposed escalation methodology should be clearly identified and justified within the budget submission. Final pricing and any renewal period adjustments will be subject to contract negotiation and applicable State approval processes.

Q243. Has DPH established a budget range or ceiling for each component that vendors should use as a guide when developing their cost proposals?

A243. The RFP does not identify a budget range or ceiling for either component. Vendors should propose budgets that are reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q244. The Technical Proposal is limited to 10 pages. If bidding on both components, does the 10-page limit apply to each component separately, or is it a combined 10-page limit for both?

A244. The 10-page Technical Proposal limit applies to the proposal as a whole, regardless of whether a vendor is proposing for one or both components. Vendors proposing for both components are encouraged to provide concise, focused responses. If additional space is necessary to adequately address both components, vendors may include up to three (3) additional pages.

Q245. On page 4 under B. General Evaluation Requirements, the solicitation notes that capacity, including "financial condition" will be an evaluation factor. Can you

clarify whether you are requesting specific information to evaluate an offeror's financial condition?

A245. The RFP does not require submission of specific financial statements or financial condition documentation as part of the proposal. However, vendors may include information they believe demonstrates organizational capacity and ability to successfully perform the requested services.

Q246. The RFP indicates that the Technical Proposal is limited to 10 pages. If a vendor chooses to propose on both components, are two separate, 10-page Technical Proposals to be submitted or should both components be addressed within one, 10-page Technical Proposal?

A246. Vendors proposing for both components should submit a single Technical Proposal addressing both components. The Technical Proposal should generally not exceed 10 pages total. Vendors proposing for both components are encouraged to provide concise, focused responses. If additional space is necessary to adequately address both components, vendors may include up to three (3) additional pages.

Q247. Is there a total budget estimate or ceiling, either a per-component or a per-year, that vendors should use?

A247. The RFP does not identify a total budget estimate or ceiling, either by component or by year. Vendors should propose budgets that are reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q248. Will cost proposals for each component be evaluated independently, or only assessed as a combined total?

A248. Cost proposals will be evaluated in alignment with the selected component(s) proposed by the vendor and the applicable RFP evaluation criteria and associated weights. Vendors proposing for both components should clearly distinguish costs by component within the budget submission.

Q249. Should vendors develop cost proposals for optional years?

A249. Vendors should provide cost proposals for the initial contract term and the optional renewal years in accordance with the instructions identified in the RFP.

Q250. Will the two components be evaluated and potentially awarded separately, or only as a bundled package? If separately, will the state accept proposals from different vendors for each component?

A250. The two components will be evaluated separately using the applicable RFP evaluation criteria, and may be awarded separately. The State reserves the right to make separate awards by component, a combined award, or multiple awards, if determined to be in the best interest of the State, consistent with the provisions of the RFP. Different vendors may be awarded each

component.

Q251. If a vendor bids both components, will the evaluation team score them as one proposal or two?

A251. If a vendor proposes both components, each component will be evaluated and scored independently using the applicable RFP evaluation criteria and associated weights. Vendors should clearly distinguish responses and budget information for each component within the proposal.

Q252. If a vendor bids both components, does that 10-page technical proposal limit apply to both components? Or would a vendor get 10 pages per component, that is total of 20 pages if bidding for both components?

A252. The 10-page Technical Proposal limit applies to the proposal as a whole, regardless of whether a vendor is proposing for one or both components. Vendors proposing for both components are encouraged to provide concise, focused responses. If additional space is necessary to adequately address both components, vendors may include up to three (3) additional pages.

Q253. The RFP on page 4, item III.B.4 states that "geographical location" is one of the general evaluation requirements. Can you clarify what that means?

A253. "Location (geographical)" is not intended to establish a preference for a particular geographic location independent of the vendor's ability to perform the scope of work described in the RFP. Vendors must comply with applicable RFP requirements, including requirements related to vendor activity occurring within the United States.

Q254. Would prospective vendors with physical presence in the state of Delaware have preference over out-of-state vendors? How important is the vendor's geographic location for the monitoring and evaluation component?

A254. No, the RFP does not establish a preference for vendors based on physical presence in Delaware. Vendors and subcontractors located outside of Delaware may be considered, provided they comply with all applicable federal and State of Delaware procurement, contracting, licensing, registration, and RFP requirements. Vendors will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP.

Q255. What is the expected level of in-person presence in Delaware (e.g., at DPH offices or subrecipient sites)? Does the level of in-person presence vary by component?

A255. The RFP does not establish a specific requirement regarding the frequency or duration of in-person presence in Delaware. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to communication, coordination, stakeholder engagement, meeting participation, and support for

implementation activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q256. The RFP on page 4, item III.B.7 states that "distribution of work to individuals and firms or economic considerations" is one of the general evaluation requirements. Can you clarify what this means and how this requirement will be evaluated?

A256. This provision refers to the State's consideration of factors identified in the RFP and applicable procurement requirements during the evaluation process. Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria and requirements identified in the RFP.

Q257. How many subrecipients are currently anticipated across the 15 initiatives, and will that number be known by project start?

A257. The number of subrecipients, contractors, and implementation partners may vary across the initiatives based on initiative structure, operational needs, procurement activities, funding arrangements, and stages of implementation.

Q258. Will all subrecipients and project activities be concentrated in Sussex and Kent Counties?

A258. RHTP activities may include statewide, regional, county-level, rural, or initiative-specific implementation activities depending on the structure and goals of the individual initiatives. While certain initiatives may focus on Kent and Sussex Counties or rural populations, implementation activities associated with the RHTP award are not limited exclusively to those counties.

Q259. Does DPH have existing data infrastructure, data sharing agreements, or baseline data that the vendor would build on? Or would the vendor be responsible for establishing this with the various subrecipients?

A259. Existing data infrastructure, reporting processes, data sharing arrangements, and baseline information may vary across initiatives, subrecipients, systems, and stages of implementation. Certain systems, processes, or reporting activities may already exist or be underway, while vendors may also be expected to support coordination, data collection, reporting, validation, standardization, and related monitoring and evaluation activities associated with the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting these activities within their proposal.

Q260. Are CMS metrics, data elements, and reporting requirements defined and available to vendors?

A260. Applicable CMS award materials and program guidance associated with the RHTP award are publicly available. Vendors should describe their approach to supporting reporting, tracking, monitoring, evaluation, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q261. Does DPH expect that as part of evaluation activities, the vendor will conduct regular site visits, surveys, and interviews/focus groups with subrecipients' staff,

partners and clients? What other monitoring and evaluation activities does DPH expect from the vendor?

A261. The level and type of monitoring and evaluation activities may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, implementation status, and the selected component(s). Activities may include reporting support, tracking, validation, stakeholder engagement, coordination, surveys, interviews, focus groups, site engagement, implementation monitoring, performance measurement, and related evaluation activities, as applicable. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting these activities within their proposal.

Q262. What is the current status of AchieveIt implementation — is it already configured and in use, or will the vendor be involved in initial setup? What training or platform access will the vendor receive?

A262. The AchieveIt platform has been procured and related implementation and tracking activities may already be established or underway at the time of contract award. The selected vendor may be tasked with assisting with revisions to the platform architecture, dashboard development, workflow design, and reporting configuration. The state will provide the vendor with AchieveIt licenses and appropriate training.

Q263. Does AchieveIt already include accessibility tools and guidance or would the vendor be responsible for developing accessibility features?

A263. The AchieveIt platform environment already incorporates applicable accessibility requirements and standards. Vendors may be expected to support accessibility considerations related to dashboard content, reporting outputs, and related activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q264. Will there be an ongoing need to support ad-hoc requests from the State as part of RHTP data reporting and analysis?

A264. Yes, the selected vendor(s) may be expected to support ongoing and ad hoc reporting, data tracking, analysis, monitoring, and related grant management activities associated with the RHTP award and the selected component(s) throughout the contract period.

Q265. In Appendix B, Section C. Scope of Services, page limits are provided for each of the sections (e.g., cover letter (limit 1 page), executive summary (limit 2 pages), etc.). If a vendor proposes to deliver services for both program components (i.e., Coordination Component and Monitoring & Evaluation Component), will the same page limits apply to each component separately or be combined?

A265. The state page limits apply to the proposal as a whole, not separately to each component. Vendors proposing for both program components should address both components within a single proposal. Vendors are encouraged to provide concise, focused responses. If additional space is necessary to adequately address both components, vendors may include up to three (3) additional pages for the Technical Proposal, up to one (1) additional page for the Executive

Summary, and up to two (2) additional pages for the Budget and Budget Narrative.

Q266. In Appendix B, Section C. Scope of Services, it notes there are no page limits for the Attachments section, which can include items such as an organizational chart, resumes, and sample reporting templates. In addition to the items provided, can DPH confirm if Attachments 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, Appendix E (Sample Workplan Template), and Appendix F (Project Cost Template) should also be included in the same Attachments section?

A266. The required forms and templates including Appendix C (which consists of Attachments 2-7) as well as Appendix E (Workplan Template) and Appendix F (Project Cost Template) should be submitted in the applicable upload locations within Bonfire. Attachment forms and Appendix E are not subject to page limits. However, Appendix F budget documents remain subject to the applicable Budget and Budget Narrative page limitations identified in the RFP.

Q267. On page 13 of the RFP, it states "Provide at least three (3) business references consisting of current or previous customers of similar scope and value using Attachment 6." If a vendor proposes to deliver services for both program components, should at least three (3) business references be provided for each component (i.e., 3 references for Coordination Component and 3 references for Monitoring & Evaluation Component) or is it a total of three (3) references for both (e.g., 2 references for Coordination Component and 1 reference for Monitoring & Evaluation Component)?

A267. Vendors are required to provide a minimum of three (3) business references total in accordance with the RFP requirements. Vendors proposing for both components are encouraged to provide references demonstrating relevant experience across the proposed scope of services.

Q268. Does DPH anticipate providing vendors access to data containing PHI / PII or will all data provided be aggregated or de-identified?

A268. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to access data, reporting information, or systems necessary to support the selected component(s) and associated RHTP activities. The nature of the data provided may vary based on initiative needs, operational requirements, and applicable State and federal requirements.

Q269. Can DPH provide examples of tools and resources available through the Achieveit platform (e.g., Tableau, PowerBI) to develop and maintain data visualizations and perform validation checks?

A269. The RFP identifies the Achieveit platform for activities related to data visualization, tracking, reporting, and dashboard support associated with the RHTP award. Vendors should describe within their proposal how they intend to utilize the platform and support dashboard development, reporting, validation activities, and related functions associated with the selected

component(s), including any additional tools or technologies proposed as part of their approach.

Q270. Can DPH provide examples of tools, resources, and/or platforms available to perform data hosting, data collection, and analyses and transformations other than the AchieveIt platform?

A270. The RFP identifies the AchieveIt platform for activities related to data visualization, tracking, reporting, and dashboard support associated with the RHTP award. The RFP does not prescribe specific additional platforms, tools, or technologies for data hosting, collection, analysis, or transformation activities. Vendors should describe their proposed approach, tools, technologies, and resources for supporting these activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q271. Is the vendor expected to design/configure automated data integrations between AchieveIt and other state systems (such as the DHIN)?

A271. The RFP does not specifically require the selected vendor(s) to design or configure automated integrations between AchieveIt and other State systems. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting data collection, reporting, coordination, tracking, and related activities associated with the selected component(s), including any proposed tools, technologies, or integration approaches.

Q272. Is the vendor expected to manually enter any programmatic/financial data (such as data provided by subrecipients) into AchieveIt or other state systems?

A272. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support data entry, tracking, reporting, and related administrative activities within AchieveIt or other applicable systems associated with the selected component(s) as described in the RFP. The specific level of data entry and system support activities may vary based on initiative needs and operational requirements throughout the contract period.

Q273. How are subrecipients currently expected to provide DPH with programmatic/financial progress updates (such as through AchieveIt, DHIN, etc.)?

A273. Subrecipient reporting processes, systems, and tools may vary across initiatives based on operational needs, implementation structures, and applicable reporting requirements. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support coordination, tracking, monitoring, reporting, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s), including activities involving systems or platforms identified in the RFP, such as AchieveIt, as applicable.

Q274. Does DPH already have established communication protocols, standardized templates, or defined cadences for communicating with subrecipients, or should proposers include an approach for designing, implementing, and managing the subrecipient communication strategy?

A274. Vendors should describe their approach form communication, coordination, reporting,

stakeholder engagement, and related subrecipient engagement activities associated with the selected component(s), including any proposed communication structures, templates, or meeting cadences.

Q275. For initiatives involving funding administration, does DPH anticipate one or multiple funding cycles or procurement cycles annually?

A275. Funding administration activities, procurements, and related implementation processes may vary across initiatives based on operational needs, funding structures, procurement timelines, and program requirements throughout the contract period. Multiple funding or procurement activities may occur throughout the year as applicable to the selected component(s).

Q276. Which specific initiatives will the vendor be required to provide program coordination across?

A276. The selected vendor(s) will be expected to support activities across all RHTP initiatives in alignment with the selected component(s).

Q277. Approximately how many subrecipients does DPH envision the vendor being required to interact with?

A277. The number of subrecipients, contractors, and implementation partners may vary across the initiatives based on initiative structure, operational needs, procurement activities, funding arrangements, and stages of implementation.

Q278. Does DPH maintain standardized reporting templates or reporting tools that subrecipients will use, or should the Offeror anticipate developing these materials?

A278. DPH will provide reporting templates, tools, guidance, or other reporting processes associated with RHTP implementation and applicable CMS requirements. Vendors should also describe their proposed approach to supporting reporting, tracking, monitoring, evaluation, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s).

Q279. Approximately how many subrecipients does Delaware intend on having?

A279. The number of subrecipients, contractors, and implementation partners may vary across the initiatives based on initiative structure, operational needs, procurement activities, funding arrangements, and stages of implementation.

Q280. Are there anticipated subrecipients, as defined by CMS for RHTP, for all 15 initiatives, or will Delaware be leveraging consultants or contractors to execute some initiatives? Will the awarded vendor have any engagement with DE's consultants or contractors?

A280. RHTP implementation may involve a combination of subrecipients, contractors, consultants, and other entities across the 15 initiatives, depending on initiative structure and operational needs.

The selected vendor(s) may be expected to coordinate and engage with subrecipients, contractors, consultants, state agencies, and other relevant stakeholders in support of the selected component(s) and RHTP activities throughout the contract period.

Q281. [Re: #2 under "Coordination Component"] – What is the State's intended role in confirming or reviewing guidance to be given by the awarded vendor to subrecipients?

A281. DPH will maintain overall programmatic and administrative oversight responsibilities for the RHTP award. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to coordinate with DPH regarding guidance, reporting, monitoring, communication, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s) as described in the RFP. The specific processes for review, coordination, and communication may vary based on operational needs and initiative structure throughout the contract period.

Q282. What type of audit does Delaware expect for "Conduct periodic audits to ensure alignment with project goals and approved budget"?

A282. "Periodic audits" as referenced in the RFP may include monitoring, review, validation, reporting, coordination, compliance, budget alignment, or related oversight activities associated with the selected component(s). The RFP does not prescribe a specific audit framework, methodology, or format for these activities. Vendors should describe their proposed approach within their proposal.

Q283. What are Delaware's expectations for the comprehensive evaluation framework?

A283. The evaluation framework should support program-wide monitoring, reporting, performance tracking, data validation, outcome measurement, and related evaluation activities associated with the RHTP award and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to evaluation, reporting, performance measurement, data collection, analysis, coordination, and related support activities associated with the scope of work described in the RFP.

Q284. Will Delaware provide the awarded vendor with full access to its AchieveIt platform? Are there any expected costs to the awarded vendor in order to use AchieveIt?

A284. DPH anticipates providing access to the AchieveIt platform for activities associated with the RHTP award, as applicable to the selected component(s).

Q285. How does Delaware intend for the awarded vendor to engage with CMS? If questions arise from subrecipients, regarding CMS reporting, etc., how will the awarded vendor engage with Delaware to submit or discuss these with CMS in a timely manner?

A285. DPH, as the recipient and administrator of the RHTP award, will maintain primary responsibility

for communications and interactions with CMS. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support coordination, reporting, tracking, monitoring, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s), including coordination related to CMS reporting processes and requests, as applicable. Specific communication and escalation processes may be established throughout the contract period based on operational needs and applicable reporting requirements.

Q286. Is there an estimated or maximum budget amount for these services?

A286. The RFP does not identify an estimated or maximum budget. Vendors should propose budgets that are reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q287. Can DPH confirm whether the selected vendor(s) will be given access to the AchieveIt platform?

A287. DPH anticipates providing access to the AchieveIt platform for activities associated with the RHTP award, as applicable to the selected component(s).

Q288. The RFP allows vendors to propose for one or both program components (Coordination and/or Monitoring & Evaluation), but does not clarify whether a vendor can propose to support only a subset of the 15 initiatives within a chosen component, or whether the expectation is full coverage of all 15. Reference: Appendix B, p. 46

A288. Vendors proposing for a selected component should propose approaches capable of supporting the full scope of RHTP activities associated with that component across the RHTP initiatives. Vendors should clearly describe their proposed approach, activities, and level of support for the selected component(s).

Q289. The RFP allows vendors to propose for one or both components and outlines overlapping responsibilities (e.g., reporting, subrecipient oversight, data tracking).

How does DPH plan to delineate responsibilities and expected deliverables between the Coordination Component and the Monitoring & Evaluation Component and how will responsibilities be assigned and managed if different vendors are awarded each component?

A289. The Coordination Component and the Monitoring & Evaluation Component are intended to support distinct but complementary functions described in the RFP. Vendors should clearly describe their proposed roles, responsibilities, deliverables, coordination processes, and communication approaches for the selected component(s). If different vendors are awarded each component, DPH will coordinate with the selected vendors to establish roles, reporting expectations, communication processes, and operational coordination necessary to support

successful implementation of the RHTP activities.

Q290. The vendor is expected to serve as a primary point of contact for subrecipients across the 15 initiatives. Approximately how many subrecipient organizations are currently anticipated, and will a full subrecipient list be made available prior to contract execution? Reference: Appendix B, p. 46

A290. The number of subrecipients, contractors, and implementation partners may vary across the initiatives based on initiative structure, operational needs, procurement activities, funding arrangements, and stages of implementation.

Q291. The technical proposal requires a staffing plan, but the RFP does not specify a minimum number of full-time equivalents (FTEs) or required on-site presence in Delaware. Is there a minimum staffing expectation, and are there any requirements for staff to be physically located in Delaware? Reference: Appendix B, p. 48; RFP p. 4

A291. The RFP does not establish a minimum staffing requirement, minimum number of FTEs, or a requirement for staff to be physically located in Delaware. Work is expected to be performed primarily remotely. Limited in-person engagement activities, including stakeholder meetings, site visits, coordination activities, qualitative information gathering, or other implementation-related activities within Delaware may occur on an as-needed or ad hoc basis depending on operational needs, initiative activities, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed staffing approach and organizational structure in relation to the scope of work described in the RFP.

Q292. The RFP does not state a not-to-exceed budget or funding ceiling for this oversight contract. Can the State provide the anticipated budget range or maximum award value for each component to help vendors structure realistic proposals? Reference: RFP p. 2; Appendix F

A292. The RFP does not identify a total budget estimate or ceiling, either by component or by year. Vendors should propose budgets that are reasonable, clearly justified, and aligned with the proposed scope of services, staffing, activities, and deliverables.

Q293. Can DHSS provide additional detail regarding the anticipated evaluation framework? Specifically, will the selected vendor be expected to develop evaluation questions, logic models, measures, methodologies, and reporting structures, or will the vendor primarily align its work to an existing CMS-approved or State-developed framework?

A293. The evaluation framework may continue to evolve throughout implementation of the RHTP initiatives and may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, CMS requirements, reporting expectations, and the selected component(s). Certain reporting requirements, measures, or evaluation expectations may already exist, while the selected vendor(s) may also be expected to support development, refinement, coordination, implementation, validation, and

reporting activities related to evaluation questions, methodologies, measures, logic models, tracking, and reporting structures associated with the selected component(s).

Q294. The RFP references quarterly and annual reports to CMS but does not specify the exact format, template, or data elements required by CMS. Will DPH provide the vendor with CMS reporting templates and requirements prior to or upon contract award? Reference: Appendix B, p. 47

A294. DPH will provide applicable reporting requirements, guidance, and available reporting materials associated with the RHTP award as appropriate throughout the contract period. Certain CMS reporting templates, formats, and data specifications may continue to evolve or be refined.

Q295. The RFP references quarterly and annual reports to CMS but does not specify the exact format, template, or data elements required by CMS. Will DPH provide the vendor with CMS reporting templates and requirements prior to or upon contract award? Reference: Appendix B, p. 47

A295. DPH will provide applicable reporting requirements, guidance, and available reporting materials associated with the RHTP award as appropriate throughout the contract period. Certain CMS reporting templates, formats, and data specifications may continue to evolve or be refined.

Q296. What data sources and systems does DPH anticipate making available to the selected vendor(s) for program oversight, monitoring, and evaluation activities? Examples may include Medicaid claims or encounter data, public health datasets, hospital utilization data, workforce data, DHIN or Smart Health Network data, provider or FQHC data, subrecipient-reported data, and qualitative or community input.

A296. The data sources, systems, reporting processes, and information available to the selected vendor(s) may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, applicable approvals, data governance considerations, data availability, and the selected component(s). This may include programmatic, operational, reporting, performance, workforce, utilization, subrecipient-reported, qualitative, or other information associated with RHTP implementation activities, as applicable.

Q297. The evaluation criteria awards 10 points for "partnerships and coordination strategy," but the RFP does not identify required teaming partners or preferred organizations. Can DPH clarify what types of partnerships or coordination approaches are considered most advantageous for scoring purposes? Reference: RFP p. 15

A297. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to coordination, communication, stakeholder engagement, and collaboration with partners involved in RHTP implementation, such as DPH, other DHSS division, other State agencies, subrecipients, contractors, healthcare providers, community-based organizations, and other relevant stakeholders. Proposals will be evaluated based on the vendor's demonstrated approach to supporting effective coordination and

implementation of the selected component(s) consistent with the evaluation criteria identified in the RFP.

Q298. The RFP states that selected vendors may be invited to make oral presentations, and that presentations will be "scored or ranked," but does not provide a scoring rubric or weighting for the oral presentation stage. Will an oral presentation scoring breakdown be provided in advance, and will it affect the original 100-point scoring?

A298. Any oral presentations or related follow-up activities will be conducted in accordance with the RFP and applicable procurement requirements. If applicable, additional information regarding presentation logistics or evaluation considerations will be provided to selected vendors during the procurement process.

Q299. What are the State's expectations regarding data governance, data sharing agreements, privacy/security review, and timelines for obtaining access to sensitive or protected data necessary to support monitoring and evaluation activities?

A299. Vendors must comply with all applicable federal, State, confidentiality, privacy, security, records management, and data management requirements identified in the RFP and contract documents. Data governance processes, data sharing requirements, approvals, and timelines for access to sensitive or protected information may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, applicable laws and regulations, data availability, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting data governance, privacy, security, access management, reporting, and related monitoring and evaluation activities within their proposal.

Q300. What level of authority and responsibility does DPH expect the vendor to exercise in overseeing subrecipients (e.g. advisory guidance vs. formal enforcement of compliance, budget adherences and corrective action planning and management)?

A300. DPH will maintain overall programmatic and administrative oversight responsibilities for the RHTP award. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support subrecipient monitoring, reporting, budget tracking, compliance support, issue identification and escalation, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s), as described in the RFP. The RFP does not authorize selected vendor(s) to independently exercise formal enforcement authority on behalf of DPH.

Q301. How will those responsibilities be coordinated with DPH staff involvement and decision-making authority?

A301. DPH will maintain overall programmatic and administrative oversight responsibilities and decision-making authority for the RHTP award. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to coordinate with DPH. The specific coordination processes and allocation of responsibilities may

vary based on operational needs and initiative structure throughout the contract period.

Q302. Can DPH provide any additional expectations or insights regarding the frequency, format, and level of detail for coordination activities (e.g., subrecipient meetings, cross initiative convenings, reporting cycles), including any required templates or cadence beyond quarterly and annual reporting?

A302. The frequency, format, and level of detail for coordination activities may vary based on initiative needs, implementation status, operational priorities, and the selected vendor's proposed approach. Vendors should describe proposed approaches for communication, coordination, reporting, stakeholder engagement, meeting cadence, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s). Any required reporting processes, templates, or deliverables will be further defined through contract management and implementation activities as applicable.

Q303. How does DPH envision the coordination vendor facilitating integration across the 15 RHTP initiatives (e.g., shared performance management, any cross-initiative dependencies, or joint project milestones)?

A303. DPH envisions coordination activities that support visibility, communication, reporting consistency, milestone tracking, and overall implementation alignment across the 15 RHTP initiatives. This may include coordination related to shared reporting processes, tracking of initiative progress and deliverables, identification of cross-initiative dependencies, stakeholder communication, and support for overall program management activities associated with the RHTP award. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting coordination and integration across the RHTP initiatives.

Q304. If the desired outcome is coordination through cross-initiative integration, would the integration goals best be defined as administrative governance or strategic integration, or both?

A304. DPH envisions coordination activities that support both administrative governance and strategic integration across the RHTP initiatives. This may include support for reporting consistency, milestone and performance tracking, stakeholder coordination, communication, implementation alignment, and identification of cross-initiative dependencies associated with the RHTP award as described in the RFP. Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting these coordination activities within the selected component(s).

Q305. For the "comprehensive evaluation framework," does DPH envision the Monitoring & Evaluation Component as primarily focused on performance monitoring and outcomes reporting, or does DPH expect more formal impact evaluation methods, such as pre/post analysis, comparison groups, quasi-experimental designs, or cost/return-on-investment analyses?

A305. The Monitoring & Evaluation Component may include a range of monitoring, reporting, analytical, and evaluation activities depending on initiative structure, operational needs, CMS requirements,

data availability, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed evaluation approach, methodologies, and analytical framework within their proposal.

Q306. How does DPH envision the operating model for the Monitoring & Evaluation Component across the contract year? Specifically, what cadence and level of effort should vendors anticipate for routine monitoring, data review, dashboard support, subrecipient follow-up, analytic updates, and written reporting beyond quarterly and annual CMS-related reporting requirements?

A306. The cadence and level of effort for Monitoring & Evaluation activities may vary based on initiative needs. Vendors should describe their proposed operating model and approach to supporting ongoing monitoring, reporting, coordination, and evaluation activities within their proposal.

Q307. Are all 15 RHTP initiatives expected to have the same level of monitoring and evaluation, or does DPH anticipate more rigorous or specialized evaluation approaches for selected initiatives?

A307. The level and type of monitoring and evaluation activities may vary across initiatives based on initiative structure, operational needs, implementation status, reporting requirements, and CMS requirements. Certain initiatives may require different levels or types of monitoring, reporting, analytical, or evaluation support.

Q308. Does DPH expect the Monitoring & Evaluation vendor to conduct primary data collection, such as interviews, focus groups, surveys, etc?

A308. The level and type of data collection activities may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, reporting requirements, implementation status, and the selected component(s). Vendors should describe their proposed approach to supporting qualitative and quantitative data collection and related monitoring and evaluation activities within their proposal.

Q309. In general, the level of effort for program coordination for some of the 15 initiatives may depend on how far along those initiatives have already progressed. Should we assume that these initiatives are all in the early stages of development for purposes of assessing level of effort?

A309. At the time of contract award, RHTP initiatives may be in varying stages of implementation and operational development. Some initiatives and related implementation activities may already be underway or further advanced than others. Vendors should propose approaches capable of supporting initiatives across varying stages of implementation and operational maturity.

Q310. Will the contractor be expected to support the competitive procurement process for the rural community health hubs or the two new Hope Centers?

A310. The selected vendor's role may include coordination, reporting, monitoring, and other grant management support activities associated with RHTP implementation activities under the selected component(s), as described in the RFP. Some initiative procurements or agreements

may already be completed or underway at the time of contract award, and the specific level of vendor involvement in individual implementation activities may vary throughout the contract period.

Q311. What role will the contractor play in working with FQHCs and their partners to prepare for the transition to VBC? Will the contractor be required to provide technical assistance on the transition to VBC or on various approaches to VBC?

A311. The selected vendor's role is intended to support RHTP grant implementation activities associated with the selected component(s), including coordination, reporting, tracking, monitoring, milestone management, and related grant oversight activities, as described in the RFP. The RFP does not require the selected vendor to serve as the primary provider of Value-Based Care technical assistance to FQHCs or their partners.

Q312. What role with the contractor play in supporting the DE Healthcare Commission in the "Train Here, Stay Here" workforce development strategy? Will the contractor be monitoring progress and providing support? Will the contractor be involved in the process of making financial awards at all?

A312. The selected vendor's role may include coordination, monitoring, reporting, tracking, and other grant management support activities associated with workforce development initiatives under the selected component(s), as described in the RFP. The RFP does not required the selected vendor to administer or make financial awards under the "Train Here Stay Here" initiative.

Q313. How much progress has the State already made on the SHN and the DHIN in building digital infrastructure? Will the contractor be required to provide TA to support the ongoing development of these digital assets?

A313. The selected vendor(s) may be expected to support coordination, reporting, monitoring, tracking, evaluation, and related grant management activities associated with the selected component(s), which may involved coordination with initiatives, systems, or entities related to digital infrastructure and data-sharing activities. The RFP does not required the selected vendor(s) to serve as the primary technical assistance provider for development of digital infrastructure assets.

Q314. What types of data analytics is the State anticipating will be part of the Monitoring and Evaluation component of the SOW?

A314. The types of data analytics associated with the Monitoring & Evaluation Component may vary based on initiative structure, operational needs, CMS requirements, reporting expectations, data availability, and the selected component(s). This may include activities related to performance monitoring, implementation tracking, reporting, trend analysis, data validation, outcome measurement, dashboard support, quality assurance, operational analysis, and related monitoring and evaluation activities. Vendors should describe their proposed analytical

approach, methodologies, tools, and technologies within their proposal.

Q315. Will the State provide additional guidance on completing the Template Appendix E – Sample Workplan Template and Template Appendix F – Project Cost Template? For the latter, does the State anticipate a separate phase/activity description for each of the 15 initiatives in its RHT program?

A315. No additional guidance documents are anticipated at this time. Vendors may complete Appendix E and Appendix F in a manner that best reflects their proposed approach, workplan, activities, deliverables, and costs for the selected component(s). The State does not require vendors to provide a separate phase or activity description for each of the 15 initiatives unless proposed as part of the vendor's approach. If the provided templates do not fully meet a vendor's needs, vendors may supplement or adapt the format, provided all required information identified in the RFP is clearly addressed.

Q316. Will the State provide vendor access to the existing AchieveIt environment, or is the vendor expected to procure and configure it from scratch? What data is already in the system?

A316. The AchieveIt platform has been procured and related implementation and tracking activities may already be established or underway at the time of contract award. The selected vendor may be tasked with assisting with revisions to the platform architecture, dashboard development, workflow design, and reporting configuration. The state will provide the vendor with AchieveIt licenses and appropriate training.

Q317. The RFP references a "separate Word document" for the Scope of Services (Appendix B, Section C), but only the PDF was posted. Is there additional scope documentation we should have received?

A317. The PDF RFP document posted for this solicitation contains the Scope of Services requirements. There is no additional separate scope document associated with this solicitation.