

E-MAIL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
March 21, 2019 through March 29, 2019
for
RFP 12-2019

**City and County of San Francisco, Department of Public Health
San Francisco Health Network**



Request for Proposals (RFP) 12-2019

**ENVIRONMENT HEALTH MANAGEMENT SYSTEM/ SOLUTION
(EHMS)**

PLEASE NOTE THE PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DEADLINE HAS BEEN EXTENDED

Proposals are now due on or before 12:00 pm Monday, April 29, 2019

MANDATORY Letters of Intent are due on or before Friday April 5, 2019

1. Can the City extend the due date of the response by 2 – 4 weeks?
Answer: The due date is extended to **April 29, 2019** at noon PDT.
2. What is the total number full-time equivalent (FTE) *inspectors and supervisors* in EHB? (Do not require a complete staff breakdown, only seeking the FTE inspector and supervisor count.)
Answer: Environmental Health has a total of 165 FTE all of whom may be authorized users of the new system.
3. Will any data migration from EHB's current (non-automated) standalone system to the new EHMS be required as part of the scope of this project?
Answer: Active accounts will be migrated from the old system to the new system on a one-time batch conversion process to be determined by the selected Vendor.
4. Please provide a detailed integration scope for each of the following external systems:
Some external systems use real time APIs and others use batch files.
 - a. Recology
Answer: Receive and Reconcile a weekly flat file from Recology.
 - b. Oracle Applications
Answer: The City uses PeopleSoft financials & SCM (supplier chain management), it will be expected that the Vendor can integrate with that system.
 - c. Aumentum
Answer: Receive and Reconcile a bi-monthly flat file from Aumentum for Permits & Licensing.
 - d. Hyland Onbase
Answer: Treasury & Tax real time API for processing online applications and payments
 - e. SharePoint
Answer: We are open to a common solution for file/permit/document storage. We are currently moving our files into SharePoint, but are open to other solutions.
5. Regarding the additional documentation required for all requirements tables (Technical-B3, Hosting- B4, Implementation- B5, Operational Support Services- B6), you've indicated the additional documentation must be submitted as Appendices B-3 through B-6 and in a binder. Please confirm vendors are only required to submit one (1) bound hard copy of each Appendix.
Answer: Vendors are required to submit 1 original and 5 copies of all submissions (including the attachments B-Budget and B1 to B7)
6. Will selected vendor be required to execute the City and County of San Francisco agreements provided in Attachment 3 (P-540, P-545, P-600, P-648), or is SFDPH willing to execute the selected vendor's standard agreement?
Answer: As stated under Section IX City Contract Requirements of the RFP (page 35), selected vendors are required to enter into a contract with the City, in the form of the Agreement provided in the attachment A-3 folder (P-540, P-545, P-600, P-648).

7. The RFP indicates “e-questions” can be submitted between 3/21/19 and 3/29/19. Please provide the latest possible date vendors can expect answers to their questions.
- Answer:** The standard time for issuing answers is a week from the email question end date, which is April 5, 2019. However, for this RFP, the department will make an effort to issue the answers before April 5, so interested applicants can have a day before submitting their letter of intent. Note – A letter of intent is mandatory and is due before 5pm on or before **April 5, 2019**. The email answers will be posted on DPH website (see link below) and will only be emailed to those who have submitted questions and to those who have downloaded the RFP from the DPH site, using the tracking form.
<http://www.sfdph.org/dph/comupg/aboutdph/insideDept/Contracts/>
8. Regarding the schedule vendors are required to complete provided on RFP page 8 of 39, what should vendors use as anticipated start date? Will the RFP award date, followed by contract negotiations and execution, dictate the project commencement date? These dates are unknown. Do you want all vendors to build this schedule around a SFDPH *desired* start date?
- Answer:** All vendors should build their schedules using the desired/anticipated start date of July 1, 2019. This actual start date may be later, depending on contract negotiations and execution, however it is not expected to be earlier.
9. Regarding RFP 12-2019 proposal submissions, please confirm which of the following forms are **required** to be included in the vendor’s response package:
- Form CMD-12B-101- Declaration: Non Discrimination in Contracts & Benefits – **Required after selection**
 - Employers’ Projection of Entry Level Positions – **Required after selection**
 - Health Care Accountability Ordinance (HCAO) Declaration – **Required after selection**
 - Minimum Compensation Ordinance (MCO) Declaration – **Required after selection**
 - FORM 2A: CMD CONTRACT PARTICIPATION FORM – **Not Required**
 - FORM 2B: GOOD FAITH OUTREACH” REQUIREMENTS FORM – **Not Required**
 - FORM 3: CMD COMPLIANCE AFFIDAVIT - **Required**
 - FORM 4: CMD JOINT VENTURE FORM – **Not Required**
 - FORM 5: CMD EMPLOYMENT FORM – **Not Required**
- Answer:** See above for what is required and what forms are not required. Note, items “b, c and d”, MCO, HCAO and Employer Projection of Entry level positions forms are not required at the time of proposal submissions but must be completed and submitted within 5 working days after the notification of contract selection.
10. I am not able to participate in this, but as a Tier 2 vendor, I would be pleased to quote IT hardware and software for your department. May I know whom I should contact?
- Answer:** We are not soliciting subcontracting services under this RFP, however, vendors may request a list of RFP “holders” to use for your own outreach.
11. What is the estimated cost of the Environmental Health Management System/Solution project?
- Answer:** DPH-EH expects that vendors proposal budgets may differ widely depending on numerous factors, therefore we are not publishing an estimated cost. If the cost associated with

the highest scoring proposal exceeds the allocated budget then cost-reduction will be included in the contract negotiation process.

12. Has the Department allocated funding for the Environmental Health Management System/Solution yet? If so, through which source (budget, CIP, state/federal grant etc)?
Answer: This project is funded locally by internal funds set-aside by the Environmental Health Branch.
13. How is the Department currently meeting this need? Which vendor provides the incumbent Environmental Health Management System/Solution?
Answer: The core of the DPH Environmental Health Branch application portfolio, known as Environmental Health Database (EHD), is a multi-layered application, in which presentation, application processing, and data management functions are separated. EHD is a “homegrown” system of 15 largely siloed databases for data storage and management. The bulk of the data exist on individual SQL Server databases. Additionally, a handful of third-party tools and some internally developed solutions for GIS reporting exist.
14. Who is the technical contact and/or project manager for the Environmental Health Management System/Solution?
Answer: The Contract Analyst for this RFP is the single point of contact for the RFP. Technical questions regarding the RFP are asked during the email-question period. The Contract Analyst obtains appropriate responses from program and/or project management staff and provide responses to all RFP holders when the e-question responses are sent out
15. Would it be possible to name the three greatest challenges the Department is having with the current solution?
Answer: Environmental Health has identified the following classic problems that have emerged over the years:
 - Data store fragmentation
 - Lack of application communication
 - Lack of global application standards
 - EH data incompatible with State databases and reporting requirements
 - Emergence of “work arounds”
 - Unlinked and unsearchable shared storage and artifacts
16. Which other systems will have to integrate or interface with the Environmental Health Management System/Solution, and will the State provide incumbent vendors for each system?
Answer: Please see question 4.
17. What is the number of users anticipated for the Environmental Health Management System/Solution?
Answer: Please see question 2.
18. Will the City please clarify when responses to all questions will be addressed by?
Answer: see answers from question 7.

19. Is the City receptive to having a solution that is custom-built to specifically address the City's requirements? Or is the City's preference to have a pre-built solution to the greatest degree possible?

Answer: The city prefers a configurable off-the-shelf solution.

20. Is the City receptive to leveraging offshore resources (where possible) to fulfill work efforts?

Answer: No. Must be remotely hosted in the United States of America. Furthermore see answers of question 58.

21. Is the client willing to utilize an agile development methodology?

Answer: Yes

22. In Attachment B2 (Functional Requirements), there are requirements related to appointments (1-11). Is it required or preferred to have appointment-related functionality integrated with the City's existing e-mail/calendaring tool?

Answer: Integration with the city's email/calendaring tool is not required, however integration with the city's email system (Outlook) may be desirable. Vendor proposals should address the ability to set deadlines to complete inspections, or take other actions such as send letter, enforcement orders. Frequencies are based on different elements depending on the program—for example some business activities require annual or biannual inspections, others require event-driven inspections.

23. In Section II.A (System Functional Requirements) on page 7, there is reference to integration of the proposed solution to a separate billing system from City partners. Will the City please clarify the requirement to integrate with external billing systems and how many?

Answer: See question 4.

24. In Attachment B2 (Functional Requirements), there are requirements related to data storage (83-85). Will the City please clarify how much existing data needs to be stored? Are there projections for future data needs?

Answer: See question 3.

25. In Attachment B2 (Functional Requirements), there is a requirement to upload documents (83-85). Will the City please clarify how many existing documents need to be uploaded? Are there projections for the number of future documents that need to be uploaded?

Answer: See question 3.

26. In Attachment B2 (Functional Requirements), there is a requirement to create forms based on City-provided templates (90). Will the City please clarify how many existing forms/templates need to be incorporated within the proposed solution?

Answer: Due to the fragmented nature of the current system, the current state where each program has its own specific forms for different needs does not reflect the anticipated future state where information will be collected in a more uniform manner. The current forms utilized by Environmental Health are available by searching:

<https://www.google.com/search?q=%22application%22+site:www.sfdph.org/dph/files/ehsdocs>

[+filetype:pdf](#)

27. In Attachment B2 (Functional Requirements), there are requirements related to Letters and Notices (101-108). Will the City please clarify how many existing letter/notice templates need to be incorporated within the proposed solution?

Answer: : Due to the fragmented nature of the current system, the current state where each program has its own Letters and Notices for different needs does not reflect the anticipated future state where Notices and Letters will be generated in a more uniform manner.

28. In Attachment B2 (Functional Requirements), there is reference to requirements for Standard Reports (195-196). Will the City please clarify how many existing reports need to be incorporated within the proposed solution?

Answer: Currently individual reports require SQL to be written on a request-by-request basis, and an entire development cycle spent, per user need. Reporting objects, queries, and access methods are not standardized.

29. (Functional Requirements) May we obtain "screen shots" from the correct in-house system. Primary screens that would be a representative sample of fields and types of data currently collected.

Answer: See question 13.

30. (Functional Requirements) Will the City assign a lead resource to support Change Management functions? If so, what level of FTE?

Answer: As part of their proposals, vendor should propose Vendor Tasks and City Tasks for change management as described in Scope of Work Part IV.A.d.

31. (Functional Requirements) D 7.d Please provide more details about the reporting required to meet CCSF, DPH, State and Federal Standards. Please specify which standards to which the solution must be compliant.

Answer: This requirement refers to our mandatory external regulatory reporting. For example, data collected for the Unified Program Administration must conform to the data dictionary values defined in the Unified Program Data Dictionary, as well as follow the applicable Compliance, Monitoring and Enforcement (CME) Business Rules defined in the current version of the CERS Business Rules document (California Environmental Reporting System). The system must be capable of generating CME data that conforms exactly to the structure of the CME template provided in CERS (exact match of columns headings and order, as well as worksheet names).

32. (Technical) Has the City initiated, or completed a data cleansing effort, from the current in-house system?

Answer: See question 3.

33. (Functional Requirements) Attachment B5, User Training, Requirement #I-41 and #I-42. Please describe what level of work effort the City will be taking responsibility for regarding training content creation, and training delivery. What is the estimate number of EH staff that need to be

trained on the new system?

Answer: As part of their proposals, vendor should propose Vendor Tasks and City Tasks for User Training as described in Scope of Work Part IV.A.e. Environmental Health has a total of 165 FTE.

34. (Technical) How many systems will need to be integrated? Which integrations are unidirectional / bi-directional? How many data tables will be integrated? Will the integrations synchronize data, provide data views to the external system, or pull in data-on-demand?

Answer: See question 4.

35. (Technical) Attachment B3.T109 -> Can City share number of SFDPH IT Systems to be integrated along with details of interfaces like Mode of data transfer (like Real Time/Batch), Protocol (HTTP, FTP, Messaging etc.), Volume, Number of layouts.

Answer: Not applicable. See Answer #4

36. (Technical) Attachment B3.T110 -> Can city share the list of external systems to be integrated with and details of interfaces?

Answer: See question 4.

37. (Technical) Attachment B3.T120 -> W.r.t. requirements "The System shall provide the ability to automatically extract batch data and SFTP to external agencies based on SFDPH requirements.". Does City require batch data to be extracted in any specific format or system is free to choose the data format/layout? Can city share number of tables to be extracted?

Answer: Standard protocols need to be applied, but open to vendor solutions.

38. (Technical) C.8 Which mobile tablet Operating Systems and Hardware versions would have to be supported?

Answer: Per Scope of Work IV.A.b, vendor proposals should provide guidance for hardware needs and procurement.

39. (Technical) C.9 Please describe in more detail which GIS capabilities that will be required. How many data layers will need to be supported by the GIS capabilities?

Answer: Vendor should propose a GIS solution that, at a minimum, uses the city's Enterprise Addressing System (EAS) as a data domain (dropdown) for addresses entered into forms

40. (Technical) C.11 Does a document management solution already exist? If so, please provide the name of the solution, the version, and whether it is a hosted or on premise solution?

Answer: DPH Environmental Health currently uses a variety of document management strategies.

41. (Technical) C.11 Will video and video streaming be required from the document management system?

Answer: Video and video streaming are not a requirement.

42. (Technical) D 7.c Please describe in more detail the definition of "Secure data transmissions." (presumed to be AES-256)

Answer: Correct AES-256. Must be able to stay current with standard encryption to meet current standards for NPI and financial transactions.

43. (Technical) D.8.b Would a lower availability be allowed? (99%)

Answer: No. – Scheduled maintenance on weekends and post business hours would be acceptable. 99% availability required during PST business hours.

44. (Technical) H. Which mobile platforms must support offline inspections?

Answer: See question 38.

45. (Technical) H. What payment gateways must be supported?

Answer: See question 4.

46. (Technical) Attachment B3.T121 -> Data Migration - how many data sources will be migrated into the system? How many Tables? How many fields / table? How many records per data source?

Answer: See question 3.

47. (Technical) What hardware, other than the hardware required to run the application will be required to be procured? (i.e., mobile devices, printers)

Answer: See question 38.

48. (Technical) How many users of the system (internal and external)?

Answer: See question 2.

49. (Technical) For external users, how frequently will they be accessing the system or what is their usage profile (i.e., 10,000 external users who login an average of 1 time a month with 50% never logging into the portal?)

Answer: All users of the main system will be City employees. Interactions with external users will typically be to submit online permit applications and to pay fees. There are approximately 13,000 active permits-to-operate at this time, with 50 to 200 new permit applications received each month. Some programs collect non-permit fees that could invite external user interaction with the EHMS.

50. (Technical) Is middleware available (i.e., Mulesoft, Enterprise Service Bus (ESB))?

Answer: No.

51. (Technical) Can you provide a complete list of the existing business & financial systems (and their supporting technology platforms) the EHMS must interface with (such as Aumentum, CERS, Recology, etc.).

Answer: See question 4.

52. (Technical) Do all of these existing systems to be integrated with support web service/API access?

Answer: Existing systems do not. See answers to question #4 – many will not be real time New

system needs to have ability to integrate with systems in Question #4

53. (Technical) Does SFDPH have existing SOA/integration technology for system interoperability that they prefer to use?

Answer: No

54. (Technical) In regards to the "virtualizable" requirement of T-002, will SFDPH consider a solution on a cloud architecture that is not virtualized?

Answer: Yes.

55. (Technical) What is the total number of anticipated internal "Authorized Users" who will need access to the system to perform the functionality described in Time & Task Management, Billing, Document Management & Reporting

Answer: See question 2.

56. (Technical) How many internal "Authorized Users" you anticipate will need access to the system to perform the field inspection functionality described in Permits & Enforcement?

Answer: See question 2.

57. (Technical) How many external "Authorized Users" you anticipate will need access to the system for online applications & payment for permitting and licensing?

Answer: See question 49

58. Page 05, Section I (Introduction), A (General), 2. (Companies Headquartered in Certain States) outlines a State where the software publisher does business and/or has an office. However, work will not occur in this state for this potential engagement. Does this preclude us, the Systems Integrator, from being awarded work with San Francisco?

Answer: As stated in the RFP on page 5 section I.A2, this Contract is subject to the requirements of Administrative Code Chapter 12X, which prohibits the City from entering into contracts with companies headquartered in states with laws that perpetuate discrimination against LGBT populations, or where any or all of the work on the contract will be performed in any of those states. A list of states on the Covered State List is available at the website of the City Administrator.

If your firm chooses to submit a proposal for consideration, and your firm is the successful respondent to the RFP, your firm will need to comply with the requirements of 12X in order to enter into a contract with the City. For your reference, below is a link to 12X

<https://sfgsa.org/sites/default/files/Document/AdminCodeChapter12X.PDF>

59. We would request an extension (2-4 weeks from current due date if possible).

Answer: See question 1.

60. Are there any specific start dates for the project to begin and/or are there any deadlines for your new solution to be live in production?

Answer: See question 9.

61. Please provide your top 5 main points that is leading you to move from your legacy system.
[Answer: See question 15.](#)
62. Is the expectation that your centralized IT and/or IT department will maintain tier 1 and 2 support for the solution after Go Live?
[Answer: Per Scope of Work IV.A.i, vendors should propose city tasks for post Go Live.](#)
63. SMEs availability throughout the project is key to a successful implementation. What allocation is available for your SMEs over the life of the project? (i.e. participation in workshops, attending train the trainer sessions, perform/assist in performing UAT, etc)
[Answer: Per Scope of Work IV.A., vendors should propose city tasks for these elements.](#)
64. Would you prefer UAT to be managed by the vendor or internally by your project team?
[Answer: Per Scope of Work IV.A.i, vendors should propose city tasks for UAT management.](#)
65. What is the budget for the implementation?
[Answer: See questions 11 and 12.](#)
66. Does DPH know how many estimated internal users there will be for the new solution?
[Answer: See question 2.](#)
67. How Many inspectors does DPH have?
[Answer: See question 2.](#)
68. Does the city have biometrics technology currently in place for other IT Systems? if so can you disclose the vendor/technology?
[Answer: Unknown/Not applicable.](#)
69. What is the current DPH document management system?
[Answer: See question 40.](#)
70. Is there a list or number of interfaces required with DHP EHMS Solution?
[Answer: See question 4.](#)
71. Will there be any sharing of information with treasurer and Tax Collector for business licensing as part of this EHMS Solution?
[Answer: See question 4.](#)
72. Will permits issued by DPH be offered for in person applications?
[Answer: Yes.](#)
73. Does DPH or the City have a POS solution?
[Answer: Vendors may propose integration with any POS solution.](#)
74. Who maintains address point, parcel, and GIS data for the city?
[Answer: The San Francisco Department of Technology works with Planning and the Assessor to update, publish, and maintain the Enterprise Addressing System \(EAS\), which contains address, and parcel info. With respect to "who maintains GIS data", nearly every department in the city](#)

maintains GIS data in some capacity.

75. Will this proposed solution be required to interface with it?

Answer: Yes the proposed solution will need to interface with the Enterprise Addressing System (EAS).

76. Can a list of existing legacy data fields or data dictionary be provided during RFP process? As a data dictionary or list of current legacy fields?

Answer: See question 3.

77. What is the technology of the current legacy system, specifically what database technologies?

Answer: See question 13.

78. Is there an estimated count of tables in the legacy system?

Answer: See question 13.

79. Will all historical information be carried over to the new solution?

Answer: See question 3.

80. Does the City have all forms, or a list of the form names, that can be provided?

Answer: See question 26.

81. Will inspectors for DPH enforce compliance for Business Licensing or non EHMS legislation?

Answer: Environmental Health programs are shown on our website at
<https://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh>

82. Does the DPH or the City have an existing online payment provider that is PCI compliant and can be utilized for this solution?

Answer: Hyland On Base Revised: Though Hyland Onbase is the interface for collecting information for the online food application, the PCI compliant vendor is Citybase

83. Attachment B2, Requirements 25-30 refer to a "Risk Assessment Policy." Will the City please direct bidding vendors to or provide the desired Risk Assessment Policy?

Answer: Some programs, such as Food Safety, provide scores based on the severity of the violation (i.e. High Risk or Low Risk) and subsequent health outcomes that may result as a failure to comply with the San Francisco Health Code
[http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/health/healthcode?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca](http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/health/healthcode?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca). The intention is for the EHMS to accommodate decision rules that inform inspection frequency or activate other enforcement tools based on the number, type and disposition of current or previous violations, or based on the presence of higher risk activities in the regulated environment.

84. Attachment B2, Requirement 53 indicates that the City can specify all required fields during implementation. To accurately assess configuration and data conversion scope, will the City provide all required fields to bidding vendors?

Answer: See questions 3 and 13.

85. Attachment B2, Requirement 53 indicates that bidders can find the City's forms on the web site. Has the City reconciled the forms' fields to the required fields in the proposed data system? Please specify the online resource(s) that contain the exhaustive repository of forms.
[Answer: See question 26.](#)
86. Attachment B2, Requirement 69 cites two Windows-based examples of mobile devices (Laptop and Tablet). Is the requirement to deliver a Windows-based field inspection system?
[Answer: See question 38.](#)
87. Attachment B2, Requirement 89 requires that electronic forms based on existing paper forms shall be included. Please confirm that the City is also interested in discovering the best practices established through multiple large health department projects and will consider alternate forms in its move to a digital future. In other words, please confirm that the City will engage in good faith interchange such that solutions (solutions superior to paper-based forms) will be considered.
[Answer: Yes. See question 26.](#)
88. Attachment B2, Requirement 99 refers to the Department of Public Health website interface. Does this imply a requirement to keep the City's existing public-facing application? Or, may the vendor propose a new configuration-driven online form/experience?
[Answer: See question 26.](#)
89. Attachment B2, Requirement 135 requires an interface to the City's Tax Collector System, Hyland OnBase. Please convey the details of the interface (e.g., data to be transferred, real-time or daily transfer, data structure, interface, security requirements, etc.).
[Answer: See question 4.](#)
90. Attachment B2, Requirement 135 requires an interface to Recology. Please convey the details of the interface (e.g., data to be transferred, real-time or daily transfer, data structure, interface, security requirements, etc.).
[Answer: See question 4.](#)
91. Attachment B2, Requirement 135 requires an interface to Aumentum. Please convey the details of the interface (e.g., data to be transferred, real-time or daily transfer, data structure, interface, security requirements, etc.).
[Answer: See question 4.](#)
92. Attachment B2, Requirement 195 describes a yet-to-be-defined set of report types. Will the City disclose the Report Types referenced by this requirement in advance of the implementation?
[Answer: Yes, as part of the implementation the report types will be described. What we expect is that the vendor will have standard Environmental Health reports "out of the box" as part of your solution, and then we may identify additional reports.](#)
93. Given the level of detailed scope and response requirements included in the RFP, it is clear the City invested significant time and resources in preparing it for release. As such, you deserve vendor responses of equal or better investment of time including our most innovative recommendations and solutions. This is especially true given the City expects the new system to

remain viable for 10 to 12 years.

The response effort for this RFP is significant for the amount of detail requested. Additionally, many internal key team members will be out of the office over the next few weeks spending time with their families during Spring Break. To allow bidding vendors sufficient time to perform the necessary outreach and develop comprehensive bids worthy of the detail required, will the City please consider granting a 2-week extension to the Questions deadline and Proposal Due Date? We do not ask this question lightly, as we understand the City's constraints with keeping to its planned schedule for this project. We hope the City can appreciate vendors are eager to respond with the level of detail requested in the RFP. We want to present the City with the best possible proposal, so we would greatly appreciate the additional time.

Answer: See question 1.

94. Attachment B2, Requirement 191 requires emails be sent with attachments. What email system and what electronic file system does the City use?

Answer: See question 22 and question 40.

95. Attachment B2, Requirement 173 refers to built-in viewers/convertors. What converters does the City use? What file formats does the City use?

Answer: Vendor should have the capability of displaying on devices.

96. Attachment B2, Requirement 109: The System shall allow users across divergent environmental health programs to make referrals to other programs for possible enforcement actions. Can the City please clarify?

Answer: Many entities are regulated by more than one Environmental Health program, and the system needs to have the ability to appropriately notify other authorized users of possible jurisdiction.

97. Attachment B2, Requirement 66 refers to smart logic. What does smart logic imply? Please clarify what the selected system will perform.

Answer: For example, if a permit applicant answers "yes" to a question about storage of hazardous materials over a certain quantity, then subsequent questions about the nature and quantity will be included; if not then the subsequent questions would be skipped.

98. Attachment B2, Requirement 63 requires the user to enter lab data. Will this be done manually or through an interface?

Answer: Vendor proposals should describe how lab data would be entered and updated either manually or through an interface.

99. Attachment B2, Requirement 54: Please clarify what the City is referring to as "selected Environmental Health program information."

Answer: This refers to things that may change unpredictably, and Environmental Health requires the ability to update program elements that may change unpredictably and can not wait for scheduled system maintenance or change requests (e.g. staff names, required inspection frequencies, etc.). System administrators need to be able to change scheduled review dates, scoring or a fee, without having a programmer to make the change – configurable

by appropriate internal staff.

100. Some requirements in Attachments B3, B4, B5, and B6 are labeled with "S" indicating vendors must provide a sample illustrating that requirement. Many of those same requirements are asking vendors to "provide an approach to X" or "provide Y". For those requirements where a Sample may not apply or exist, please confirm it is acceptable for vendors to narratively address those requirements.

[Answer:](#) Correct

101. What is the City's approved or anticipated budget for this project?

[Answer:](#) See questions 11 and 12.

102. We acknowledge that the City is a Covered Entity in the Healthcare Insurance Portability and Accountability Act. In our extensive experience serving over 150 Environmental Health departments, we have found very few cases where Protected Health Information (PHI) or Personally Identifiable Information (PII) is necessarily managed in the course of a health department's duties and responsibilities. Will the City please declare in what records/fields it creates and/or maintains PHI and PII in the context of this proposed system? This is important to vendors to assess project and hosting risk.

[Answer:](#) Protected Health Information (PHI) is not collected or stored by any of the programs that will utilize the new system.

103. Under section H of the RFP it references the "ability" to: "Integrate with other internal or external business and financial systems (e.g. CERS, Recology, Oracle Applications, Aumentum, Hyland Onbase, SharePoint, etc.) Can you confirm all interfaces you would like developed as part of this proposal?

[Answer:](#) See question 4.

104. Attachment B3, "The Proposer shall provide all services needed to transform, standardize, migrate and load external legacy electronic data in order to establish an initial database suitable for live organization operations." Please provide details on the different database sources, and the type of data to be converted. Also, what type of data cleansing and standardization activities are required?

[Answer:](#) See question 3.

105. Can the City please provide a list of desired business processes (permits, licenses, record types)?

[Answer:](#) Environmental Health programs are shown on our website at
<https://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh>

106. Do the migrated historic records need to be read/write in the new system or is read only acceptable?

[Answer:](#) See question 3.

107. Can you provide the total number of named users that will be accessing the EHMS software

[Answer:](#) See question 2.

108.Does the agency have an existing billing application that would be integrated with the new solution, or is the vendor expected to provide all billing/accounting functionality with the proposed solution?

[Answer:](#) See question 3.

109.Since the agency owns a Hyland OnBase solution, has the agency investigated using OnBase Case Manager/WorkView to meet the needs of this solution? If yes, what was the general outcome of that review?

[Answer:](#) DPH has a Hyland Onbase solution that is targeted specifically for delivery of care and was purchased for HIM(medical records) content management use, storage of PDFs from legacy Electronic Health Records (EHRs) and integration with Epic . The DPH Hyland contract can't be used for other purposes.

110.Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada)

[Answer:](#) See question 20.

111.Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

[Answer:](#) As stated in the RFP Section III. G, product demonstrations, the top three (3) proposers receiving the highest scores may be invited for an oral interview or product demonstration.

112.Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)

[Answer:](#) See question 20.

113.Can we submit the proposals via email?

[Answer:](#) No. Please follow the RFP guidelines under Section V. Submission Guidelines. Proposers shall submit one (1) Original hard copy and five (5) hard copies, Two (2) copies of the required CMD forms in person or by mail before the due date and time. An Email copy of the original is only accepted with the hard copy submissions.

PLEASE NOTE THE PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DEADLINE HAS BEEN EXTENDED

Proposals are now due on or before 12:00 pm Monday, April 29, 2019

Please follow the guidelines of the RFP for Submission Requirements and Submission Details.

MANDATORY Letters of Intent are due on or before Friday April 5, 2019