



RETURN BIDS TO:

RETOURNER LES SOUMISSIONS À:

Bid Receiving - PWGSC / Réception des soumissions -
TPSGC

Place du Portage, Phase III

Core 0B2 / Noyau 0B2

11 Laurier St./11, rue Laurier

Gatineau, Québec K1A 0S5

Bid Fax: (613) 997-9776

**SOLICITATION AMENDMENT
MODIFICATION DE L'INVITATION**

The referenced document is hereby revised; unless otherwise
indicated, all other terms and conditions of the Solicitation
remain the same.

Ce document est par la présente révisé; sauf indication contraire,
les modalités de l'invitation demeurent les mêmes.

Comments - Commentaires

Vendor/Firm Name and Address

Raison sociale et adresse du
fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur

Issuing Office - Bureau de distribution

Health Services Project Division (XF)/Division des
projets de services de santé (XF)
Terrasses de la Chaudière 5th Floo
10 Wellington Street
Gatineau
Gatineau
K1A 0S5

Title - Sujet PSHCP ASO Retender	
Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation 24062-180558/D	Amendment No. - N° modif. 002
Client Reference No. - N° de référence du client 24062-180558	Date 2020-09-29
GETS Reference No. - N° de référence de SEAG PW-\$\$XF-002-38428	
File No. - N° de dossier 002xf.24062-180558	CCC No./N° CCC - FMS No./N° VME
Solicitation Closes - L'invitation prend fin at - à 02:00 PM on - le 2020-11-02	
Time Zone Fuseau horaire Eastern Daylight Saving Time EDT	
F.O.B. - F.A.B. Plant-Usine: <input type="checkbox"/> Destination: <input type="checkbox"/> Other-Autre: <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address Enquiries to: - Adresser toutes questions à: You, Soun	Buyer Id - Id de l'acheteur 002xf
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone (613) 408-6402 ()	FAX No. - N° de FAX () -
Destination - of Goods, Services, and Construction: Destination - des biens, services et construction:	

Instructions: See Herein

Instructions: Voir aux présentes

Delivery Required - Livraison exigée	Delivery Offered - Livraison proposée
Vendor/Firm Name and Address Raison sociale et adresse du fournisseur/de l'entrepreneur	
Telephone No. - N° de téléphone Facsimile No. - N° de télécopieur	
Name and title of person authorized to sign on behalf of Vendor/Firm (type or print) Nom et titre de la personne autorisée à signer au nom du fournisseur/ de l'entrepreneur (taper ou écrire en caractères d'imprimerie)	
Signature	Date

SOLICITATION AMENDMENT 002

This amendment is raised to answer questions received from Industry and to update the RFP where applicable.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Q10: REFERENCE: SOW articles 3.15.13 and 4.14.34

article 3.15.13 focuses on Threat Monitoring and a request for Canada to be either sent (cloud solutions) or have the capability to install passive devices (on premise). Is the requirement that Canada would like to execute their own monitoring? Article 4.14.34 speaks to the contractor providing monthly incident reporting. We would like to clarify that the requirement is that the contractor would have a robust threat monitoring program for the solution being provided and any confirmed incidents (actual experienced threats) involving PSHCP data would be reported to PSHCP on a monthly basis. The monthly reporting would essentially be a summary of report of incidents reported to PSHCP during the month aligned to the breach notification requirements. Is this a correct interpretation of the 2 articles?

A10: Yes, the interpretation of both articles is correct.

Q11: REFERENCE: SOW article 4.7.4 i.

The SOW requests an audit program specific to paramedical/medical equipment providers that submit claims directly to the Contractor. Our understanding is that only paramedical providers and hospitals will have the provider claiming functionality. Should this section be corrected to only paramedical providers and hospitals? Can Canada provide a complete list of paramedical providers they expect to be set up for digital claim submission?

A11: SOW article 4.7.4 is specific to Paramedical Practitioner and Medical Equipment Provider Audits. Audit requirements for Hospital Provider Audits are outlined in SOW article 4.7.3. There is not a final list of paramedical providers for digital claims submission as Canada is aiming to eventually have all eligible paramedical providers whose services are covered under the PSHCP have access to digital claims submission capabilities once industry can support, validate and audit these claims. As such the list will change over time.

Q12: REFERENCE: SOW articles 4.9.3 xi and 4.9.5 vi.

Is there a reference to what the "approved frequencies and timeframes" are?

A12: Specific to 4.9.3 xi, please refer to 4.9.3 iv d) which stipulates that the Contractor is required to performs daily updates to all PSHCP claims history and all other related information (e.g. Member, Dependant, and provider data, etc.) in the Ad Hoc Reporting System.
Specific to 4.9.3 xi, please refer to 4.9.5 iv which stipulates that management dashboards must allow for the display of monthly, Quarterly, Calendar Year, year-to-date, Fiscal Year and point in time PSHCP information as appropriate.

Q13: REFERENCE: SOW article 4.4.7 i and 4.4.7 ii.

Can Canada confirm if access to the Eligibility Interface should be read-only or read-write-edit access?

A13: Read-only access is required. Refer to RFP Revision 16 below.

Q14: REFERENCE: SOW articles 4.9.5 iii.

Can Canada provide sample templates for the management dashboards and provide examples on how they might differ from the standard reports? Can Canada confirm that the list of data elements outlined in Appendix 4 to Annex A is the data that will be used to populate the Management dashboards? If not, can Canada provide a complete list of data elements required to populate the management dashboards? What is Canada's expectation on the frequency of these dashboards?

A14: Management dashboards as specified in 4.9.5 iii must be designed to utilize visual and graphical displays (e.g. bar graphs, pie charts, etc.) of plan data and information, whereas standard reports typically provide data in table formats. One example of a possible dashboards template is the map of Canada, PSHCP Member Population and Paid Amount by Province that is located on page 570 of 709 of the RFP (slide #40 of Attachment 2.1 – PSHCP Volumetrics). Canada can confirm that similarly to Standard Reports, the list of data elements outlined in Appendix 4 to Annex A will be used to populate management dashboards. Specific to the frequency of management dashboards, as specified in 4.9.5 iv, management dashboards must allow for the display of monthly, quarterly, Calendar year, year-to-date, Fiscal year and point in time PSHCP information as appropriate.

Q15: REFERENCE: SOW articles 4.11.2 i. and v.

Based on the quoted services levels, Canada is requesting a higher service standard for Provider calls vs. Plan member calls. Can Canada confirm that is the intent?

A15: Yes, that is correct. The requirements for the Member Contact Centre and the Provider Contact Centre are stipulated in SOW articles 4.10. 1 and 4.11.2, respectively.

Q16: REFERENCE: SOW articles 4.11.2 i. and v.

Can Canada confirm their expectations regarding hours of operation for the Provider Contract Centres? The requirement seems to have Paramedical Providers, Hospitals and Pharmacy's under the same requirement. Can Canada confirm this is the intent? If so, can Canada provide insight on the reason behind 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. (caller's local time, within Canada), 7 days a week for Paramedical Providers and Hospitals?

A16: The requirements for the Provider Contact Centre are stipulated in SOW article 4.11.2 and must support all Providers including Pharmacy, Electronic and Medical Supplies Providers, Electronic Paramedical Practitioners, and Electronic Hospital Providers. The requirements set out in the SOW reflect the business requirements of the Canada, the PSHCP Members and the Providers. Canada recognizes that the majority of calls to the Provider Contact Centre received outside of normal business hours will likely be from Pharmacy Providers.

Q17: REFERENCE: SOW article 4.11.2 iv.

Can Canada confirm if both Paramedical Provider and Hospital Provider calls are handled by the same Contact Centre if Service levels can be combined?

A17: See A16 above. Also, refer to SOW article 4.11.2 iv.

Q18: REFERENCE: SOW article 3.7.8 g)

Would Canada kindly expand on the level of information/detail required in a Delisting report?

A18: The Delisting report is required to contain detailed information about the provider as well as the date and reason for delisting. Annex A, Statement of Work, requires the Contractor to propose the frequency and the content of the Delisting report for Project Authority Approval.

Q19: REFERENCE: SOW article 4.7.4 i.

Would Canada allow for member notification at the point of claim adjudication to satisfy the requirements outlined in the SOW 4.7.4? We would encourage Canada to consider this option as it

will help contain the program costs. Additionally, this approach will not negatively impact the Plan Members experience.

- A19:** Annex A, Statement of Work requirements cannot be satisfied by alternative tasks or actions proposed by Bidders that differ from the requirements outlined in each SOW Reference number.
- Q20:** REFERENCE: SOW article 4.7.6 ii.
Would Canada kindly expand on the requirement for a 100% pre-payment audit program? Would a combination of pre and post payment program satisfy Canada's requirement? A pre and post payment approach will increase the Plan members experience while still addressing the risk.
- A20:** Requirements remain unchanged. As Digital Claims selected for audit are based on claims submitted in the prior day, Canada requires that the Payment for Claims selected through the program component must be held until the audit is complete and only released, if appropriate. As such, for all Digital Claims selected for audit the Contractor must assess the validity of the supplied documentation, determine whether it is appropriate and whether the information on supporting documentation aligns with the information submitted by the Member before releasing the payment. As part of the audit, the Contractor must also contact the service provider to confirm that benefits have been rendered.
- Q21:** REFERENCE: SOW article 4.7.6 ii.
Would Canada allow for a monthly calculation of the SVS based on the previous month's claims volume to satisfy the requirements outlines in this SOW article?
- A21:** Yes, Canada would allow the Contractor to calculate the SVS based on the previous month's claims volume, with claims then selected daily.
- Q22:** REFERENCE: SOW article 4.7.9 v.
Would Canada allow for multiple tools with one common data source to be used to satisfy the requirements outlined in this article of the SOW?
- A22:** Yes, Canada would allow for multiple tools with one common data source. However, all the requirements for the Benefit Misuse and Abuse Detection Data Mining tool stipulated in SOW article 4.7.9 must be satisfied.
- Q23:** REFERENCE: SOW article 4.5.6 iii.
Would Canada clarify the difference between provider delisting and provider deregistration? In SOW 4.5.6 Canada requests that the Contractor seek approval prior to deregistering the following provider types: Pharmacy and Electronic Medical Supplies Provider, Electronic Paramedical Practitioner, and Electronic Hospital Provider Deregistration. In SOW 4.7.4, the same requirements are not listed for the process of delisting Electronic Paramedical Practitioners.
- A23:** The definitions for Delisting and Deregistration have been amended for greater clarity. Refer to RFP Revisions 18 and 19 below.
- Q24:** REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A.
Can Canada confirm their expectation regarding how to Coordinate benefits as a second payer?
Should the Contractor use the amount eligible or the amount submitted?
- A24:** Refer to SOW articles:
- 4.3.1 v. g) ii.
 - 4.3.1 ii. g)
 - 4.3.1 ii. h)
 - 4.4.2 i. d)

Q25: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A

Can Canada provide further clarity/instructions on the adjudication requirements in order to determine what is eligible under the referral benefit? How are reasonable and customary amounts derived?

A25: Refer to SOW article 4.3.1 v. h) i. a).

Q26: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A

Can Canada provide further clarity on what would constitute as an eligible vaccine?

A26: An eligible vaccine will have a Drug Identification Number (DIN) and be prescribed by a physician or other qualified health professional and not covered by a provincial/territorial health insurance plan, a provincial/territorial drug plan, or any provincially/territorially sponsored program, whether or not the participant is participating in the plan or program. Refer to item 1) of the Drug Benefit section of the PSHCP Directive <http://www.njc-cnm.gc.ca/directive/d9/en>

Q27: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A

Can Canada provide clarity of their intent as it relates to proof of payment? Is a receipt sufficient?

A27: Refer to the definition of Proof of Payment contained in Appendix 5 to Annex A, Acronyms and Glossary of Terms.

Q28: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A

Can Canada confirm if all injectable drugs are eligible under the plan? Does this include Synovial Fluid replacements? If not are there other injectable drugs that are excluded from coverage?

A28: Refer to item 4) of the Drug Benefit section of the PSHCP Directive <http://www.njc-cnm.gc.ca/directive/d9/en> (Note to bidders: link contained in published Appendix 1 to Annex A).

Q29: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A

Can Canada confirm if there are any drugs on their formulary that require special handling? If so, can Canada specify the drugs and the special handling instructions?

A29: Refer to the Drug Benefit section of the PSHCP Directive <http://www.njc-cnm.gc.ca/directive/d9/en>. Canada requires the Plan Administrator's expertise, and/or that of their applicable subcontractors, to determine if special handling instructions are required to confirm eligibility criteria is met and ensure integration with Provincial and Territorial health plans and programs (e.g. hospital use drugs).

Q30: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A

Does Canada comply with Quebec bill 33?

A30: No, Canada does not comply with Bill 33.

Q31: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A

What are the requirements regarding eligibility of replacement therapeutic nutrients?

A31: Refer to item 3) of the Drug Benefit section of the PSHCP Directive <http://www.njc-cnm.gc.ca/directive/d9/en>.

Q32: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A

What is Canada's expectation as it relates to Quebec vision claims for claimants under the age of 18?

- A32:** The PSHCP may cover the expense for the Eligible claimant if it is not already covered under any other Provincial or Territorial Plan. Refer to the General Section (Purpose and scope of the PSHCP) of the PSHCP Directive (<http://www.njc-cnm.gc.ca/directive/d9/en>). All other PSHCP exclusions and maximums apply.
- Q33:** REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A
Are eye exams performed by an ophthalmologist eligible under the PSHCP? If so, is there an expectation to have a separate reasonable and customary charge for these services?
- A33:** Yes, eye exams performed by an ophthalmologist are eligible under the PSHCP. Refer to http://www.pshcp.ca/media/38835/pshcp-bulletin-35-eng-sept-2017_read.pdf
Yes, a separate reasonable and customary charge for these services is expected.
- Q34:** REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A
What criteria is required to determine eligibility under the laser eye surgery benefit?
- A34:** Refer to the Special Bulletin on Plan Changes – October 2014 at the top of the PSHCP Directive <http://www.njc-cnm.gc.ca/directive/d9/en>. For greater clarity, this Benefit does not include cataract surgery.
- Q35:** REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A
Are there any special instructions/administrative guidelines as they relate to intra-ocular lenses?
- A35:** Refer to the Vision Care Benefit section of the PSHCP Directive <http://www.njc-cnm.gc.ca/directive/d9/en>.
- Q36:** REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A
Can Canada provide additional insight into their expectation regarding the Physician service and Laboratory services benefit? This is not common in the industry. How does a contractor determine if an expense qualifies under this benefit?
- A36:** Refer to the Medical Practitioner Benefit section of the PSHCP Directive <http://www.njc-cnm.gc.ca/directive/d9/en>.
- Q37:** REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A
What is Canada's expectation regarding eligibility of acupuncture services?
- A37:** Refer to the Medical Practitioner Benefit section of the PSHCP Directive <http://www.njc-cnm.gc.ca/directive/d9/en>.
- Q38:** REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A
How does Canada envision the determination of eligible durable equipment? Is there a lowest cost alternative? How are reasonable and customary charges established?
- A38:** Refer to the Miscellaneous Expense Benefit section of the PSHCP Directive <http://www.njc-cnm.gc.ca/directive/d9/en>. See also Q&A24 above.
- Q39:** REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A
Can Canada provide a more detailed description of the adjudication requirement to determine eligibility of the benefit outlines under the miscellaneous expense benefit as it relates to the following: devices for physical movement, devices for support and for treatment. Specifically, what information would be required under each category in order to determine eligibility. For example, what

information is required to determine eligibility of a wheelchair, CPAP/bi-PAP machine, TENS, hospital bed, etc.?

A39: Refer to SOW article 4.3.1 v. h) i. a) and the Miscellaneous Expense Benefit section of the PSHCP Directive <http://www.njc-cnm.gc.ca/directive/d9/en>. Canada requires the Plan Administrator's expertise, and/or that of their applicable subcontractors, to determine the eligibility criteria for medical necessity and establish R&C amounts and limits.

Q40: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A

Are there any specific adjudication rules for compression stockings? Is there an annual maximum? Would stocking with gradual compression levels be included?

A40: See A39 above.

Q41: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A

What is Canada's expectation as it relates to the posting of reasonable and customary amounts? Is this request solely for paramedical providers? OR is this all-encompassing for benefits & services reimbursed under the Plan?

A41: The posting of reasonable and customary amounts is solely for paramedical providers. Refer to SOW article 4.10.3 i. k). See also the Definition of Reasonable and Customary Fee contained in Appendix 5 to Annex A, Acronyms and Glossary of Terms.

Q42: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A

What is the expectation for applying the R/C for services incurred outside of Canada? What jurisdictions within each country are to be referenced? With on-line shopping services members have the ability to purchase items within the US what is the expectation to determine R/C for these products?

A42: Refer to SOW article 4.3.1 v. h) i. a). Canada requires the Plan Administrator's expertise, and/or that of their applicable subcontractors, to determine the eligibility criteria for medical necessity and establish R&C amounts and limits.

Q43: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Annex A

What is Canada's expectation for determining R/C for products such as artificial appliances that have a wide range of models available to the patient? How is the R/C to be applied if the patient should purchase an appliance that is high in cost due to the customization for the patients specific needs?

A43: Refer to SOW article 4.3.1 v. h) i. a). Canada requires the Plan Administrator's expertise, and/or that of their applicable subcontractors, to determine the eligibility criteria for medical necessity and establish R&C amounts and limits.

Q44: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Attachment 3.1 to Part 3 - Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria, and Appendix 2 to Attachment 3.1 to Part 3 - Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria

In Appendix 1 to Attachment 3.1 to Part 3 - Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria, the Financial Management Services and Controls and the Security criteria appear in the Start-Up Phase, but not in the Operations Phase. Additionally, in Appendix 2 to Attachment 3.1 to Part 3 - Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria, the Financial Management Services and Controls criterion appears in the Start-Up Phase and the Operations Phase, while the Security criterion appears in the Start-Up Phase, but not the Operations Phase. Can Canada confirm that these omissions are intentional and correct?

A44: Omission of the Security criterion in the Operations Phase of the Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria and the Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria is intentional and correct. However, a correction has been made to include the Financial Management Services and Controls in the

Operations Phase of the Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria. Refer to RFP Revisions 20 and 21 below.

Q45: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Attachment 3.1 to Part 3 - Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria, and Appendix 2 to Attachment 3.1 to Part 3 - Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria
Quality Assurance and Data Migration are activities that both appear in the Start-Up Phase of the Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria (M-3.1) and the Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria (R-1.1), but not in the Operations Phase of either evaluation criteria. Can Canada confirm that these omissions are intentional and correct?

A45: Canada confirms that the referenced omissions are intentional and correct. Although no detailed work plans are required for these two activities in the Start-Up Phase, they still must be addressed accordingly to satisfy the requirements for evaluation criteria M-3.1 and R-1.1.

Q46: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Attachment 3.1 to Part 3 - Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria, and Appendix 2 to Attachment 3.1 to Part 3 - Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria
The Investment in Technology Infrastructure and Approach to Continuous Improvement criteria both appear in the Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria, but not in the Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria. Can Canada confirm that this omission is intentional and correct?

A46: Canada confirms that the referenced omission is intentional and correct.

Q47: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Attachment 3.1 to Part 3 - Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria, and Appendix 2 to Attachment 3.1 to Part 3 - Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria
The criteria for Provider Registration and Management Services appear in the Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria, but not in the Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria. Can Canada confirm that this omission is intentional and correct?

A47: Refer to RFP Revisions 20 and 21 below.

Q48: Is it Canada's expectation that bidders cover sections like Veterans Affairs, Greenhouse Gas etc., in Technical Bid Part 3 with section headings along with any other supporting proposal material for our submission (labelled accordingly per section and phase)? Or are these items simply informational within the SOW?

A48: Unless otherwise specified in the solicitation, all required information and supporting documentation should be provided in the bidder's technical bid with corresponding titles.

Q49: Attachment 2.1 to Part 2 - PSHCP Volumetric Data and Annex C - Security Requirements Check List (SRCL) appear to be missing from the solicitation. Can Canada provide these documents?

A49: Please refer to the answer from Q2 of Solicitation Amendment 001.

Q50: REFERENCE: Appendix 1 to Attachment 3.1 to Part 3 - Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria, and Appendix 2 to Attachment 3.1 to Part 3 - Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria
Where the same criteria appear in both the Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria (e.g. M-4.1, M-4.2, etc.) and the Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria (e.g. R-1.2, R-1.3, etc.), are bidders required to address them individually? If so, can you confirm how these sections are different, as there appears to be significant overlap in how we would provide answers in these two different spots. Our initial understanding was that the Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria served as a scoring system to guide our responses to M-3 and M-4, however the RFP appears to suggest that answers are required under each of the point-rated criteria too.

- A50:** It is not necessary for a Bidder to duplicate its response to a criterion if that criterion appears in the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria and, correspondingly, in the Point-Rated Evaluation Criteria. A bidder's response, however, should include cross references, where applicable, to better ensure evaluators can find the necessary information.
- Q51:** To obtain Protected B status, a sponsor from the Government is required. Does Canada intend to provide sponsorship for the successful proponent?
- A51:** Upon request, Canada will sponsor any bidding organization that is interested in this requirement. Bidders are strongly encouraged to obtain all the necessary security requirements detailed in the solicitation as soon as possible to avoid delays.
- Q52:** With organizations positioning their employees to work from home in light of the pandemic, how does this impact Canada's requirements regarding Protected B status?
- A52:** At this time, there is no impact or deviation from the security requirements currently detailed in the solicitation.
- Q53:** REFERENCE: SOW articles 4.1.1 v., vi., and 4.11.3 v.
Can Canada provide clarity on their definition of 'available'? Would demonstrating system functionality via a UAT environment hosted at the Contractor's site or via online tools be sufficient/meet Canada's requirement for these 3 SOW articles?
- A53:** 'Available' as it relates to the training environment (SOW article 4.1.1 v) and the UAT (SOW article 4.1.1 vi); references the ability for the Project Authority to access these environments at all times. This would exclude the agreed upon service window. As it relates to demonstrating system functionality via a UAT environment hosted at the Contractor's site or via online tools, it is expected that due to the nature of these requirements, that visiting the Contractor's site will not be deemed acceptable for the Project Authority given the requirement to actively access these environments .
- Q54:** REFERENCE: Attachment 3.1 to Part 3 - Technical Bid Requirements and Bidder Instructions
Can Canada confirm that further to resizing the columns in the response tables, we are allowed to reformat the tables to include our Bidder Responses. More specifically, are we allowed to delete the rating guide, i.e. Column "C", and replace it with a column titled "Bidder Response" for better visual presentation of the response side by side with Canada's Point-Rated Technical Evaluation question?
- A54:** Bidders may either add another column to provide their response, or they may replace the Rating Guide in Column C with a response column.
- Q55:** REFERENCE: SOW article 4.7.6 iii.
Would Canada allow for digital claims to be released without requesting supporting documentation from the member if the bidder is able to validate the expense with the identified provider?
- A55:** As part of the audit, the Contractor must assess the validity of the supplied documentation from the Member, determine whether it is appropriate and whether the information on supporting documentation aligns with the information submitted by the Member. Further, SOW 4.3.4 iv and SOW 4.3.4 vi require that the Contractor ensure that Members submit all required information and documentation as part of each Digital Claims submission. As such, the Contractor should already have all supporting documentation from the Member prior to initiating the audit.

Q56: REFERENCE: SOW article 4.7.4 ii.

Would Canada confirm if the Contractor must request supporting documentation on the entire selection of SVS claims or can the Contractor review a SVS of claims and then select which claims require additional supporting documentation?

A56: Where the SOW specifies that the Contractor must obtain supporting documentation to review a SVS of claims, then supporting documentation must be requested for the entire selection of claims.

Q57: REFERENCE: SOW articles 4.12 and 4.14. For Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Reduction, Canada is open to considering an alternative equivalent standard, platform, methodology, or system that is acceptable to Canada with respect to measuring, tracking and reporting. Would Canada be open to adopting a similar approach for Continuity Management (SOW 4.12) and Security (SOW 4.14) as it relates to ISO certifications?

A57: Canada has very specific Security and Privacy requirements for service providers that handle Protected B, Medium Integrity and Medium Availability (PBMM) data. Therefore an alternative equivalent standard will not be accepted. The requirement remains as is.

RFP REVISION

16. At Annex A, SOW,

DELETE: and read-write-edit

17. At Appendix 2 to Attachment 3.1 – Point-Rated Technical Evaluation Criteria, requirement R-2.3 Financial Management Services and Control solution, a)

DELETE: (Note: The Project Authority currently used Microsoft (MS) Project 2013)

18. At Appendix 5 to Annex A, Acronyms and Glossary of Terms,

DELETE: Definition of **Delist / Delisted / Delisting** in its entirety; and

INSERT: **Delist / Delisted / Delisting.**

A process where a Provider is removed from the active list of eligible Providers in the Provider Management System. Claims submitted by a Delisted Provider, or by a Member who received a service from this Provider, will no longer be considered for payment/reimbursement.

19. At Appendix 5 to Annex A, Acronyms and Glossary of Terms,

DELETE: Definition of **Deregister / Deregistered / Deregistration** in its entirety; and

INSERT: **Deregister / Deregistered / Deregistration.**

A process where a Provider, who has signed a Provider agreement, requests to be removed (e.g. business is sold or closed) or is removed by the Contractor (e.g. due to audit findings) from the Provider Management System. Claims submitted by a Deregistered Provider, or by a Member who received a service from this Provider, will no longer be considered for payment/reimbursement.

20. At Appendix 1 to Attachment 3.1 – Mandatory Evaluation Criteria, Section 1. Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria,

DELETE: M-4.3 Proposed Provider Registration and Management Services Solution ^(PB); and
INSERT: M-4.3 Proposed Financial Management Services and Controls Solution ^(PB).

21. At Appendix 1 to Attachment 3.1 – Mandatory Evaluation Criteria, Section 5. Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria – Proposed Operations Phase Solution,

DELETE: **M-4.3 Proposed Provider Registration and Management Services Solution** ^(PB) in its entirety; and

INSERT: **M-4.3 Proposed Financial Management Services and Controls Solution** ^(PB)
The Bidder must describe its proposed Financial Management Services and Controls solution, which will be put in place to support Start-Up Phase activities and continue through the Final Claim Day, in accordance with the requirements set-out in SOW article 4.6. The Bidder's response must demonstrate that, at a minimum, the proposed solution includes each of the following service requirement:

- 1) Daily Claim Funding Request Service (SOW article 4.6.3); and
- 2) PSHCP Recovery of Overpayments and Erroneous Payments Service (SOW article 4.6.6)

22. At Annex A, SOW, article 4.14.2 ii.,

DELETE: (two instances) Sub-processor; and
INSERT: (two instances) subcontractor

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.