



STATE OF TENNESSEE  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS # 34310-21124  
AMENDMENT # 3  
FOR CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE MONITORING  
DATABASE AND DATA COLLECTION**

**DATE: February 25, 2025**

**RFP # 34310-21124 IS AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:**

1. **This RFP Schedule of Events updates and confirms scheduled RFP dates. Any event, time, or date containing revised or new text is highlighted.**

EVENT	TIME (central time zone)	DATE
1. RFP Issued		January 3, 2025
2. Disability Accommodation Request Deadline	2:00 p.m.	January 8, 2025
3. Pre-response Conference	10:00 a.m.	January 9, 2025
4. Notice of Intent to Respond Deadline	2:00 p.m.	January 10, 2025
5. Written "Questions & Comments" Deadline	2:00 p.m.	January 16, 2025
6. State Response to Written "Questions & Comments"		February 25, 2025
7. Response Deadline	2:00 p.m.	March 4, 2025
8. State Schedules Respondent Oral Presentation or Field Test		March 5, 2025
9. Respondent Oral Presentation or Field Test	8 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.	March 10, 2025
10. State Completion of Technical Response Evaluations		March 21, 2025
11. State Opening & Scoring of Cost Proposals	2:00 p.m.	March 24, 2025
12. Negotiations (Optional)	4:30 p.m.	March 24-26, 2025

13. State Notice of Intent to Award Released <u>and</u> RFP Files Opened for Public Inspection	2:00 p.m.	March 27, 2025
14. End of Protest Period		April 3, 2025
15. State sends contract to Contractor for signature		April 7, 2025
16. Contractor Signature Deadline	2:00 p.m.	April 10, 2025

**2. State responses to questions and comments in the table below amend and clarify this RFP.**

Any restatement of RFP text in the Question/Comment column shall NOT be construed as a change in the actual wording of the RFP document.

RFP Section	#	Question/Comment	State Response
	1	Given the re-release of the RFP, Can you provide an updated, anticipated timeline for the implementation of the system? What are the new target dates to for key milestones and to have the system fully operational?	December 31, 2025 is the ideal date of Production, but the timeline will be dependent on the vendor's migration plan.
	2	In the last iteration of this RFP, there was a 1 hour time limit for the demonstration of the system. Will the vendors be allowed to exceed that time limit to expand on new functionality?	We will increase the time limit to 1.5 hours for presentations.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet row 22 column C	3	In row 22, Column C, of the Business Requirements tab of the Attachment 1 Excel spreadsheet, TN states: "Contractor shall permit the State to enroll unlimited users to securely integrate the PDMP System with EHRs, pharmacy management Systems, HIEs, and any other parties using RxCheck, PMP Gateway, or the System API pursued by the State at no additional cost or individual user fee." o Can TN please confirm that this means that the vendor's integration solution must be made available at no cost to the integrating entities (the EHRs, pharmacy management systems, and HIEs statewide)? o Can TN please confirm that the vendor also may not charge the integrated facilities	All three statements are correct.  The State confirms that the vendor's integration solution must be made available at no cost to the integration entities or the State.  The State confirms that the vendor will not charge the integrated facilities directly for the implementation and maintenance of the integrations.  The State confirms that the State intends to cover the cost of the integrations as part of our PDMP services and maintenance costs associated with making the integration solution available to all entities statewide should be included in the cost proposal of this RFP.

		(such as hospitals, clinics, and pharmacies) directly for implementation and maintenance of the integrations? o Can TN please confirm that the state intends to cover the cost of these integrations as part of their PDMP services, and that any implementation and maintenance costs associated with making the integration solution available to all entities statewide should be included in the cost proposal of this RFP?	
Attachment 1 spreadsheet row 58 column C	4	In row 58, Column C, of the PDMP tab of the Attachment 1 Excel spreadsheet, TN states: "The System must securely integrate with the PMPi data sharing hub and allow integration services (PMPi, PMP Gateway, RxCheck, etc.) requests as permitted by the State." o RxCheck is a separate data sharing hub with its own distinct integration service, "RxCheck Integration." This service is not compatible with PMPi. Could you clarify if the intent is for the system to support respective connections to both PMPi and RxCheck independently, recognizing the unique integration requirements for each?	Correct. The State confirms that the system will support respective connections to both PMPi and RxCheck independently, recognizing the unique integration requirements for each.
RFP Attachment 6.2. C.4.	5	In Item C.4 of the Technical Response and Evaluation Guide (attachment 6.2) in the Proforma PDF document, TN states: "a narrative that describes up to three (3) states /territories/entities in which the Respondent has implemented and maintained a PDMP". o Can TN please confirm that "implemented and maintained a PDMP" means that the vendor has implemented and is currently live with all major components of a PDMP, including Data Collection, a PDMP web portal, and an integration solution?	Correct. The State confirms the statement "implemented and maintained a PDMP" means that the vendor has implemented and is currently live with all major components of a PDMP, including Data Collection, a PDMP web portal, and an integration solution.
RFP Attachment 6.4.	6	In the Reference Questionnaire (attachment 6.4) in the Proforma PDF document, TN states: "two	The State confirms that "two (2) contracts Respondent currently services that are similar in scope to the services required by this RFP" as

		(2) contracts Respondent currently services that are similar in scope to the services required by this RFP” as well as “three (3) completed contracts that are similar in size and scope to the services required by this RFP.” o Can TN please confirm that the “similar in scope” means that the reference contracts should include all major components of a PDMP, including Data Collection, a PDMP web portal, and an integration solution?	well as “three (3) completed contracts that are similar in size and scope to the services required by this RFP” means that the reference contracts should include all major components of a PDMP, including Data Collection, a PDMP web portal, and an integration solution.
	7	Are we allowed to highlight or otherwise indicate updates to our RFP submission from the previous release, to facilitate ease of review since the RFP is so similar?	That is acceptable. Your response should conform to RFP 34310-21124.
	8	Could the State clarify the technical requirements or preferred protocols for integrating the new system with external data sources (e.g., DEA database, ICD-10 codes, and TN Department of Safety data)?	The State currently has an API (built on REST technology) for: Tennessee Driver’s Licenses and State of Tennessee Professional licenses validations. The State currently uses source data files provided from the vendor for: DEA, NDC, NPI numbers, ICD-10 codes, and US Postal Service.
	9	Are there existing API specifications or documentation available for interfacing with these systems?	The State currently has an API (built on REST technology) for verification of Tennessee Driver’s License information through the Department of Safety & Homeland Security. Documentation for interfacing with required systems will be provided upon award.
	10	Will modifications to existing APIs be handled by the State, or should these be accounted for in the proposal?	Depending on what needs to occur with the API and why it needs to be modified will determine which party will handle the modification. An API requires that both parties have code in place. The vendor would need to code to TN’s APIs.
	11	What is the state timeline for migration of data and anticipated date of implementation?	Please see the State’s response to question 1, above.
	12	What is the expected size and format of the data to be migrated from the legacy system?	The State is expecting to migrate a minimum of five (5) years of data from the legacy system. There will be at least 2760 GB of data. The data is stored in SQL but the exact format is to be determined.
	13	Will the State provide sample data or testing environments for use during migration?	Test data can be provided. The State has test environments for any processes like API but the vendor would need to create a test environment to use that data.
	14	Is there an expectation for data cleansing before or during migration, and who will bear responsibility for ensuring data quality?	The State is currently working on data cleansing. The migration plan will determine the data elements that need to be migrated. See Pro Forma Section A.4.a.

	15	What is the expected timeline for correcting errors identified by the system?	Depending on the type of “error”, a timeline will be developed between the State and vendor.
	16	Some of the functionalities and data points requested in the RFP, such as tracking overlapping dispensations, opioid-naïve status, and the existence of controlled substance dispensations from multiple prescribers, may be subject to limitations or regulations outlined in your PMPi MOU. Prior to implementation, would it be possible for TN to share a copy of your PMPi MOU and/or any relevant documentation that outlines the parameters and restrictions governing the use of data obtained through the Prescription Monitoring Program to ensure alignment with any relevant contractual or regulatory requirements?	<p>Please see the following links to the statutes and rules regarding the Tennessee Controlled Substance Monitoring Database (CSMD). These links will provide you with information regarding the parameters and restrictions governing the use of data obtained through the CSMD.</p> <p>The Tennessee Prescription Safety Act of 2016 can be found at Tenn. Code Ann. § 53-10-301, et. seq.  <a href="#">Tennessee Code Unannotated – Free Public Access   Main Page</a></p> <p>You may also find the Rules and Regulations at:  <a href="https://publications.tnsosfiles.com/rules/1140/1140-11.20220126.pdf">https://publications.tnsosfiles.com/rules/1140/1140-11.20220126.pdf</a>.  <a href="https://publications.tnsosfiles.com/rules/1145/1145-01.20220126.pdf">https://publications.tnsosfiles.com/rules/1145/1145-01.20220126.pdf</a>.</p> <p>Lastly, you may find additional information on the Committee’s website at:  <a href="https://www.tn.gov/health/health-program-areas/health-professional-boards/csmd-board.html">https://www.tn.gov/health/health-program-areas/health-professional-boards/csmd-board.html</a>.</p>
RFP Attachment 6.2. A.4.	17	<p>Bank of America, Chase Bank, and Wells Fargo have all stated that they do not provide bank references confirming a business account’s positive standing; such references are only available for private client accounts. These banks only provide a standard template letter for business accounts, which cannot be amended to include the wording “positive standing.” All three of these banks have confirmed that the issuance of the letter by the banks themselves serves as proof that the account is in positive standing. Given these constraints, would the State accept such a standard template letter from these financial institutions as an acceptable bank reference for business accounts?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In light of this, what alternative documentation would the State accept as a bank reference for business accounts held with</li> </ul>	A standard letter for business accounts, signed and dated within the last three months, would satisfy the bank reference requirement if the contents of the letter “indicate that the Respondent maintains a satisfactory business relationship with the financial institution.” I.e., the letter need not include the words “positive standing.” A credit rating report would not be acceptable in lieu of a bank reference letter for this requirement.

		Bank of America? Could this requirement be waived or would a Dun and Bradstreet Report be accepted to meet this requirement?	
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: Data Validation and Data Cleansing (Rows in "Data Validation", "Dispenser Submission")	18	How should the system handle data submissions with errors that cannot be resolved within the specified timeframe?	Depending on the type of "error", a time-line and protocol will be developed between the State and vendor. Errors in data reported from the data submitters should be reviewed by the data submitters for correction.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: Algorithm Refinement (Rows in "PDMP Algorithms")	19	What metrics or KPIs will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of patient linking, risk scoring, and unsolicited reporting algorithms?	The State currently has a 99.9% system uptime, and a patient matching rate of 95% that we would like to maintain. See Pro Forma Section A.3.f.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: Algorithm Refinement (Rows in "PDMP Algorithms")	20	Are there predefined thresholds or tolerances for algorithm performance that must be met?	The State does not have predefined thresholds for algorithm performance. The State currently has a 99.9% system uptime, and a patient matching rate of 95% that we would like to maintain.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: System Interoperability (Rows in "Data Sharing", "Integration")	21	Does the State anticipate needing to expand interoperability to international databases or organizations in the future?	The State does not anticipate expanding interoperability to international databases currently.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: Data Cleansing During Migration (Rows in "Migration")	22	What level of detail is expected in the migration plan for identifying and addressing gaps between the legacy and new systems?	The vendor shall determine the level of detail to present to the State.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: Data Cleansing During Migration (Rows in "Migration")	23	Are there specific quality assurance processes that the State requires during data migration?	The State will collaborate with the vendor to perform an analysis to determine which data elements are required to be migrated. See Pro Forma Section A.4.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: User Profile Migration (Rows in "Migration", "User Profiles")	24	Should all inactive user accounts and their associated data be migrated, or will they only be archived?	It will depend on the date of deactivation of the account.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: User Profile Migration (Rows	25	How should historical relationships (e.g., supervisor-delegate connections) be validated during migration?	Through testing described in the migration plan to be presented to the State.

in "Migration", "User Profiles")			
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: Training Modules (Rows in "Training")	26	Will the State provide branding guidelines or content standards for training materials, or should these be created independently?	The State has branding guidelines that must be followed if materials are distributed under the State independently of the vendor.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: Training Modules (Rows in "Training")	27	How will training effectiveness be evaluated by the State (e.g., testing, user feedback surveys)?	Through testing, user surveys, FAQs, webinars, etc.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: Help Desk Features (Rows in "Customer Support")	28	Are there specific tools or platforms preferred for managing help desk tickets?	There are no specific tools or platforms preferred for managing help desk tickets.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: Security Standards (Rows in "Security", "Disaster Recovery")	29	What are the State's expectations for periodic security assessments or penetration testing?	The State currently participates in HITRUST and HITECH scans. See Pro Forma Section A.3.p. Please also see Pro Forma Section E.9.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: User Authentication (Rows in "Security", "User Roles")	30	Should the system support multi-factor authentication (MFA) for all user roles or only certain high-access roles?	The system will support State control of determining the user roles that require MFA and the functionality should be available to every role.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: User Authentication (Rows in "Security", "User Roles")	31	What identity management system is currently in place and will this be used by the contractor as well or will a new identity management system need to be designed and implemented?	The State currently uses Tennessee Driver's license verification, DEA registration, Tennessee State professional license, and NPI verifications depending on the User's role. See Pro Forma Section A.3.q.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: Customization Scope (Rows in "Customization", "Configuration")	32	Can the State provide examples of functionality or features that may require future customization?	The State does not have any examples to provide. The Change Order process is listed in Pro Forma Section A.5.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: Customization Scope (Rows in "Customization", "Configuration")	33	How does the State plan to prioritize and manage customization requests during the contract period?	Contractor shall create and implement a management policy for notification and tracking of Authorizations to Modify as well as critical outages. Contractor shall provide the State with a copy of this policy within ninety (90) days of the Effective Date of the Contract.
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: Scalability Requirements (Rows in	34	Does the State anticipate a significant increase in the number of users or data volume during the system's life cycle?	The State does not currently expect a significant increase in the number of users or data volume. This is dependent on future legislation regarding authorized users and prescribing requirements.

"System Performance", "Availability")			
Attachment 1 spreadsheet: Scalability Requirements (Rows in "System Performance", "Availability")	35	Are there specific performance benchmarks the system must meet as user and data volume grow?	There are no specific performance benchmarks beyond those outlined in the Pro Forma Contract. This is dependent on future legislation regarding authorized users and prescribing requirements.

3. **Delete RFP # 343410-21124, in its entirety, and replace it with RFP # 34310-21124, Release # 2, attached to this amendment.** Revisions of the original RFP document are emphasized within the new release. **Any sentence or paragraph containing revised or new text is highlighted.**
4. **RFP Amendment Effective Date.** The revisions set forth herein shall be effective upon release. All other terms and conditions of this RFP not expressly amended herein shall remain in full force and effect.