PDMP RFP Q&A

Q. Given a complex technical landscape, with the choice to have technology procured within your own environment vs. licensing a hosting service, what is your preference?

A. CRISP is willing to evaluate various options for implementing the PDMP solution. Inform us of the option(s) offered by your company and we are open to exploring those, including software as a service and cloud-based solutions. There is an ease of use for us to host but that is not an absolute requirement. Please keep any cost implications of these various options clear.

Q. The RFP mentions making data available in real time. Can you clarify the expectations for what qualifies as "real-time" delivery? Is this based on specific legislative requirements?

A. Defining real-time expectations differs depending on whether you're referring to data acquisition or data retrieval. Dispenser information falls under a legislative mandate to be reported within one day. Commenting on the time required to process and load data files as they are received is helpful. We are interested in getting data into the PDMP as quickly as possible.
Please also comment on response time for retrieving the data to present to end users when a real time call is made. Our current API call response time is about 300ms.

Q. On page 6, "Investigative user workflow," CRISP describes the result of this workflow as a report released back to the user "in a format designated by the investigator." Could CRISP please clarify what this means and, if possible, provide detailed parameters for this format? Alternatively, CRISP could confirm that the same query result format delivered to clinical users is acceptable.

A. Investigators utilize data reports in PDF and CSV file formats. Ideally, a solution would allow an investigative user to receive data in both formats. Minimum criteria would be the ability to provide both a static, downloadable and printable report, as well as a file that can be manipulated in a format compatible with common spreadsheet software products. Please note that investigators do not access data reports in the same workflow as clinical users in Maryland; solutions should not rely on CRISP's clinical user credentialing processes and portal access.

Q. On page 3, in the proposal submittal table, the table refers to response section H, "Response to General Technical Requirements". We are unable to find the corresponding RFP section and only see RFP section 9. Technical Requirements which we believe is responded to as part of

response section E, “Response to Technical Requirements”. Can CRISP please confirm what the vendor should provide in response section H, “Response to General Technical Requirements”, if anything?

A. Please disregard Response Section H. Those requirements are covered in other sections.

Q. Page 17 of the RFP requires submission of an Acceptance of Terms document. Can CRISP confirm that this requirement refers the “RFP Terms and Conditions” section of the RFP (starting on page 16) that ends with a signature block, and that a signed version of this section is what we should place in response to section M6, “Acceptance of Terms”?

A. Yes, signing the “RFP Terms and Conditions” fulfills this requirement.