SOLICITATION ADDENDUM ONE
LANGUAGE MODIFICATION/QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

SOLICITATION NUMBER: 127870 O5
InterRAI Assessment Evaluation
Opening Date: December 9, 2026
Addendum Effective Date: November 12, 2026

Language Modification

RFP Page Number 7, Section I.S, is hereby modified to reflect the changes below:

The inactive link (https://das.nebraska.gov/materiel/docs/NE_DAS_Materiel_Purchasing_Agency-SPB_Policy_23_07_Protest_Policy.pdf) is hereby deleted and replaced with the correct link as follows: NE_DAS_Materiel_SPB_Policy-Protest.pdf

---

RFP Page Number 24, Section IV.C, is hereby modified to reflect the changes below:

The incorrect email (DHHS.MedicaidDrugRebate@nebraska.gov) is hereby deleted and replaced with the correct email as follows: DHHS.hcbsbilling@nebraska.gov

This addendum will be incorporated into the solicitation.

Questions and Answers

Following are the questions submitted and answers provided for the above-mentioned solicitation. The questions and answers are to be considered as part of the solicitation. It is the responsibility of bidders to check the State Purchasing Bureau website for all addenda or amendments.

NOTE: If any questions were submitted with specific numbering and were referenced in subsequent questions, those numbers will be listed at the beginning of the specific question in the Question column.

Question Number	RFP Section Reference	RFP Page Number	Question	State Response
1.	Cover Page	i	The proposal says: The term of the contract will be five (5) months, commencing upon execution of the contract by the State and the Vendor (Parties). The State reserves the right to extend the period of this contract beyond the termination date when mutually agreeable to the Parties. Are there factors that are influencing the time frame? Is the state willing to consider extending the initial time period of the contract to allow for thorough engagement that can be meaningfully incorporated into the recommendations?	The initial contract term of five (5) months is based on the state's anticipated project requirements and scope of work. At this time, the State intends to maintain the proposed initial term. However, should circumstances warrant additional time to fulfill project requirements, the State may consider an extension, subject to mutual agreement between the parties and applicable statutory and contractual requirements. Any extension shall be limited in accordance with Neb. Rev. 73-812 (2). The State will continue to assess project needs and timelines throughout the contract period to ensure the necessary engagement and deliverables can be achieved.
2.	Section V	26	Related to Stakeholder Engagement: Conduct interviews, focus groups, and observations with DDA staff, program leadership, quality assurance/appeals personnel, and participants, would the state consider multiple options for community engagement such as virtual and/or in person?	The state will consider in-person, virtual, and hybrid approaches to Stakeholder Engagement.
3.	Section V	26	Related to Stakeholder Engagement: Conduct interviews, focus groups, and observations with DDA staff, program leadership, quality assurance/appeals personnel, and participants, will the contract allow for stipends for engagement?	All costs should be incorporated into Deliverables as appropriate.
4.	Section V	27	Regarding the submittal of the Current-State and Preliminary Findings Report at the end of the second month, can the state confirm that the required assessment data, claims data, and other necessary participant level information will be readily available as of the start of the contract and/or that the 5 month completion	Data sharing of the described information may occur as soon as a Data Sharing Agreement is executed.

			timeline for this work will commence upon receipt of the requisite data by the selected bidder.	
5.	Section V	28	Related to Recommended Algorithms, Methodologies, and Implementation Recommendations, and specifically a replacement of the current algorithm, if the bidder recommends a replacement to the current assessment algorithm, does the state also assume that the bidder would reconfigure the associated funding tied to the assessment algorithm? If so, is this expected in the same time frame.	Per Deliverable #4C, the State assumes that if the Bidder recommends replacing existing algorithms, the Bidder will be responsible for providing the proposed replacement algorithms. All work and deliverables must comply with the timeline described in the RFP.
6.	Section VI	30	Will the state allow for travel costs for onsite meetings with DDA staff, program leadership, quality assurance/appeals personnel, and participants?	The state will allow for reasonable travel costs as required by the vendor's project work plan and management approach within Part I- Technical Approach and Project Management.
7.	I. Procurement Procedure - V. Prices & Cost Clarification	7	Is there an estimated budget or funding ceiling for this contract?	Yes, the State has an estimated budget for this contract.
8.	III. Vendor Duties – I. Ownership of Information and Data / Deliverables	18	Will the State accept language preserving interRAI's rights and the vendor's pre-existing intellectual property and methods?	Yes.
9.	III. Vendor Duties – J. Insurance Requirements – 2. Commercial General Liability Insurance and Commercial Automobile Liability Insurance	19-20	Will the State accept proposed exceptions to the insurance requirements, specifically the $5M Umbrella/Excess Liability coverage inclusion of Abuse & Molestation and XCU Liability (Explosion, Collapse, and Underground Damage) coverage as part of General Liability, and Commercial Criminal coverage, for scope and duration of this contract?	The insurance requirements are subject to limited negotiation as described in III.J.4 Deviations.
10.	III. Vendor Duties – L. Conflict of Interest	21	Would the State consider a relationship with interRAI (for example, a vendor having a contract with interRAI or a staff person who is also an interRAI Fellow) to be an actual or perceived conflict of interest for purposes of this evaluation? If such an affiliation requires disclosure, what form of mitigation would the State find acceptable?	Vendors shall propose their mitigation plan for consideration. The State will then consider such disclosure and proposed mitigation plan and either approve or reject as part of the overall solicitation response evaluation.

11.	III. Vendor Duties – T. Time is of the Essence	22	Can the State clarify what this means in the context of contractual requirements?	The parties are expected to complete their obligation within the specified timeframes.
12.	V. Project Description and Scope of Work – B. Scope of Work – 2. Data and Assessment Analysis	26	Will the selected vendor have access to the materials of the vendor the State contracted with to design and implement the current interRAI assessment process and resource allocation framework?	Yes.
13.	V. Project Description and Scope of Work – B. Scope of Work – 3. Stakeholder Engagement	26	Can the State provide more specifics about its expectations for stakeholder engagement? In particular: - What DDA considers "observations". Does this refer to shadowing? If so, approximately how many staff should be shadowed? - An estimate of the number of expected interviews and focus groups with DDA staff, program leadership, quality assurance/appeals personnel, and participants. - Is there an expectation of data collection via a survey across stakeholders? - Will DDA recruit participants and families and arrange accommodations and guardian consent? Can interviews and observations be conducted virtually?	- Observations refer to the understanding of current assessment practices and related processes. - The State has not established a specific minimum number of interviews, focus groups, or observations. Bidders should propose a reasonable stakeholder engagement approach. - Bidders should determine their individualized approach to stakeholder engagement, to meet requirements of the RFP. - The state will consider in-person, virtual, and hybrid approaches to Stakeholder Engagement.
14.	V. Project Description and Scope of Work – B. Scope of Work – 4. Peer-State Review	26	Is there a minimum or preferred number of peer states for the comparative review?	The bidder should develop an approach to a Peer-State Review as a part of the project work plan and management approach within Part I- Technical Approach and Project Management. The bidder should ensure that the number of states reviewed allows for sufficient comparison necessary to Deliverables as described in the RFP.
15.	V. Project Description and Scope of Work – B. Scope of Work – 5. Recommendations and	26	Is algorithm development or recommendations for algorithmic changes included in the scope of work? If so, should vendors assume the least favorable outcome and use that to determine the resources needed given that	Requirements are described within the RFP under Deliverable 4 task details. The vendor should utilize professional judgement and expertise in the development of their work plan and management approach within Part I- Technical Approach and Project Management.

	Improvement Options		recommendations would be premised on the first four parts of the scope of work?	
16.	V. Project Description and Scope of Work – B. Scope of Work – 5. Recommendations and Improvement Options	26	A potential finding of this evaluation could be that assessor training may be needed to improve data quality. Given that any algorithmic recommendations should be premised on analysis of good data, should we incorporate the potential need for training into our cost and timeline considerations?	The bidder should include the development of such training into the cost and timeline consideration but is not required to account for the cost or timeline of training delivery.
17.	V. Project Description and Scope of Work – E. Deliverables	27	The five-month term requires a work plan, full data analysis, peer-state review, stakeholder engagement, and final recommendations, with each deliverable subject to State review and acceptance. Would the State consider a longer contract term, such as nine to twelve months, to allow time for data access, participant engagement, and State review of each deliverable? May bidders propose an alternative deliverable schedule in their Technical Response without that schedule being treated as a deviation or causing the response to be deemed non-responsive? If delivery of data, scheduling of stakeholder activities, or State review of a deliverable takes longer than planned, will subsequent deliverable due dates be adjusted by a corresponding amount?	Please refer to response provided in question 1.
18.	V. Project Description and Scope of – E. Deliverables – 2. Current-State and Preliminary Findings Report	27	Regarding the "evaluation of assessment results, transformed metrics, Level of Care (LOC), Level of Need (LON) determinations, and associated budget tiers": - How many years of data will be provided? - Will the vendor receive individual and item-level assessment responses, algorithm outputs (e.g., LOC/LON/budget-tier), and service authorization, expenditure, and appeals data, and will these data be linkable or already linked?	The State will provide 1 year of interRAI assessment data as well as all data utilized in the development of the current system. Data provided by the State will be both linkable and linked. An approximate total of 6,759 interRAI assessments were completed between July 1, 2025, and June 30, 2026. Of those, approximately 78% were completed using the interRAI ID, with others utilizing the interRAI ChYMH or, if the individual was less than 4 years of age, a clinical review. DUA negotiation will occur concurrently with contract negotiation. Data will be provided in XLSX format. Data sharing of the described information may occur as soon as a contract and Data Sharing Agreement are executed.

			- How many assessments are in the current and historical datasets, by instrument and year? - Will the State begin DUA negotiation before contract execution, so data is available for the Month 2 deliverable? - In what format and from what system will data be provided? What is the expected turnaround after the DUA is executed?	
19.	V. Project Description and Scope of Work– E. Deliverables – 4. Recommended Algorithms, Methodologies, and Implementation Recommendations	28	Because the extent of algorithm work depends on evaluation findings, bidders must price the "Recommended Algorithms" deliverable without knowing whether it involves minor adjustments or full replacement of LOC, LON, and budget-tier logic. Would the State consider separating detailed algorithm development and specification into an optional follow-on phase, priced separately or through the Part II hourly rates, once the evaluation findings are accepted?	Not at this time.
20.	V. Project Description and Scope of Work – E. Deliverables – 4. Recommended Algorithms, Methodologies, and Implementation Recommendations	28	Does the State expect the vendor to translate the recommended algorithm(s) into a specific computer language?	The State expects the vendor to provide any recommended or modified algorithms in SAS, the current programming language for the algorithm.(SL)
21.	VI. Solicitation Response Instructions – A. Solicitation Response Submission – 1. Corporate Overview – h. Summary of Bidder's Corporate Experience and Requested	31	Many of the samples most relevant to this solicitation, such as level of care, level of need, and resource allocation algorithm work, contain information that is private or confidential to a previous state client or that includes proprietary interRAI scale and algorithm content. As a result, bidders with the most directly relevant experience may only be able to provide samples that appear less related to this scope. Will a bidder's score be	Confidential Information Redactions: The vendor shall redact all client names and personally identifiable information that could reasonably identify a client. Redaction shall not obscure information necessary to evaluate the Vendor's experience, qualifications, and capacity to deliver the required goods or services.

	Samples – IV. Requested Work Samples		reduced if it substitutes samples that are less directly related to the work described in Section V?	
22.	V.D – Post-Implementation Support & Consultation Services; V.E – Deliverables	26-27	Please confirm that the five-month scope requires evaluation, development of recommendations, and complete implementation specifications, but does not require the selected vendor to implement modified assessment instruments, LOC/LON methodologies, resource-allocation methods, budget-tier methodologies, or replacement algorithms during the initial contract term. For post-implementation support and consultation that may be requested by the State, please clarify the pricing structure bidders should include on the Cost Sheet.	The five-month scope requires evaluation, development of recommendations, and complete implementation specifications, but does not require the selected vendor to implement modified assessment instruments, LOC/LON methodologies, resource-allocation methods, budget-tier methodologies, or replacement algorithms during the initial contract term. Post-implementation support may be included as position hourly rates (ex., computer programmer, trainer, project manager), itemized/deliverable (ex., on-site training) costs, or a combination of both.
23.	V.B.5 – Recommendations and Improvement Options; VI.A.2 Part II, TR#2, TR#3 and TR#6	26; 32	If the selected vendor recommends modification or replacement of an existing algorithm or methodology, does DDA expect the vendor to statistically validate and test the proposed algorithm against historical Nebraska data during the five-month contract, or is the requirement limited to development, documentation, implementation specifications, and a recommended validation methodology?	Recommendations should be validated by the vendor before they are submitted.
24.	V.B.4 – Peer-State Review; VI.A.2 Part II, TR#7 – Stakeholder and Comparative Analysis	26; 32	Does DDA have a desired minimum number of peer states or jurisdictions for the comparative review? Additionally, does DDA expect the selected vendor to conduct primary interviews with officials or stakeholders in comparison jurisdictions, or may the review rely on publicly available documentation and the vendor's existing knowledge and relationships?	See question 14.
25.	V.B.2 – Data and Assessment Analysis; VI.A.2 Part II, TR#4 – Data Analysis and Evaluation	26; 32	Please clarify DDA's expectations for evaluating reliability and validity. Does DDA expect the selected vendor to perform original psychometric and/or statistical testing using Nebraska assessment data, evaluate existing validation evidence	DDA expects the vendor to perform statistical testing for reliability and validity using Nebraska assessment data, evaluate existing validation evidence and Nebraska implementation practices.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>and Nebraska implementation practices, or both?</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>26.</td><td>V.B.1 – Current-State Assessment; V.B.5 – Recommendations and Improvement Options</td><td>26</td><td>Please provide available volumes and disposition data for appeals, exceptions, variances, overrides, or similar challenges involving assessment results, LOC/LON determinations, resource allocation, or budget tiers, and confirm whether case-level documentation will be available to the selected vendor for analysis.</td><td>Please see below for the Appeals related data. Additional case-level documentation will be shared with the vendor to the extent permitted by law following the vendor selection and contract execution.
October InterRAI Appeals Report
July 1st, 2025 – September 30th, 2026
<table><tr><th>Status</th><th>2025</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>2026</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></tr><tr><th></th><th>Aug</th><th>Sep</th><th>Oct</th><th>Nov</th><th>Dec</th><th>2025 Total</th><th>Jan</th><th>Feb</th><th>Mar</th><th>Apr</th><th>May</th><th>Jun</th><th>Jul</th></tr><tr><td>Active</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>4</td><td>6</td><td>12</td><td>6</td><td>13</td><td>31</td><td>55</td></tr><tr><td>Closed</td><td>6</td><td>17</td><td>53</td><td>68</td><td>44</td><td>188</td><td>34</td><td>23</td><td>53</td><td>44</td><td>27</td><td>29</td><td>25</td></tr><tr><td>Affirmed</td><td>4</td><td>15</td><td>34</td><td>39</td><td>17</td><td>109</td><td>12</td><td>14</td><td>19</td><td>21</td><td>12</td><td>12</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>Dismissed</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>18</td><td>29</td><td>27</td><td>78</td><td>22</td><td>9</td><td>32</td><td>21</td><td>15</td><td>17</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>Reversed</td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td><td></td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Grand Total</td><td>6</td><td>17</td><td>53</td><td>69</td><td>47</td><td>192</td><td>38</td><td>29</td><td>65</td><td>50</td><td>40</td><td>60</td><td>80</td></tr></table></td></tr>
<tr><td>27.</td><td>V.B.3 – Stakeholder Engagement</td><td>26</td><td>Please clarify the anticipated scale and format of stakeholder engagement, including the approximate number of participant and stakeholder interviews, focus groups, and observations expected. Will DDA facilitate recruitment and access to participants and stakeholders? Please also indicate whether DDA anticipates any engagement or assessment observations occurring in person and, if so, the anticipated geographic locations.</td><td>The state will consider in-person, virtual, and hybrid approaches to Stakeholder Engagement. The vendor's approach for stakeholder engagement should be fully articulated within the submitted work plan and management approach within Part I- Technical Approach and Project Management. DDA will facilitate recruitment of stakeholders but the vendor remains the responsible party for stakeholder engagement.</td></tr>
<tr><td>28.</td><td>V.B.2 – Data and Assessment Analysis</td><td>26</td><td>Please describe the current and historical data that DDA anticipates making available to the selected vendor for the interRAI-ID, interRAI ChYMH-DD, and ChYMH-DD Adolescent Supplement, including the approximate number of assessment records, time period/date range(s) of data available, data/file format, and whether linkable participant identifiers, participant characteristics, assessor identifiers, individual assessment-item responses, calculated scores, LOC/LON determinations, budget tiers, service utilization, appeals, exceptions, and variance outcomes will be included.</td><td>DDA anticipates providing one year of interRAI assessment data, the data used to develop the initial interRAI algorithm, primarily within a .xlsx format with linkable participant identifiers and scoring as well as service utilization, appeals, and exceptions.</td></tr>
<tr><td>29.</td><td>V.B.2 – Data and Assessment Analysis</td><td>26</td><td>Please also describe any known limitations of the relevant data and whether DDA will provide data dictionaries, findings from any prior assessments of data</td><td>No known limitations exist.

The State will provide data dictionaries, findings from prior assessments, and documentation of known changes to the selected bidder following contract execution.</td></tr>
</table>

			quality, and/or documentation of known changes over time.	
30.	V.B.2 – Data and Assessment Analysis	26	When does the State expect to provide the first complete data extract relative to submission of the Data Request?	Data sharing of the described information may occur as soon as a Data Sharing Agreement and contract are executed.
31.	V.B.2 – Data and Assessment Analysis	26	Please clarify what specific outcomes or types of outcomes the State wants evaluated as referenced in this sentence: "Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes." Are the desired outcomes related to end-clients receiving services, fiscal outcomes for the State, program process outcomes, or others?	Recommendations should be actionable, strategic recommendations for improving assessment processes, methodologies, and existing algorithms to ensure optimal allocation of State personnel and fiscal resources to support eligible individuals.
32.	V.B.2 – Data and Assessment Analysis	26	Please clarify if analysis of historical data is limited to post-implementation of interRAI or if the vendor is expected to evaluate data from before interRAI implementation.	The vendor will have access to post-implementation interRAI data as well as the data used to develop the original algorithm.
33.	V.B.1 – Current-State Assessment; V.B.5 – Recommendations and Improvement Options	26	Will DDA provide complete documentation of the current methodologies used to translate interRAI assessment results into LOC, LON, resource allocation, and budget-tier determinations, including applicable formulas, variables, weights, thresholds, decision rules, exceptions, and manual overrides? If so, are all of the described methodology pieces well documented and organized?	Well-documented and organized documentation will be provided to the selected vendor.
34.	V.A – Project Overview; III.H – Permits, Regulations, Laws	18; 26	What access will DDA provide to the selected vendor for applicable interRAI instruments, manuals, scoring documentation, algorithms, training materials, or other proprietary resources necessary to perform the evaluation? Please identify any licensing, use, or intellectual-property restrictions applicable to the selected vendor and clarify whether the vendor is expected or permitted to engage directly with interRAI representatives as part of the evaluation.	The State will provide the selected vendor all documentation to which the State has access. Bidders can engage with interRAI representatives.

35.	III.U - Data Use Agreement (DUA) Requirements	22	Before data access, will the vendor be required to undergo personnel background checks, submit IT security policies, or any compliance measures apart from the Data Use Agreement?	No.
36.	I.P - Evaluation of Solicitation Responses	6	When the State is evaluating the solicitation responses, what are the maximum point potentials for each of: Corporate Overview, Technical Response, and Cost Sheet?	Corporate Overview= 30%, Technical response= 60%, and Cost Sheet= 10%
37.	Request for Proposal for Services Contract (first page)	i	Has the State established an estimated budget, funding range, or not-to-exceed amount for the initial five-month contract? If so, please provide the anticipated budget or range to assist bidders in developing an appropriately scaled staffing and technical approach.	The State has established an internal estimated budget for this procurement; however, the estimated amount will not be disclosed to bidders. This approach is intended to preserve the integrity of the competitive solicitation process and ensure that vendors independently develop their proposed pricing based on the requirements, scope of work and services outlined in the solicitation.
38.	Request for Proposal for Services Contract (first page)	i	In the context of this contract only being five (5) months, how would delays in the vendor receiving data, documentation, or stakeholder access affect the deliverables timeline? Would the State be amenable to extending the contract termination date in the case of the described delays?	This Contract may be amended in writing, within scope, upon the agreement of both parties.
39.	V.B.3	26	Are there existing advisory groups the State wishes the contractor to use?	There is an established DD Advisory Committee. Bidders can identify in their work plan how they might want to engage them.
40.	Scope of Service (RFP p. 1); V.B.2 (Data and Assessment Analysis); V.B.5 (Recommendations and Improvement Options); V.E, Deliverable 4	1; 26–28	Section V.B.2 refers to findings that "inform recommended revisions or replacement algorithms," and Section V.B.5 and Deliverable 4 call for "complete, fully articulated proposed algorithms" detailed "sufficiently to serve directly as system implementation specifications." The contract term is five (5) months, including a Work Plan and Data Request due within 30 days. Will the State clarify that the Vendor's role is to (a) evaluate the existing algorithms and methodologies, (b) assess their impact on assessment results, tier assignments, and budgets, (c) identify the components that may be contributing to the	Requirement for recommended algorithms are described in the RFP including clear identification of assessment elements, algorithms, and methodologies that should be retained, modified, or replaced and complete, fully articulated proposed algorithms for any components recommended for modification or replacement—including all formulas, variables, decision rules, thresholds, calculations, weighting, and logic parameters detailed sufficiently to serve directly as system implementation specifications including implementation considerations, supporting rationales, execution priorities, and project dependencies.

			issues identified, and (d) provide recommendations to address them, and that developing, revising, or replacing algorithms is outside the scope of this contract?	
41.	V.E, Deliverable 4 (Recommended Algorithms, Methodologies, and Implementation Recommendations); Cost Sheet, Part I	27–28; Cost Sheet	If the State confirms the scope described in the prior question, will the State amend the description of Deliverable 4 in Section V.E and on the Cost Sheet (for example, to "Findings and Recommendations for Improvement") and remove the requirement for formulas, variables, thresholds, weighting, and decision-rule specifications?	No.
42.	Scope of Service (RFP p. 1); V.B.5; VI.A.2, Part I (Project work plan and management)	1; 26; 29–33*	Developing or revising an algorithm that determines Level of Need and budget tiers generally requires data preparation, model development, validation on separate data, simulation of impacts on individual participants' tiers and budgets, State and stakeholder review, and system testing. Does the State agree that this work cannot be completed with the evaluation within the five-month term? Would the State consider addressing any algorithm development or revision as a separate, later effort that follows the State's acceptance of the evaluation findings and recommendations?	No.
43.	V.B.2; V.B.5; V.E, Deliverables 3 and 4	26–28	Will the State confirm that the Vendor's recommendations may identify the specific components of the current algorithms and methodologies (for example, variables, scoring rules, thresholds, tier mapping, or caps) that warrant review, retention, or modification, and may describe the direction and expected impact of changes, without the Vendor being required to specify revised formulas, weights, or thresholds?	No.
44.	V.E, Deliverable 5 (Final Evaluation Report and Presentation)	28	Deliverable 5 includes "supporting documentation necessary to facilitate DDA's formal review, vendor handoff, and technical implementation of approved recommendations." Will the	See question 40.

			State confirm that this does not include system-ready technical specifications, and that technical implementation is the responsibility of the State or its implementation vendor?	
45.	VI.A.2, Part II, TR#2 (Algorithm and Scoring Execution); TR#6 (Algorithm Development and Documentation)	29–33*	TR#6 requires bidders to demonstrate the ability to "develop or modify algorithms." If the State confirms that algorithm development and revision are not within the contract scope, will the State amend TR#6 so that bidders are evaluated on their ability to review algorithms and methodologies, assess their impact, and recommend changes? How will TR#2 and TR#6 be scored?	Algorithm revision and modifications are major components of the contract scope.
46.	V.E, Deliverables 4 and 5	27–28	Who holds final decision authority on any change to the algorithms or tier methodology? Does the State intend to conduct its own validation, legal, and policy review, and system testing, before any recommended change is implemented?	The State holds final decision authority and will review all recommendations prior to implementation.
47.	VI.A.2, Part II, TR#3 (Technical Validation)	29–33*	Does "independently reproduce calculations, develop test cases, compare expected and actual results" mean replicating scoring from de-identified assessment data using documented logic, or does it include testing the State's production system or source code? If production testing is intended, what access and test environments will the State provide?	Production testing is not required.
48.	V.B.3 (Stakeholder Engagement)	26	Section V.B.3 lists "participants" among those with whom the Vendor is to conduct interviews, focus groups, and observations. Please confirm that the State expects the Vendor to directly engage individuals receiving services and their families or guardians?	The state expects the vendor to directly engage with individuals receiving services and their families or guardians.
49.	V.B.1 (Current-State Assessment); V.E, Deliverable 2	26–27	Does evaluation of "assessor training and competency" include direct testing of assessors (for example, inter-rater reliability studies), or a review of training materials, credentials, and quality assurance records?	Both.
50.	V.E, Deliverables 1 and 2; II.E	27; 10; 22	Deliverable timelines run from contract commencement and depend on data and	This contract, including deliverable timelines, may be amended in writing, within scope, upon the agreement of both parties.

	(Beginning of Work & Suspension of Services); III.T (Time Is of the Essence)		stakeholder access. Will deliverable due dates adjust if State data delivery or access to staff is delayed?	
51.	V.E (Deliverables, introductory paragraph); IV.D (Inspection and Approval)	27; 24	What review and acceptance period does the State expect for each deliverable? Will the timelines for subsequent deliverables adjust if State review extends beyond that period?	This contract, including deliverable timelines, may be amended in writing, within scope, upon the agreement of both parties.
52.	V.E, Deliverable 5 (Final Evaluation Report and Presentation)	28	Please identify the expected audience(s) and number of presentations beyond the final executive presentation to DDA leadership.	No additional requirements exist beyond those in the RFP.
53.	V.D; Cost Sheet, Part II	26	Please confirm that post-implementation support under Section V.D is optional and is authorized only by written State request (for example, a task order), is priced separately at hourly rates, and is not part of the scored Initial Term deliverables.	Post-implementation support under Section V.D is optional, authorized only by written State request, priced separately at hourly rates, and not part of the scored Initial Term deliverables.
54.	III.I (Ownership of Information and Data / Deliverables); V.F	18; 28	Will the Vendor's deliverables be issued under the Vendor's name, and will the Vendor have the opportunity to review any State modifications before publication or external distribution?	The Vendor's deliverables will be issued under the Vendor's name in their original form.
55.	V.B.2; V.C; III.U (Data Use Agreement Requirements)	26; 22	May the Vendor rely on State-provided data and documentation without independent verification? Who is responsible for resolving data quality issues identified during analysis, and will the State designate a data steward to review data before release to the Vendor?	Yes.
56.	VI.A.1 (Bidder's Employee Relations to State); III.L (Conflict of Interest); V.F (Minimum Vendor Qualifications) and VI.A.2, Part II, TR#5; I.F (Ethics in Public Contracting)	29–33*; 21; 28; 3	A bidder employs a former State employee who left State employment more than five (5) months ago (c.f., Section VI.A.1.f.). The bidder will put a written ethical screen in place confirming the individual will not work on any resulting contract. (a) Will the State confirm that this employment, with the screening described, does not by itself make a bidder ineligible, non-responsive, or subject to rejection under Sections III.L, V.F/TR#5, or I.F? (b) If the bidder discloses this	Yes, the State will evaluate the response on the same basis as all other responses if the bidder discloses this relationship, puts a written ethical screen in place, confirms the individual will not work on any resulting contract; and submits a mitigation plan.

			relationship and submits a mitigation plan under Section III.L, will the State evaluate the response on the same basis as all other responses?	
57.	V.A Project Overview	26	1a) The Overview describes an evaluation of Nebraska's "implementation and use" of the interRAI instruments. Does the scope include evaluating the accuracy and appropriateness of assessment and funding results for participants, in addition to the processes and workflows listed in V.A?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
58.	V.A Project Overview	26	1b) Does the scope include evaluating whether the CMI-based method for setting Individual Budget Amounts is an appropriate methodology?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
59.	V.A; Glossary	26; v–x	2a) "Level of Need (LON)" is used in V.A, V.B.1, V.B.5 and V.E but is not defined in the Glossary or the Acronym List. Please define LON.	Level of Need (LON) is a standardized measure of how much support, care, and funding an individual with intellectual or developmental disabilities (IDD) requires.
60.	V.A; Glossary	26; v–ix	2b) Please identify every determination that Level of Need (LON) governs.	Level of Need (LON) is a standardized measure of how much support, care, and funding an individual with intellectual or developmental disabilities (IDD) requires.
61.	V.E (Deliverable 2)	27	3a) Please define "transformed metrics" as used in Deliverable 2.	Transformed metrics refer to an analysis of how the system is operating currently compared to previously utilized LOC/LON tools.
62.	V.B.1; V.B.5; V.E (Deliverable 4.c)	26; 28	3b) Please explain how "exceptions" differ from "variances" as used in V.B.1, V.B.5, and Deliverable 4.c.	Exceptions refer to funding exceptions made through the Exception Process for Funding as outline in DD Provider Policy Manual section 5.3 Exception Process for Funding. Variances refer to a statistical measure of the spread of a set of numbers from their mean value.
63.	V.B.1; V.B.5; V.E (Deliverable 4.c)	26; 28	3c) Do "exceptions" and "variances" in V.B.1, V.B.5, and Deliverable 4.c include each of the following: Continuity of Care exceptions; Risk-tier clinical exceptions; and "alternative compliance to the funding tier" described in CDD Waiver Appendix C-4?	Exceptions refer to funding exceptions made through the Exception Process for Funding as outline in DD Provider Policy Manual section 5.3 Exception Process for Funding. Variances refer to a statistical measure of the spread of a set of numbers from their mean value.
64.	V.B.1; V.B.5; V.E (Deliverable 4.c)	26; 28	3c-1) If any request type listed in 3c is not included in "exceptions" or "variances," please identify each such request type.	Deliverable 4c refers to recommendations regarding how exceptions for funding should be considered or factored into tiers and the appropriate level of variance within each funding tier.
65.	V.A Project Overview	26	4) Does the scope include the waiver-placement and continuous-residential-habilitation logic (the Limited Informal Supports, Housing Instability, High Supervision and Respite Needed domains, and the "Manual Review Needed" routing), in addition to LOC and budget tiers?	Yes.
66.	V.A Project Overview	26	4-1) If any domain or routing step listed in 4 is excluded	Not applicable.

			from the scope, please identify each such domain or step.	
67.	V.A Project Overview	26	5a) Does the scope include every program in which the interRAI instruments are used in determinations, including the CDD waiver, the DDAD waiver, the Family Support Waiver, and any other program (for example, ICF/IID level-of-care determinations)?	The scope of work refers to all uses of the interRAI-ID and interRAI-ChYMH tools for Nebraska HCBS waivers but does not include other ICF/IID level-of-care determinations for which the interRAI is not currently used.
68.	V.A Project Overview	26	5a-1) If any program listed in 5a is excluded from the scope, in whole or in part, please identify each such program.	The scope of work refers to all uses of the interRAI-ID and interRAI-ChYMH tools, including the Adolescent supplement, for Nebraska HCBS waivers but does not include other ICF/IID level-of-care determinations for which the interRAI is not currently used.
69.	V.A; Glossary ("InterRAI Assessments")	26; vii	5b) Does the scope include children ages 4–21 assessed with the ChYMH-DD and its Adolescent Supplement, on the same terms as adults assessed with the interRAI ID?	The scope of work refers to all uses of the interRAI-ID and interRAI-ChYMH tools, including the Adolescent supplement, for Nebraska HCBS waivers but does not include other ICF/IID level-of-care determinations for which the interRAI is not currently used.
70.	I.A; Glossary ("InterRAI Assessments")	1; vii	5c) Section I.A describes the work as support of "the interRAI suite of assessments," while the Glossary limits "interRAI Assessments" to the interRAI ID, ChYMH-DD, and ChYMH-DD Adolescent Supplement. Which definition governs the scope of this evaluation?	The interRAI suite of assessments refers to the interRAI assessments noted in the Glossary including the interRAI ID, ChYMH-DD, and ChYMH Adolescent Supplement.
71.	Glossary ("InterRAI Assessments")	vii	5d) Nebraska's interRAI license also covers the interRAI HC, PEDS-HC, and CMH, and allows a pre-screening tool derived from the interRAI HC. Is any of these, or any other interRAI-derived tool, used in any DD eligibility, level-of-care, waiver-placement, or funding determination?	This assessment is limited to those tools identified in the scope of work
72.	Glossary ("InterRAI Assessments")	vii	5d-1) If so, please identify each such instrument or tool, the determinations it is used for, and whether it is within the scope of this evaluation.	This assessment is limited to those tools identified in the scope of work
73.	V.A; Glossary ("InterRAI Assessments")	26; vii	5e) Will the evaluator be required to identify the version of each instrument used since July 1, 2025 (for example, interRAI ID version 9.2)?	The evaluator will be expected to identify the version of the instrument when and if a finding or recommendation is specific to a particular version of a specific assessment tool.
74.	V.A; Glossary ("InterRAI Assessments")	26; vii	5f) Will the evaluation cover every version of each instrument in use since July 1, 2025, including any change of version during that period?	The evaluation will include all uses of the specified interRAI assessment tool versions used between July 1, 2025, and June 30, 2026.
75.	V.A; Glossary ("InterRAI Assessments")	26; vii	6a) Will the evaluation cover the Risk tier, which the DD Provider Policy Manual (Ch. 5) lists as a clinical exception rather than a CMI range?	Yes.

76.	V.A; Glossary (“InterRAI Assessments”)	26; vii	6b) Will the evaluation cover the Clinical Support Team process that assigns the Risk tier?	Yes.
77.	V.A Project Overview	26	7a) Is there an estimated budget or ceiling for this contract?	Yes.
78.	V.A Project Overview	26	7b) What is this contract’s funding source?	The Division will utilize Program 269 - Administration
79.	V.B.1	26	8) Will the State attach to an addendum, before proposals are due, the complete documentation of the algorithms the evaluator is to review: the CMGDD and ChYRI scoring logic as built in Therap; the CMI-to-tier cut points; the level-of-care algorithm, including any SAS code or pseudocode; the waiver-placement logic; the materials reported under Neb. Rev. Stat. § 68-9,112(6)(b); and the version history of each since July 1, 2025?	No.
80.	V.B.1	26	8-1) If any item of documentation listed in 8 will not be attached, please identify each such item.	Not Applicable
81.	V.B.1	26	8-2) If not, will the documentation be provided to the contractor at the start of the contract?	Yes.
82.	V.B.1	26	8-3) If not, what information about the algorithms will be available to bidders before proposals are due?	Only the information contained in the Request for Applications and responses to Bidder questions will be available to bidders before proposals are due.
83.	V.B.1	26	8-4) If any documentation described in 8 is provided to a bidder before proposals are due, will it be provided to all bidders at the same time?	Yes.
84.	V.B.1	26	9a) Will the evaluator be required to identify who derived the CMI-to-tier cut points (Basic 0.45–0.75, Intermediate 0.76–1.23, High 1.24–1.50, Advanced 1.51–2.01, as published in the DD Provider Policy Manual, Ch. 5)?	No.
85.	V.B.1	26	9b) Will the evaluator be required to identify and assess the data and method used to derive the tier cut points?	The evaluator will be required to provide the deliverables as outlined in the Task Details column of V-E. Deliverables.
86.	V.B.1	26	9c) Will the evaluator be required to document how the tier cut points were calibrated, including any calibration to prior funding levels, budget distributions, appropriations, or other factor(s) (for example, a budget-neutrality target)?	The evaluator will be required to provide the deliverables as outlined in the Task Details column of V-E. Deliverables.

87.	V.B.1	26	9c-1) Will the evaluator be required to document how each such factor was selected and assess its effect on tier assignments?	The evaluator will be required to provide the deliverables as outlined in the Task Details column of V-E. Deliverables.
88.	V.B.1	26	9d) Will the State provide the full Myers and Stauffer analyses, along with the supporting materials and data used to set the tier cut points and tier rates?	Yes.
89.	V.B.1	26	9d-1) If any of the analyses, supporting materials, or data described in 9d will not be provided, please identify each such item.	Not applicable.
90.	V.B.1; V.B.2	26	10a) The CMGDD was developed and calibrated on Arkansas data (Fries et al., 2019). Will the evaluator test whether the CMGDD is valid for Nebraska's waiver population?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
91.	V.B.1; V.B.2	26	10b) Will the evaluator test whether the ChYRI is valid for Nebraska's child and youth population?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
92.	V.B.1; V.B.2	26	10c) Does the scope include recalibrating either index on Nebraska data, if the evaluator finds that necessary?	The scope of work includes providing actionable recommendations and options to improve assessment integrity, reliability, validity, quality assurance, algorithms, LOC/LON/budget determinations, and variance processes, including complete implementation specifications (formulas, variables, decision rules, thresholds, weighting, and calculations) for any algorithm recommended for modification or replacement.
93.	V.B.1	26	11a) Will the evaluator verify the CMI values and tier assignments produced in Therap against the published source specifications?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
94.	V.B.1	26	11b) If the evaluator identifies discrepancies in CMI values or tier assignments, will it be required to quantify how many participants were affected and by how much?	The scope of work includes providing actionable recommendations and options to improve assessment integrity, reliability, validity, quality assurance, algorithms, LOC/LON/budget determinations, and variance processes, including complete implementation specifications (formulas, variables, decision rules, thresholds, weighting, and calculations) for any algorithm recommended for modification or replacement.
95.	V.B.1	26	12) Will the evaluator be required to assess how the CMGDD grouping variables (age over 40, years in an institution, and whether the person has left the family home; Fries et al., 2019, Figure 1) affect tier assignment?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
96.	V.B.1	26	12-1) If the effect of any grouping variable listed in 12 will not be assessed, please identify each such variable.	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
97.	V.B.1	26	13a) Will the evaluator assess the effect on scores and tiers	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency,

			of each Nebraska modification to the instruments (including items L1aa, L1bb, L1cc, L7, G6, and I2h) and of the coding rules in Chapter 8 of the DD interRAI Nebraska Manual?	integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
98.	V.B.1	26	13a-1) If the effect of any modification or coding rule listed in 13a will not be assessed, please identify each such modification or rule.	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
99.	V.B.1	26	13b) Will the evaluator assess whether Nebraska's modifications stay within the 5% modification limit in the State's interRAI license?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
100.	V.B.1	26	14a) One set of cut points is applied to two different indices (CMGDD for adults and ChYRI for children). Will the evaluator assess whether a single set of cut points is appropriate for both?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
101.	V.B.1	26	14b) Will the evaluator assess the funding effect of moving from the ChYMH-DD to the interRAI ID at the age transition?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
102.	V.B.1	26	14c) Will the evaluator be required to identify which age is applied for the transition from the ChYMH-DD to the interRAI ID, and assess the effect of any difference? (The DD interRAI Nebraska Manual, § 2.2, applies the interRAI ID at age 22 and older; the HCBS Instruction Manual, Ch. 2, § 2.1.B.1.e, applies it at age 21 and older.)	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
103.	V.B.1	26	15a) Will the evaluator assess whether DDA assessors meet interRAI's recommended professional qualifications?	The scope of work includes a review process of the assessment intake, assignment, scheduling and administration, to include assessor training and competency.
104.	V.B.1	26	15b) Will the evaluator assess whether assessor training meets Neb. Rev. Stat. § 68-9,112(2)?	The scope of work includes a review process of the assessment intake, assignment, scheduling and administration, to include assessor training and competency.
105.	V.B.1	26	15c) Will the evaluator assess assessor caseload and assessment volume?	The scope of work includes a review process of the assessment intake, assignment, scheduling and administration, to include assessor training and competency.
106.	V.B.1	26	15d) Will the evaluator measure variation in scores and tiers by individual assessor and by region?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
107.	V.B.1	26	16a) Will the evaluator review the post-interview edit history of assessments in the Therap audit logs, including the frequency, timing, and authorization of changes?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
108.	V.B.1	26	16b) Will the evaluator audit the supervisory reviews of	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency,

			reductions required by Neb. Rev. Stat. § 68-9,112(5)?	integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
109.	V.B.1	26	17a) Will the evaluator report the number of appeals of interRAI-based decisions filed, affirmed, reversed, and withdrawn since July 1, 2025?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
110.	V.B.1	26	17a-1) If any appeal outcome listed in 17a will not be reported, please identify each such outcome.	Not applicable
111.	V.B.1	26	17b) Will the evaluator assess the appeal structure in which a hearing officer issues a recommended decision and the DDA Director issues the final decision (404 NAC 3-004)?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
112.	V.B.1	26	17c) Will the evaluator assess the use of telephone hearings?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
113.	V.B.1	26	17d) Will the evaluator review hearing records and decisions from fair hearings on interRAI-based decisions?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
114.	V.B.1	26	17d-1) If so, will that review document each of the following: which party was treated as bearing the burden of proof; the evidence DHHS presented in support of reductions; how hearing officers weighed the interRAI result against other evidence; and what evidence was found sufficient to overcome an interRAI result?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
115.	V.B.1	26	17d-2) If any element listed in 17d-1 will not be documented, please identify each such element.	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
116.	V.B.1	26	17d-3) Will the review in 17d cover all such hearings since July 1, 2025, or a sample?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
117.	V.B.1	26	17d-4) If a sample, will the evaluator or DHHS select it?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
118.	V.B.1	26	17e) Will the evaluator assess whether participants receive, before the hearing, every document DHHS will use, including item-level responses, the CMI calculation, and the tier logic applied to them, consistent with 42 CFR 431.242(a)?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
119.	V.B.1	26	17f) Will the evaluator assess what information participants have available to determine whether a change in an item	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.

			response would change their tier or budget?	
120.	V.B.1	26	17g) Will the evaluator report how often the DDA Director's final decision differed from the hearing officer's recommendation, in which direction, and on what stated basis?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
121.	V.B.1	26	17h) Will the evaluator assess whether services and budgets continue unchanged pending a timely appeal, consistent with 42 CFR 431.230?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
122.	V.B.1	26	18a) Will the evaluator assess whether Notices of Decision meet 42 CFR 431.210?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
123.	V.B.1	26	18b) Will the evaluator assess whether Notices of Decision give "a clear and precise explanation of the assessment tool results" consistent with Neb. Rev. Stat. § 68-9,112(3)(b)?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
124.	V.B.1	26	19) Will the evaluator review all Continuity of Care, Risk-tier, and alternative-compliance requests submitted since July 1, 2025?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
125.	V.B.1	26	19-1) If any request type listed in 19 will not be reviewed, please identify each such request type.	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
126.	V.B.1	26	19-2) Will that review include the number granted and denied and the reasons given?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
127.	V.B.2; III.U	26; 22	20a) Will the evaluator have access to each of the following: item-level interRAI responses; prior ICAP, DI and risk-screen data; the 656-person pilot data; claims and authorization data; exception requests; appeal records; critical-incident data; and Therap audit logs?	The evaluator will have access to all data relevant to perform scope of work as outlined in the bidders proposals. Records may be requested by the evaluator to suport their analysis and will be provided to the extent permissible by law and practical for the purposes of the evaluation.
128.	V.B.2; III.U	26; 22	20a-1) If any item listed in 20a will not be provided, or will be provided only in part (for example, as summaries, samples, de-identified extracts, or subject to DHHS review before release), please identify each such item and the restriction.	Not Applicable
129.	V.B.2; III.U	26; 22	20b) Will the evaluator be permitted to communicate directly with Myers and Stauffer, Therap, and interRAI as needed, or must	The evaluator may communicate with any entity that may support the development of listed deliverables. The evaluator may request the state to serve as an intermediary or choose to communicate independently.

			communications go through DHHS?	
130.	V.B.2; III.U	26; 22	20b-1) If the evaluator will not be permitted to communicate directly with any entity listed in 20b, please identify each such entity.	Not applicable.
131.	V.B.2; III.U	26; 22	20c) What is the State's expected turnaround for fulfilling the data request in Deliverable 1, given that Deliverable 2 is due at the end of Month 2?	Deliverable 1 must be "[submitted] within 30 calendar days of contract commencement," as noted in the RFP on page 27.
132.	V.E; III.U	27; 22	20c-1) If the State's delivery of data, or execution of the data use agreement, is delayed, will deliverable due dates be extended by the same amount?	The vendor shall provide, deliver, and formally submit deliverables to the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Division of Disability and Aging (DDA), in accordance with the specified timelines as noted in the RFP.
133.	V.B.2; III.U	26; 22	20d) Will a data use agreement under III.U be required before data is released?	Yes.
134.	V.B.2	26	20e) Approximately how many interRAI assessments have been completed since July 1, 2025, by instrument, and how many participants does that represent?	An approximate total of 6,759 interRAI assessments were completed between July 1, 2025, and June 30, 2026. Of those, approximately 78% were completed using the interRAI ID, with others utilizing the interRAI ChYMH or, if the individual was less than 4 years of age, a clinical review.
135.	V.B.2	26	20f) What period does "historical assessment data" in V.B.2 cover, and does it include DI, ICAP, and risk-screen records from before July 1, 2025?	The evaluator may request historical data, including DI, ICAP, and risk-screen records from before July 1, 2025, insofar as they are necessary for their analysis. Records will be provided to the extent permissible by law and practical for the purposes of the evaluation.
136.	V.B.2	26	21a) Does the State expect "reliability" in V.B.2 to be measured by an empirical inter-rater study with independent re-assessment of a sample of participants, or by another method?	Bidders will identify in their proposals a method and means for determining reliability using established statistical methods.
137.	V.B.2	26	21b) May bidders propose the sample size and timeline for an inter-rater study?	Bidders will identify in their proposals a method and means for determining samples using established statistical methods.
138.	V.B.2	26	22a) Will the evaluator test validity by comparing interRAI results with independent clinical evaluations of the same participants?	Bidders will identify in their proposals a method and means for determining validity using established statistical methods.
139.	V.B.2	26	22b) Will the evaluator test whether tier assignments match the tier definitions in CDD Waiver Appendix I-2, including the need for 24-hour care?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
140.	V.B.2	26	22c) Will validity be tested separately for participants with severe and profound intellectual disability?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
141.	V.B.2	26	22c-1) For the analysis in 22c, will participants with severe and profound intellectual	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency,

			disability be identified by their interRAI ID item B5 code ("Documented Severity of Intellectual Disability," coded from existing records, with "8 – Not documented" as an option)?	integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
142.	V.B.2	26	22c-2) How will the evaluator treat participants whose item B5 severity is coded "Not documented," including those who lack recent intelligence testing or cannot be tested with standard instruments?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
143.	V.B.2	26	22c-3) Will the evaluator verify item B5 severity codes against participants' clinical records, and report how often the code is missing, "Not documented," or inconsistent with those records?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
144.	V.B.2	26	22d) Will the evaluator assess whether the instruments and Nebraska's coding rules capture the needs of non-speaking participants, including the DD interRAI Nebraska Manual's instructions to score Section C mental-state items, and certain items for non-verbal participants, as not present unless observed or documented (Ch. 8, pp. 24 and 34)?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
145.	V.B.2	26	22e) Will the evaluator assess whether the instrument captures the needs of people who require continuous or 1:1 supervision?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
146.	V.B.2	26	22f) Will the evaluator assess whether the instrument's look-back windows capture needs that are intermittent but significant (for example, infrequent but serious behaviors or seizures)?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
147.	V.B.2	26	22g) Will the evaluator assess whether scores reflect a participant's underlying need, or instead reflect support that family or other caregivers already provide (that is, performance with support rather than capacity without it)?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
148.	V.B.2	26	22h) The CMGDD cost weights were derived from paid-service claims (Fries et al., 2019). Will the evaluator assess how unpaid family care is accounted for in budgets for participants who rely on it?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.

149.	V.B.2	26	23a) Will the evaluator perform an item-level sensitivity analysis showing how changes in individual item responses change CMI and tier?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
150.	V.B.2	26	23b) Will the evaluator count how many participants are one item response away from a different tier or budget?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
151.	V.B.2; V.E (Deliverable 3)	26–27	24) Will the disparity analysis cover each of the following: age; sex; race and ethnicity; rural or urban residence; living setting; reliance on family caregivers; diagnosis; severity level of intellectual disability; communication method (including non-speaking participants); assessor; region; and child versus adult?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
152.	V.B.2; V.E (Deliverable 3)	26–27	24-1) If any dimension listed in 24 will not be included in the disparity analysis, or will be included only in part, please identify each such dimension.	Not applicable.
153.	V.B.2; V.E (Deliverable 3)	26–27	24-2) For the severity dimension in 24, will the disparity analysis report each interRAI item B5 severity level separately, including “Not documented” as its own category?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
154.	V.B.2	26	25a) Does the scope include assessing participant outcomes following interRAI-based tier and budget decisions?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
155.	V.B.2	26	25a-1) If so, which outcomes does the State expect to be assessed? For example: use of services compared with the authorized budget; provider continuity; changes in living setting; hospitalizations or emergency department use; critical incidents; and participant- and family-reported experience.	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
156.	V.B.2	26	25a-2) If any outcome listed in 25a-1 is not expected to be assessed, please identify each such outcome.	Not applicable.
157.	V.B.2	26	25b) Over what period after the decision should outcomes be measured (for example, 6 or 12 months)?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
158.	V.B.2	26	25c) May bidders propose the measurement period and the outcome measures?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
159.	V.B.2	26	25d) What data sources does the State expect the evaluator to use for outcomes (for	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency,

			example, claims and authorization data, Therap records, critical-incident reports, or interviews and surveys)?	integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
160.	V.B.2	26	25e) Should outcomes be compared with a baseline, such as the same participants before the decision, or with a comparison group?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
161.	V.B.2	26	25f) How should outcome results be reported? For example, separately for tier increases, decreases, and no change, and by the dimensions listed in 24?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
162.	V.B.2	26	26a) Will the evaluator assess the fiscal effect of the interRAI process on total waiver spending?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
163.	V.B.2	26	26b) Will the evaluator assess how any budget targets or funding estimates were incorporated into the methodology?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
164.	V.B.2	26	27a) Will the evaluator independently verify the figures in DHHS's August 1, 2026 report to the Legislature under Neb. Rev. Stat. § 68-9,112(6)?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
165.	V.B.2	26	27b) Will the evaluator compare, for the same individuals, interRAI results with their prior ICAP-based results?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
166.	V.B.2	26	27c) Will the evaluator compare pilot results with later production results for the same individuals?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
167.	V.B.2	26	27d) Will the evaluator review participants whose tier decreased by one or more levels to determine, case by case, whether each decrease is supported by a documented change in the participant's needs?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
168.	V.B.2	26	27e) Will the evaluator review participants whose tier increased by one or more levels to determine, case by case, whether each increase is supported by a documented change in the participant's needs?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
169.	V.B.2	26	27f) Will the evaluator report, separately for increases and decreases, how many tier changes were not supported by a documented change in need, and whether such	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.

			changes occur more often in one direction?	
170.	V.B.2	26	27g) Will the case-level reviews in 27d and 27e cover all such participants, or a sample?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
171.	V.B.2	26	27g-1) If a sample, will the evaluator or DHHS select it?	The scope of work includes: Analyze current and historical assessment data to evaluate reliability, validity, consistency, integrity, trends, and outcomes. Bidders will describe their approach within the proposals.
172.	V.B.2	26	27h) Will the State provide the Population Impact Report memo and its underlying data as an RFP attachment?	No. The evaluator will have access to all data relevant to perform scope of work as outlined in the bidders proposals. Records may be requested by the evaluator to suport their analysis and will be provided to the extent permissible by law and practical for the purposes of the evaluation.
173.	V.B.3	26	28a) V.B.3 names DDA staff, program leadership, quality assurance/appeals personnel, and participants. Does the scope also include engagement with families and guardians; providers; independent clinicians; service coordinators; advocacy organizations; the DDAC; the Olmstead Advisory Committee; the Nebraska Council on Developmental Disabilities; and Disability Rights Nebraska?	The evaluator may choose to include specific entities to the extent that they include or represent participants in the development of their work plan. The state does not require specific stakeholder engagement beyond what is noted in V.B.3.
174.	V.B.3	26	28a-1) If any group listed in 28a is not within the scope of stakeholder engagement, please identify each such group.	Not applicable.
175.	V.B.3	26	28b) Will the evaluator or DHHS select the participants and families to be interviewed?	The evaluator may choose the means and methods of its stakeholder engagement so long as it complies with the requirements noted in V.B.3.
176.	V.B.3	26	28c) Will the interview sample include participants whose tiers increased, decreased, and stayed the same?	The evaluator may choose the means and methods of its stakeholder engagement so long as it complies with the requirements noted in V.B.3.
177.	V.B.3; V.E (Deliverable 5)	26; 28	28d) Deliverable 5.a refers to “integrated DDA stakeholder feedback.” Does that include feedback from the non-DDA stakeholders engaged under V.B.3?	The evaluator is responsible for the creation of all deliverables. The state has not identified a specific format or required components beyond what is specified in the Task Details column of the Deliverables table.
178.	V.B.3	26	29a) Will stakeholder engagement include public listening sessions?	The evaluator may choose the means and methods of its stakeholder engagement so long as it complies with the requirements noted in V.B.3.
179.	V.B.3	26	29b) Will the evaluator accept written comments from the public?	The evaluator may choose the means and methods of its stakeholder engagement so long as it complies with the requirements noted in V.B.3.
180.	V.B.3	26	29c) Will stakeholders be able to comment on draft findings before the final report?	The vendor shall provide, deliver, and formally submit deliverables to the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Division of Disability and Aging (DDA), in accordance with the specified timelines as noted in the RFP.
181.	V.B.3	26	29d) V.B.3 refers to “observations.” Will the evaluator be permitted to	The evaluator may choose the means and methods of its stakeholder engagement so long as it complies with the requirements noted in V.B.3.

			observe interRAI assessments as they are administered?	
182.	V.B.3	26	30a) Does the State expect the evaluator to engage non-speaking participants directly?	The evaluator may choose the means and methods of its stakeholder engagement so long as it complies with the requirements noted in V.B.3.
183.	V.B.3	26	30a-1) If so, may bidders propose the methods (for example, supported communication, observation, or proxy interviews)?	The evaluator may choose the means and methods of its stakeholder engagement so long as it complies with the requirements noted in V.B.3.
184.	V.B.3	26	30b) Will DDA staff attend participant and family interviews, or will the evaluator conduct them independently?	The evaluator may choose the means and methods of its stakeholder engagement so long as it complies with the requirements noted in V.B.3.
185.	V.B.3	26	30c) Will stakeholders be able to contact the evaluator directly during the engagement period?	The evaluator may choose the means and methods of its stakeholder engagement so long as it complies with the requirements noted in V.B.3.
186.	V.B.3	26	31) Will the evaluator be expected to review existing public input, including DDAC and Olmstead Committee comments, the January–February 2026 waiver amendment public comments, and legislative hearing records?	The evaluator may choose the means and methods of its stakeholder engagement so long as it complies with the requirements noted in V.B.3.
187.	V.B.3	26	31-1) If any part of the public record listed in 31 will not be reviewed, please identify each such part.	Not applicable.
188.	V.B.4	26	32a) V.B.4 limits the peer-state review to jurisdictions using the interRAI-ID or ChYMH-DD. May the review also include states that use other assessment-based budget methods?	The evaluator may choose the means and methods of its stakeholder engagement so long as it complies with the requirements noted in V.B.4.
189.	V.B.4	26	32b) Should the peer-state review include legal and regulatory developments, including litigation, involving assessment-based budget methods in other states?	The evaluator may choose the means and methods of its stakeholder engagement so long as it complies with the requirements noted in V.B.4.
190.	V.B.5; V.E (Deliverable 4)	26; 28	33a) Does the scope permit recommendations ranging from refinements of the current methodology to alternative approaches, including use of the CMI as a decision aid within person-centered planning, or approaches that do not use an algorithm to set individual budgets?	The evaluator will be required to provide the deliverables as outlined in the Task Details column of V-E. Deliverables. The evaluator may choose information or recommendations to include in Deliverable 4 and 5.
191.	V.B.5; V.E (Deliverable 4)	26; 28	33a-1) Would a proposal that contemplates such recommendations be considered responsive?	The evaluator will be required to provide the deliverables as outlined in the Task Details column of V-E. Deliverables. The evaluator may choose information or recommendations to include in Deliverable 4 and 5.
192.	V.E (Deliverable 4)	28	33b) Deliverable 4.d requires complete implementation specifications for any algorithm recommended for modification or replacement. If the	Complete, fully articulated proposed algorithms are required only if any components are recommended for modification or replacement.

			evaluator recommends an approach that does not use an algorithm to set budgets, how does Deliverable 4.d apply?	
193.	V.B.5	26	34a) Does the scope include assessing legal compliance with each of the following: 42 CFR 441.301(c), 441.302 and 441.304; 42 CFR 431.200–431.246 (notice and fair hearings); the ADA integration mandate (28 CFR 35.130(d)); Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 83-1209, 83-1216, 83-1226 and 68-9,112; and the Nebraska Administrative Procedure Act?	The evaluator will be required to provide the deliverables as outlined in the Task Details column of V-E. Deliverables. The evaluator may choose information or recommendations to include in Deliverable 5.
194.	V.B.5	26	34a-1) If any legal standard listed in 34a is outside the scope, please identify each such standard.	Not applicable.
195.	V.B.5	26	34b) Does the scope include identifying conflicts between the interRAI process and Title 404 NAC, which still references the ICAP?	The evaluator will be required to provide the deliverables as outlined in the Task Details column of V-E. Deliverables. The evaluator may choose information or recommendations to include in Deliverable 5.
196.	V.B.5	26	34c) Must the evaluator's team include legal or regulatory expertise in Medicaid HCBS?	Minimum vendor qualifications are listed in F. Minimum Vendor Qualifications.
197.	V.B.5	26	35) Will the evaluator deliver interim written findings if it identifies issues affecting individual participants' determinations before the Deliverable 2 report or the final report?	The evaluator will be required to provide the deliverables as outlined in the Task Details column of V-E. Deliverables.
198.	V.B.5	26	35-1) If interim findings identify issues affecting participants, will the evaluator be required to recommend interim corrective measures?	The evaluator will be required to provide the deliverables as outlined in the Task Details column of V-E. Deliverables.
199.	V.B.5	26	35-2) Will the contract require DHHS to respond to such recommendations in writing within a stated time?	Only deliverables included in E. Deliverables are within the scope of the contract.
200.	V.A; V.B	26	36a) Is the evaluator expected to consider, or to exclude, issues that are the subject of pending litigation concerning the interRAI process?	The bidder will articulate their approach to the scope of work within their bid. No additional requirements exist beyond those listed in B. Scope of Work.
201.	V.A; V.B	26	36b) Will the evaluator be required to route draft findings or deliverables through any party other than DDA before delivery?	All requirements for deliverables are noted in E. Deliverables.
202.	V.A; V.B	26	36c) Will the publication and delivery terms for deliverables in V.E and III.I apply regardless of pending litigation, or may delivery or publication be delayed on that account?	All requirements for deliverables are noted in E. Deliverables.

203.	V.D; V.F; Cost Sheet Part II	26; 28; Cost Sheet	37) V.D and Cost Sheet Part II contemplate optional post-implementation support and consultation. May the contractor also be engaged to implement its own recommendations (for example, developing or configuring replacement algorithms in Therap), or is that excluded by the independence requirement in V.F?	As noted in V.D, direct post-implementation support is outside of the immediate scope of this contract. The vendor shall provide limited support and consultation as requested by the State, including troubleshooting, clarification of methodology and scoring, resolution of implementation issues, and technical assistance. If any post-implementation support and consultation incurs additional costs, those must be itemized on the cost sheet.
204.	V.D	26	37-1) If permitted, would that work be procured under this contract or separately?	As noted in V.D, direct post-implementation support is outside of the immediate scope of this contract. The vendor shall provide limited support and consultation as requested by the State, including troubleshooting, clarification of methodology and scoring, resolution of implementation issues, and technical assistance. If any post-implementation support and consultation incurs additional costs, those must be itemized on the cost sheet.
205.	V.C; Cover page	26; i	38a) Does the State expect every task in V.B, including an empirical inter-rater study, validity testing, and statewide stakeholder engagement, to be completed within the five-month term?	The required timeline for deliverables is outlined in the Deliverables table, in the column titled Timeline.
206.	V.C; Cover page	26; i	38b) May bidders propose a longer timeline?	The Bidder shall execute the project through a structured work plan ensuring alignment with contract timelines as noted in V.C Work Plan and Project Management.
207.	V.C; Cover page	26; i	38b-1) Will a proposal with a longer timeline be scored lower for that reason?	The evaluation of bidder proposals will include whether the bidder can perform the contract within the specified time frame as noted in P. Evaluation of Solicitation Responses, item 1.c.
208.	V.B; V.C	26	38c) After award, who has authority to add to or remove items from the V.B scope: the contractor, DHHS, or both by agreement?	This contract may be amended in writing, within scope, upon the agreement of both parties as noted in II.F. Amendment.
209.	V.B; V.C	26	38d) May the evaluator propose additional issues identified during the evaluation that are not listed in V.B?	All solicitation responses that are deemed responsive to the solicitation will be evaluated as noted in I.P. Evaluation of Solicitation Responses.
210.	V.B; V.C	26	38d-1) If so, what approval process applies?	The means and method for the evaluation of solicitation responses is outlined in I.P Evaluation of Solicitation Responses.
211.	V.B; V.C; II.G	26; 10	38e) Will changes to the V.B scope after award be handled under II.G (Change Orders), including a written description of the work and an itemized cost?	Change orders and/or substitutions will be handled as indicated in the RFP under II.G Change Orders or Substitutions.
212.	V.E	27	39a) What are the criteria for DHHS acceptance of each deliverable?	Deliverables must comply with the requirements as outlined in the Task Details column of the Deliverables table in V.E Deliverables.
213.	V.E	27	39b) May acceptance or payment be withheld for reasons other than failure to meet the stated acceptance criteria?	Requirements for payment are articulated in IV. Payment.
214.	V.E	27	39c) Will the contract require draft deliverables and DHHS's written comments on them to	All requirements for deliverables are noted in E. Deliverables.

			be retained as part of the evaluation record and made available with the final report?	
215.	V.E; IV.D	27; 24	39d) How many calendar days will DHHS take to review each deliverable?	All requirements for deliverables are noted in E. Deliverables. All requirements for payment are noted in IV. Payment.
216.	V.E; IV.D	27; 24	39e) Does DHHS review time count against the deliverable due dates in V.E?	The timeline for submitting deliverables is shown in the Timeline column of the Deliverables table.
217.	V.E (Deliverable 5)	28	40a) Who has final authority over the content of the final report, including findings with which DHHS disagrees: the evaluator or DHHS?	All requirements for deliverables are noted in E. Deliverables.
218.	V.E (Deliverable 5)	28	40b) Will DHHS's review of draft reports be limited to correcting factual errors?	Draft reports are not included in the RFP or listed as deliverables in E. Deliverables.
219.	V.E (Deliverable 5)	28	40c) Where DHHS disagrees with a finding, will the final report show the disagreement and the evaluator's response, rather than the finding being removed or changed?	The evaluator will be required to provide the deliverables as outlined in the Task Details column of V-E. Deliverables. The evaluator may choose information or recommendations to include in Deliverable 5.
220.	V.E (Deliverable 5)	28	40d) Will the final report be expected to summarize issues raised through stakeholder engagement and state the evaluator's findings on each?	The evaluator will be required to provide the deliverables as outlined in the Task Details column of V-E. Deliverables. The evaluator may choose information or recommendations to include in Deliverable 5.
221.	V.E; III.I	27–28; 18	41a) Which of Deliverables 1 through 5 in V.E, if any, does the State intend to make public?	Contract documents and deliverables may be made publicly available as required by and subject to Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 84-712 through 84-712.09.
222.	V.E; III.I	27–28; 18	41a-1) If any of Deliverables 1 through 5 will not be made public, please identify each such deliverable.	Not applicable.
223.	V.E; III.I	27–28; 18	41a-2) For this purpose, do "deliverables" also include interim written findings (see 35) and supporting materials such as appendices, data tables, and technical documentation?	Contract documents and deliverables may be made publicly available as required by and subject to Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 84-712 through 84-712.09.
224.	V.E; III.I	27–28; 18	41a-3) Will public versions include the complete deliverable, including appendices, data tables, and technical documentation, subject only to any redactions addressed in 43b?	Contract documents and deliverables may be made publicly available as required by and subject to Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 84-712 through 84-712.09.
225.	V.E; III.I	27–28; 18	41a-4) Will the contractor be expected to prepare separate public versions of deliverables (for example, redacted or accessible versions), and should bidders include that work in their pricing?	All requirements for deliverables are noted in E. Deliverables.
226.	V.E; III.I	27–28; 18	41b) Will the contractor be expected to deliver or present deliverables to any party other than DHHS (for example, the Legislature's Health and Human Services Committee,	All requirements for deliverables are noted in E. Deliverables.

			the Legislative Oversight Committee, the Public Counsel, the DDAC, or CMS)?	
227.	V.E; III.I	27–28; 18	41b-1) If the contractor will not be expected to deliver or present deliverables to any party listed in 41b, please identify each such party.	Not applicable.
228.	V.E; III.I	27–28; 18	41c) Within what time after acceptance will deliverables be published?	Contract documents and deliverables may be made publicly available as required by and subject to timelines articulated in Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 84-712 through 84-712.09.
229.	V.E (Deliverable 5)	28	42a) Will the evaluator be expected to present its findings at a public meeting?	All requirements for deliverables are noted in E. Deliverables.
230.	V.E (Deliverable 5)	28	42b) Will the evaluator be expected to present its findings to the Legislature and to the DDAC?	All requirements for deliverables are noted in E. Deliverables.
231.	V.E (Deliverable 5)	28	42b-1) If the evaluator will not be expected to present its findings to any body listed in 42b, please identify each such body.	Not applicable.
232.	V.E; III.I; II.S	27–28; 18; 13	43a) Has the State obtained interRAI's permission for the evaluator to publish findings that describe interRAI items, scoring, and algorithms?	Not applicable to the RFP. All requirements for deliverables are noted in E. Deliverables.
233.	V.E; III.I; II.S	27–28; 18; 13	43a-1) If interRAI's permission does not cover all of the items, scoring, and algorithms described in 43a, please identify each part not covered.	Not applicable.
234.	V.E; III.I; II.S	27–28; 18; 13	43a-2) If the State has not obtained that permission, will it do so before award?	Not applicable.
235.	V.E; III.I; II.S	27–28; 18; 13	43b) What categories of material, if any, does the State anticipate withholding from public versions of deliverables (for example, protected health information and personally identifiable information, or material restricted by law, contract, or license)?	Not applicable.
236.	V.E; III.I; II.S	27–28; 18; 13	43c) Will the State identify any law, contract, or license provision that restricts publication of the evaluator's findings, and attach any such contract or license?	Not applicable.
237.	V.E; III.I; II.S	27–28; 18; 13	43d) Will the evaluator be permitted to describe Nebraska's item modifications, coding rules, CMI-to-tier cut points, tier rates, level-of-care algorithm, and waiver-placement logic in its deliverables?	The evaluator will be required to provide the deliverables as outlined in the Task Details column of V-E. Deliverables. The evaluator may choose information to include within deliverables.
238.	V.E; III.I; II.S	27–28; 18; 13	43d-1) If any item listed in 43d may not be described, please identify each such item.	Not applicable.

239.	V.E; III.I; II.S	27–28; 18; 13	43e) Who will be responsible for preparing any redacted public version of a deliverable?	Not applicable to RFP.
240.	V.E; III.I; II.S	27–28; 18; 13	43f) Will redactions be marked and labeled with their basis?	Not applicable to RFP.
241.	V.E; III.I; II.S	27–28; 18; 13	43g) Where a finding depends on restricted material, will the evaluator report the finding in descriptive or summary form rather than omitting it?	The evaluator will be required to provide the deliverables as outlined in the Task Details column of V-E. Deliverables. The evaluator may choose information to include within deliverables.
242.	V.E; III.I; II.S	27–28; 18; 13	43h) Will participant-level results be reported only in de-identified, aggregate form, with small counts suppressed?	The evaluator will be required to provide the deliverables as outlined in the Task Details column of V-E. Deliverables. The evaluator may choose information to include within deliverables.
243.	V.E; III.I; II.S	27–28; 18; 13	43i) Will de-identified, aggregate results be treated as publishable?	Contract documents and deliverables may be made publicly available as required by, and subject to, the limitations articulated in Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 84-712 through 84-712.09.
244.	V.E; III.I; II.S	27–28; 18; 13	43j) Will any party other than DHHS receive unredacted deliverables?	Contract documents and deliverables may be made publicly available as required by, and subject to, the limitations articulated in Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 84-712 through 84-712.09.
245.	II.S; III.I	13; 18	43k) II.S treats all materials and information provided by either party as confidential, while III.I gives the State the right to publish deliverables. How do these provisions apply to the evaluator's findings intended for publication?	The State shall have the unlimited right to publish, duplicate, use, and disclose all information and data developed or obtained by the Vendor on behalf of the State pursuant to this contract.
246.	V.F; Technical Requirement #5	28; 32	44a) V.F and Technical Requirement #5 require an "independent" evaluator but do not define the term. Please define "independent."	Independent is defined as an objective third party capable of conducting an evaluation without a conflict of interest.
247.	V.F; Technical Requirement #5	28; 32	44b) Will a bidder be ineligible if it, or any proposed team member, has done work on Nebraska's interRAI process or tier rates, including for Myers and Stauffer?	All vendor qualifications are described in the RFP. No other bidder eligibility qualifications, beyond those described, exist.
248.	V.F; Technical Requirement #5	28; 32	44c) Will a bidder be ineligible if it has held a DHHS contract within the past five years?	All vendor qualifications are described in the RFP. No other bidder eligibility qualifications, beyond those described, exist.
249.	V.F; Technical Requirement #5	28; 32	44d) Will a bidder be ineligible if any proposed team member is a former DHHS employee?	All vendor qualifications are described in the RFP. No other bidder eligibility qualifications, beyond those described, exist.
250.	V.F; Technical Requirement #5	28; 32	44e) Will a bidder be ineligible if it or any team member is affiliated with interRAI, is an interRAI Fellow, is an interRAI licensed vendor, or authored the CMGDD or ChYRI?	All vendor qualifications are described in the RFP. No other bidder eligibility qualifications, beyond those described, exist.
251.	V.F; Technical Requirement #5	28; 32	44f) Will a bidder be ineligible if it has a business relationship with Therap Services?	All vendor qualifications are described in the RFP. No other bidder eligibility qualifications, beyond those described, exist.
252.	V.F; Technical Requirement #5	28; 32	44g) Will a bidder be ineligible if it has represented or advised the State in litigation involving the interRAI process?	All vendor qualifications are described in the RFP. No other bidder eligibility qualifications, beyond those described, exist.
253.	V.F; III.L	28; 21	44h) Did any contractor or consultant assist in developing	No.

			this solicitation, including its scope of work or evaluation criteria? (See SPB Procurement Manual (2024), § II.C.1.)	
254.	V.F; III.L	28; 21	44h-1) If so, will that contractor, and any bidder proposing it as a subcontractor, be ineligible to bid?	Not applicable.
255.	V.A; III.L	26; 21	44i) Has DHHS previously contracted with, or negotiated a contract with, any vendor to evaluate the interRAI process?	No
256.	V.A; III.L	26; 21	44i-1) If so, will any work product from that engagement be provided to all bidders?	Not applicable.
257.	V.A; III.L	26; 21	44i-2) If so, will that vendor be eligible to bid?	Not applicable.
258.	V.F; III.L	28; 21	45a) Who decides whether a disclosed conflict is acceptable and whether a mitigation plan suffices, DAS State Purchasing Bureau or DHHS/DDA?	DAS State Purchasing Bureau has final authority regarding state contracts and agreements.
259.	V.F; III.L	28; 21	45b) Will conflict disclosures and mitigation plans submitted under III.L be part of the posted solicitation response, or may they be marked proprietary?	Contract documents and deliverables may be made publicly available as required by and subject to Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 84-712 through 84-712.09.
260.	III.L; V.F	21; 28	46) Will the State accept “walling off” a conflicted individual as sufficient mitigation of a conflict of interest under III.L?	All vendor qualifications are described in the RFP. No other bidder eligibility qualifications, beyond those described, exist. DAS State Purchasing Bureau has final authority regarding all state contracts and agreements.
261.	VI.A.1 (Employee Relations)	29	47) VI.A.1 asks about former State employees within the past “five (5) months.” Is “months” intended, or should it read “years”?	Months are intended.
262.	VI.A.1 (Corporate Experience); Technical Requirement #1	30; 32	48a) VI.A.1.h allows experience with “comparable standardized assessment tools.” Which tools does the State consider comparable (for example, SIS-A, ICAP, Vineland)?	All vendor qualifications are described in the RFP. Bidders may identify comparable standardized assessments within their Technical Response.
263.	VI.A.1 (Corporate Experience); Technical Requirement #1	30; 32	48b) Under Corporate Experience and Technical Requirement #1, will prior interRAI experience be required, or only credited?	All vendor qualifications are described in the RFP. No other bidder eligibility qualifications, beyond those described, exist.
264.	VI.A.1 (Proposed Personnel)	31	49) Which areas of team expertise are required, and which are scored (for example: psychometrics, actuarial science, developmental disability clinical practice, Medicaid HCBS law, disability rights)?	All vendor qualifications are described in the RFP. No other bidder eligibility qualifications, beyond those described, exist.

265.	I.O	5	50a) Will Evaluation Committee members include staff involved in designing or administering the interRAI process?	The Evaluation Committee(s) will consist of individuals selected at the discretion of the State. Names or positions of the members of the Evaluation Committee will not be published prior to the intent to award.
266.	I.O	5	50b) Will the Evaluation Committee include any member from outside DHHS?	The Evaluation Committee(s) will consist of individuals selected at the discretion of the State. Names or affiliations of the members of the Evaluation Committee will not be published prior to the intent to award.
267.	I.O	5	50c) Will any non-state entity or individual assist the evaluators, including in a non-voting role? (See SPB Scoring & Evaluation Policy, § III.C.)	The Evaluation Committee(s) will consist of individuals selected at the discretion of the State. Names or affiliations of the members of the Evaluation Committee will not be published prior to the intent to award.
268.	I.O	5	50c-1) If so, will each be required to sign the Procurement Collaborator Agreement before reviewing any solicitation response?	DAS State Purchasing Bureau will ensure the evaluation of bids complies with established DAS policy and procedure.
269.	Evaluation Criteria; I.P	Evaluation Criteria attachment; 6	51a) Which evaluation criteria score a bidder's independence?	Bidder qualifications are evaluated through the Corporate Overview and Technical Response.
270.	Evaluation Criteria Part 3; I.V	Evaluation Criteria attachment; 7	51b) Part 3 calculates cost points "accounting for cost realism and reasonableness" from the "lowest realistic cost submitted." How will the State determine whether a submitted cost is realistic for this purpose?	The DAS State Purchasing Bureau will review bids based on established DAS policies and procedures.
271.	Evaluation Criteria Part 3; I.V	Evaluation Criteria attachment; 7	51b-1) If a submitted cost is found not realistic, will it be excluded when setting the lowest cost used in the cost formula?	The DAS State Purchasing Bureau will review bids based on established DAS policies and procedures.
272.	I.W; Evaluation Criteria	8; Evaluation Criteria attachment	51c) Does the State anticipate requiring vendor demonstrations under I.W (20 points)?	The state cannot determine whether a vendor demonstration is required until all bids are received.
273.	I.W; Evaluation Criteria	8; Evaluation Criteria attachment	51c-1) If so, what topics or requirements would the demonstrations cover?	The state cannot determine the nature of a vendor demonstration until the state determines that a vendor demonstration is required.
274.	Evaluation Criteria; I.P	Evaluation Criteria attachment; 6	51d) Before proposals are due, will the State identify how the 30 Corporate Overview points and 60 Technical Response points are allocated among the subsections of VI.A.1 and VI.A.2, including TR#1–TR#7?	No.
275.	I.O; I.P	5; 6	51e) Which scoring method applies to this solicitation: individual scoring, or a single consensus score? (See SPB Procurement Manual (2024), § II.B.4.h, and SPB Scoring & Evaluation Policy, § VII.A, which require the scoring method to be determined	Bids are evaluated individually by all members of the Evaluation Committee.

			before the solicitation is released.)	
276.	IV.C; Cost Sheet	24; Cost Sheet	52a) IV.C calls for monthly invoices with a detailed report of services, deliverables, and/or staff hours, while the Cost Sheet sets a fixed cost per completed deliverable. Will payment be made per accepted deliverable, as stated in the Cost Sheet?	Payment will be made per accepted deliverable.
277.	IV.C	24	52b) Please confirm the invoice address in IV.C (DHHS.MedicaidDrugRebate @nebraska.gov).	Yes, the correct email should be: DHHS.hcbsbilling@nebraska.gov
278.	III.J	18–21	53) Will the State consider adjusting, under III.J.4, insurance coverages that may not apply to a consulting evaluation (for example, XCU liability, abuse and molestation coverage, $5,000,000 cyber liability, and $5,000,000 umbrella liability)?	The insurance requirements are subject to limited negotiation as described in III.J.4 Deviations.
279.	V.B.3	26	54a) Will any work be required in person in Nebraska (for example, interviews, focus groups, or observations)?	All vendor requirements are described in the RFP. No other bidder requirements, beyond those described, exist.
280.	V.B.3; Cost Sheet	26; Cost Sheet	54b) Should travel costs be included in the fixed cost per completed deliverable?	All allowable costs should be incorporated into the relevant deliverable.
281.	Cover page; Cost Sheet Part II	i; Cost Sheet	55) If the contract is extended beyond five months, will additional work be priced at the Cost Sheet Part II hourly rates?	Extensions and any additional payment terms beyond the Deliverables will be agreed to by the selected bidder and Procurement in the drafting of the Agreement.
282.	III.P	21	56) Do the Nebraska Technology Access Standards in III.P apply to the deliverables, including public versions of reports?	Yes.
283.	I.C; I.D	2; 3	57) Will the Solicitation Addendum reproduce every question submitted under I.D, including any the State declines to answer?	The Solicitation Addendum will respond to submitted questions only. If a question related to "under I.D" was submitted, then response shall be available.
284.	I.S	7	58) Please confirm that the protest policy referenced in I.S is SPB Policy 23-07, Protest Policy (effective 11-20-2023), currently available at https://das.nebraska.gov/materiel/docs/NE_DAS_Materiel_SPB_Policy-Protest.pdf. (The link printed in I.S, https://das.nebraska.gov/materiel/docs/NE_DAS_Materiel_Purchasing_Agency-SPB_Policy_23_07_Protest_Policy.pdf, returned “Page Not Found” on October 23, 2026.)	Yes.

285.	I.S	7	58-1) Will an addendum correct the link in I.S?	Yes
286.	Page footers (SPB Form 22)	i–x; 1–33	59) The footers on pages i–x read “SPB Form 22 | RFP Template | Effective 07012026,” and those on pages 1–33 read “Effective 07012025.” Which version of the SPB Form 22 template governs this solicitation?	10/29/2026 is the current version of SPB Form 22. Version 07012026 & 07012025 are both acceptable for this contract.

This addendum will be incorporated into the solicitation.