



W A L L O W A V A L L E Y
CENTER *for* WELLNESS

RHTP Catalyst Procurement FAQ 1

RFQs RHTP-2026-A, -B, -C, and -D | OHA Grant Agreement 188026 | Current July 30, 2026

WVCW's RHTP Catalyst Project is launching on an accelerated timeline while OHA and CMS continue to finalize implementation guidance. WVCW will rely on the signed Grant Agreement, the approved project budget, its Procurement Policy, and the published RFQs as the current written authority. If later written guidance changes a material assumption, WVCW will issue an addendum and apply the clarification equally to all interested vendors.

The approved project budget identified anticipated vendors and solutions so WVCW could begin an implementation-ready project quickly. That planning is valued, but it did not create a vendor contract. WVCW must still complete a documented procurement, address conflicts and price reasonableness, obtain required approvals, and execute a written agreement before paid vendor work begins.

General funding and procurement

1. Does being named in the grant application or approved budget mean that a vendor has already been awarded the work?

No. The Catalyst award funded WVCW's project; it did not create a subcontract or guarantee payment to a named vendor. The approved budget identifies anticipated vendors and solutions, which is relevant to grant change control, but WVCW must still follow its procurement process, document selection and price reasonableness, address conflicts, obtain required OHA consent for subcontracts, and execute a written contract. If the competitive process results in a different vendor, scope, or allocation than the approved budget, WVCW will need to seek the required written approval before finalizing or charging the change.

2. How can WVCW show that the project began July 1 when vendor contracts are not yet executed?

The July 1 project start applies to WVCW's grant performance, not to authorization for a vendor to begin paid work. WVCW may document internal project initiation, procurement preparation, approvals, governance planning, data and inventory preparation, and partner coordination beginning July 1. Vendors must not perform paid scope or incur reimbursable costs until a written contract or work order is fully executed and any required OHA approval has been received.

3. How will WVCW handle project or budget changes while OHA and CMS guidance is still developing?

The signed Grant Agreement requires prior written OHA approval for changes to the approved annual project plan and budget. WVCW also understands from the kickoff meeting that even small changes may require CMS review through OHA. Until written follow-up guidance is issued, WVCW will use a conservative

rule: no change to vendor, scope, deliverables, budget, software, or material timeline will be treated as approved until WVCW receives written authorization through OHA.

4. May one vendor submit for or be awarded more than one RFQ?

Yes. A vendor may respond to more than one RFQ, and WVCW may consider multiple awards to the same vendor when the proposal is most advantageous and the scopes, staffing, and pricing remain transparent. For RFQs A and B, the vendor must preserve independent assessment and oversight and avoid reviewing its own work. For RFQs C and D, shared efficiencies must be shown as separately identified discounts or credits, not blended charges. Any vendor substitution or consolidation that differs from the approved budget remains subject to required written approval.

5. How should a vendor disclose prior discussions, grant-development assistance, or other potential conflicts?

Include a concise "Prior Assistance and Conflict Disclosure" in the proposal's assumptions/conflicts section. Identify the dates, participants, general subject matter, documents or language contributed, access to nonpublic information, and any proposed safeguards. Prior conceptual discussion is not automatically disqualifying. However, WVCW's Procurement Policy requires exclusion when a contractor developed or drafted the actual procurement specifications, requirements, statement of work, invitation for bids, or request for proposals. WVCW will review each disclosure and document the determination.

6. What is the Budget Period 1 period for proposal pricing?

Use the anticipated contract start date of August 17, 2026 and present one total BP1 price, not an annualized price. The RFQs authorize approved BP1 work through September 30, 2027. The Grant Agreement separately identifies the initial BP1 program period as July 1–October 30, 2026 and a BP1 spending period through September 30, 2027. Proposals should therefore front-load kickoff and priority work, clearly identify any approved BP1 activities that continue into the extended spending period, and remain within the stated BP1 ceiling.

7. When will WVCW decide whether to exercise optional Budget Period 2?

There is no guaranteed exercise date. WVCW will make a BP2 decision only after OHA confirms the applicable CMS funding and written authorization and WVCW reviews BP1 performance, remaining scope, and budget. Vendors should price BP2 separately and should not rely on it as committed revenue.

8. Do the BP1 ceilings include software, licenses, subscriptions, travel, and pass-through costs?

Generally, costs proposed by a vendor must be included within the applicable RFQ ceiling and separately itemized. **RFQ A has one exception:** its \$120,000 BP1 professional-services ceiling is accompanied by a separate approved travel placeholder of up to \$20,520. The applicable RFQ-A addendum governs travel pricing and reimbursement.

Vendors responding to RFQs B, C, or D should not assume that separate additional funding exists for software, licenses, subscriptions, travel, or pass-through costs unless WVCW issues a written addendum stating otherwise.

9. When must required insurance be active?

Insurance documentation is not required with the quotation unless specifically requested. The selected vendor must have all applicable coverage active and provide the required certificates before beginning work, accessing WVCW systems or data, or performing services. There is no grace period after the work start date. Contract execution may be conditioned on receipt and acceptance of the insurance evidence.

10. When will written answers be issued, and what are the correct email subject lines?

WVCW anticipates posting written responses as soon as practicable and no later than Monday, August 3, 2026. If later guidance materially changes scope, pricing, or proposal assumptions, WVCW may issue an additional addendum and adjust the schedule as necessary. The correct quotation subject lines are shown in the table below.

RFQ	Correct subject line
A	RHTP-2026-A – Cybersecurity Governance and Fractional CISO Advisory Services – [Vendor Name]
B	RHTP-2026-B – Health IT and Cybersecurity Implementation Services – [Vendor Name]
C	RHTP-2026-C – AI-Enabled Behavioral Health Analytics and Risk Stratification – [Vendor Name]
D	RHTP-2026-D – Data Governance, Reporting Automation, and Visualization Services – [Vendor Name]

11. May vendors use general-purpose AI tools for drafting SQL logic, report structures, or documentation when no WVCW information is entered?

Yes. The RFQ restriction applies to WVCW confidential information, security information, personal information, and ePHI. Generic drafting or coding assistance that contains no WVCW data and no nonpublic WVCW schema, configuration, security, or business information does not require pre-approval under that clause. The vendor remains responsible for ensuring that no WVCW information is entered and that final work is accurate, secure, and reviewable.

12. Will WVCW consider approving a defined AI processing environment for WVCW information?

Yes, subject to WVCW's privacy, security, legal, and contract review. A vendor should identify the provider and model, deployment and tenant structure, data types, data flow, retention and deletion, model-training use, subprocessors, hosting location, encryption, access controls, audit logging, incident response, portability, available security reports or certifications, and willingness to execute a BAA when applicable. Review may begin before the anticipated start date, but approval by August 17 cannot be guaranteed. No WVCW information may be processed until written approval is issued.

RFQ RHTP-2026-A – Cybersecurity Governance and Fractional CISO

13. Are RFQ A's "prioritized implementation workplan" and RFQ B's "prioritized remediation roadmap" the same artifact?

No. They should align, but they serve different purposes. The RFQ A workplan is the governance and oversight plan: decision rights, policy, risk reporting, dependencies, responsible parties, and advisory milestones. The RFQ B remediation roadmap is the technical plan produced from assessment findings:

specific risks, implementation effort, operational impact, timing, responsible party, and estimated cost. WVCW expects cross-referencing rather than duplicate documents.

14. How will advisory independence be maintained if the RFQ A vendor previously implemented or supports security tools?

The vendor must disclose the prior or current work and may provide governance advice, but it may not present independent assurance conclusions about its own products, configurations, or implementation. Independent testing or assessment must be performed by a separate qualified entity, and the proposal should describe organizational separation, recusal, validation, and escalation controls.

15. When should the crosswalk between baseline services and RHTP-funded work be provided?

Include a preliminary narrative and line-item crosswalk with the quotation so WVCW can evaluate duplication risk and price reasonableness. The selected vendor will then validate and finalize the crosswalk as an early post-award deliverable in coordination with WVCW and the other vendors.

16. How many on-site visits should be assumed, and are travel costs inside the \$120,000 BPI ceiling?

For comparable pricing, vendors should assume up to four Budget Period 1 on-site visits for as many as two travelers. The \$120,000 BPI ceiling applies to professional services and does not include the separately approved BPI travel placeholder of up to \$20,520.

Vendors must provide a separate estimated cost per visit. WVCW may authorize fewer visits. Travel requires advance written approval and will be limited to actual, reasonable, documented expenses and applicable GSA limits. Final traveler and location information may require OHA/CMS approval before travel funds are released. Unused travel funding may not be converted into additional professional-service fees.

17. Is the tabletop exercise a single BPI event or recurring?

Assume one formal organization-wide BPI tabletop exercise with an after-action report and remediation tracking. Vendors may propose smaller readiness drills, executive walkthroughs, or scenario work during other meetings or visits if they fit within the proposed scope and budget. Additional formal exercises are optional and may be considered in BP2.

18. How many staff and leaders should be assumed for security training?

For pricing, assume approximately 100 covered staff or users, with a smaller leadership audience. WVCW prefers a practical plan that includes at least one workforce-focused training component and one leadership-focused component, with final attendance and delivery format confirmed after award.

19. What cadence should be assumed for recurring executive advisory meetings and written reports?

Assume one executive advisory meeting and one concise written status report each month. Vendors should state the expected monthly hours, preparation time, availability for urgent issues, and any limits or overage rates. A different cadence may be proposed if the vendor explains why it better supports the deliverables.

RFQ RHTP-2026-B — Health IT and Cybersecurity Implementation

20. Must the independent cybersecurity/HIPAA assessor be a separate legal entity, or may the awarded vendor subcontract the assessment?

The assessor must be a separate, qualified, independent legal entity. The awarded implementation vendor may subcontract and coordinate that assessor if the assessor is fully disclosed, WVCW approves the subcontract in writing, and the independence, methodology, deliverables, and price are clear. The implementation vendor may not be the sole assessor of its own products or prior work.

21. Is the cost of the independent assessment included within the \$75,000 BPI ceiling?

Yes. Coordination and completion of the independent assessment are required BPI deliverables under RFQ B, so the assessor's cost must be included and separately identified within the \$75,000 ceiling unless WVCW later issues a written addendum stating otherwise.

22. What environment size should vendors use for preliminary pricing?

For preliminary pricing, assume approximately 100 users or covered seats. Exact endpoint/device, user-account, mailbox/alias, and physical-site counts are being validated. Because detailed security inventory should not be posted on a public webpage, WVCW will provide the same validated profile to all known RFQ B respondents through a controlled bidder addendum. Vendors should state their assumptions and include unit pricing for material variances.

23. How should a vendor demonstrate that its proposal avoids duplicate billing with existing services?

Provide both a short narrative and a line-item crosswalk. For each proposed service, identify whether it is existing baseline work, new or expanded RHTP work, implementation support, a one-time cost, or an optional future transition cost. Show any overlap period, credit, exclusion, or handoff assumption. The selected vendor will finalize the crosswalk with WVCW after award.

24. Are MDR, endpoint monitoring, patching, SOC/SIEM, vulnerability management, and related managed services part of RFQ B?

Not automatically. Existing baseline MDR, patching, and managed monitoring are expected to continue under separate non-RHTP arrangements unless WVCW authorizes a transition. RFQ B may fund assessment, implementation, configuration, new or expanded capabilities, and transition planning, but it does not commit WVCW to purchase every listed managed-security service for the full term. Any later transition must be approved in writing and may not result in concurrent duplicate billing.

25. Does the MDM scope assume that WVCW will enroll all personally owned phones?

No. The RFQ asks the vendor to assess and support an approved device-management approach; it does not predetermine blanket MDM enrollment on personal devices. Proposals may address organization-owned devices, application or container management, conditional access, limited BYOD, and other least-intrusive compliant options. WVCW will establish the employee consent, exception, and enforcement process with HR and legal review. If a user declines required controls, WVCW may restrict access from the personal device or provide an approved managed alternative.

26. Will WVCW purchase security licenses directly, or should the vendor include them within its proposal?

Vendors may propose either a WVCW direct purchase or a vendor-resold purchase, but all proposed license and subscription costs must be included in the BPI pricing table and separately identify term, unit cost, discount, and markup. WVCW retains final purchasing authority and may select the procurement method that provides the best value and clearest ownership.

RFQ RHTP-2026-C — AI-Enabled Behavioral Health Analytics

27. Does WVCW have an existing OCHIN pathway for Epic extracts, and who will lead the approval process?

OCHIN is WVCW's existing Epic/EHR partner, and the approved project budget includes separate OCHIN support for data access, extract planning, test feeds, technical requirements, and troubleshooting. WVCW will lead and authorize the OCHIN request, with the selected analytics vendor defining the needed data elements, frequency, security requirements, and dependencies. Vendors should not assume immediate direct access or a guaranteed interface timeline; access remains subject to WVCW, OCHIN, contract, security, and grant approvals.

28. What claims data source, format, historical depth, and refresh cadence should vendors assume?

The approved project contemplates EOCCO claims data together with OCHIN Epic and approved care-management data. The final transfer format, historical depth, refresh cadence, and access pathway are not yet confirmed and are part of the required data-source and integration planning. Vendors should state their minimum data assumptions, preferred formats, recommended historical period, refresh options, and any pricing that changes by volume or cadence.

29. Which analytics priorities should be treated as highest priority in BP1?

For proposal purposes, WVCW's intended first pilot is IET/SUD cohort and worklist functionality, followed closely by timely-access reporting and SDOH/Z-code and risk-adjustment workflows as data readiness permits. Vendors should propose a staged sequence with clear dependencies rather than assuming that all use cases will go live at the same time.

RFQ RHTP-2026-D — Data Governance, Reporting Automation, and Visualization

30. What does the RFQ mean by predictive analytics or cohort products “procured under another scope”?

That work is the subject of the separate concurrent RFQ RHTP-2026-C. No RHTP predictive-analytics contract has been awarded through this procurement. The approved project budget identified an anticipated analytics vendor, but the RFQ process and required approvals must still be completed. RFQ D proposals should describe coordination points with the eventual RFQ C vendor and exclude duplicate proprietary analytics, risk-stratification, or cohort-product charges.

31. Who are the current OCHIN and predictive-analytics vendors, and what access or cooperation is already committed?

OCHIN is WVCW's existing Epic/EHR partner. No RHTP predictive-analytics vendor has yet been awarded a contract through this solicitation. The approved budget anticipates separate OCHIN support for data access and troubleshooting, but no bidder should assume a specific interface, data feed, or cooperation beyond existing arrangements until WVCW and OCHIN approve it in writing.

32. Is the selected RFQ D vendor expected to create the authoritative report and data inventory from the beginning?

Yes. Existing spreadsheets, report lists, definitions, and informal documentation will be treated as starting material, not as a final authoritative inventory. The engagement is intended to validate, reconcile, rationalize, document, and establish ownership for the inventory and related definitions.

33. Will the selected vendor use existing Tableau licenses, and may it propose a comparable visualization platform?

WVCW currently uses Tableau and expects vendors to evaluate use of existing WVCW-held licensing first. A comparable alternative may be proposed if the vendor clearly explains the business and technical rationale, security and accessibility implications, migration and portability effects, total cost, and licensing terms. Any new platform or additional license requires WVCW's written approval and must be separately priced.

34. Is RFQ D additive to existing reporting arrangements, or will it replace or consolidate them?

The RHTP engagement must be separately scoped, contracted, invoiced, and tracked from any existing arrangement. The RFQ does not automatically renew, replace, or terminate an existing contract. After selection, WVCW may decide to continue, modify, consolidate, transition, or end related work through separate written contract decisions, but no service may be billed twice.

35. Does the \$115,000 BP1 ceiling require every listed report, dashboard, and automation to be completed in full?

The \$115,000 is the total BP1 maximum, and vendors should propose a realistic, prioritized scope within it. WVCW expects the core governance charter, inventory, definitions, lineage, roadmap, and an initial set of high-value automations or dashboards in BP1. The proposal should clearly identify which deliverables will be completed in BP1, which are phased, and which are proposed for optional BP2. WVCW does not expect an unsupported promise to automate every current report in BP1.

36. What milestone and payment cadence does WVCW prefer?

Vendors should propose fixed-fee or milestone pricing tied to defined acceptance criteria. WVCW prefers monthly progress reviews and invoices that identify the accepted milestone or monthly deliverable, service period, units or personnel billed, approved expenses, and remaining balance. Payment follows WVCW's acceptance of the applicable deliverable.

37. What sequencing and review cadence should vendors assume for RFQ D?

WVCW expects an early governance charter and decision process, followed by validated data and report inventories, common definitions and lineage, a prioritized roadmap, and then staged automation and visualization. Vendors may refine the sequence based on dependencies, but should propose monthly working reviews and formal acceptance points for major milestones.

38. How many recurring reports exist today, and is there a current report inventory?

A final validated report inventory does not currently exist; establishing it is a required deliverable. WVCW has informal and partial lists, but the selected vendor should expect discovery, reconciliation, deduplication, and prioritization. For pricing, vendors should state assumptions and provide a scalable unit or range approach for reports beyond the initial prioritized set.

Equal access to clarifications

WVCW will provide the same material clarification to all known interested vendors. General process, scope, pricing, schedule, and access assumptions will be posted on the RFQ webpage. Detailed cybersecurity inventory or architecture information, if needed, will be distributed equally through a controlled bidder addendum rather than posted publicly. Vendor-specific conflict disclosures and WVCW's evaluation deliberations will remain in the procurement file.