

**NMHIX System Integrator RFI Questions**

ID	RFI Section in question	Question	NMHIX Response
1	Page 15 4.4.3	Price Estimate requests a "detailed and complete Price Estimate for completion of all tasks included in the Scope of Work - Section 3." Further breakout is requested for other direct costs.  Do you want the detail to extend to all levels of the subtasks (e.g., 1.9.6.1)? We are concerned about being able to provide detailed information for both costs and technical approach for all tasks in five pages. We respectfully request that we be allowed to submit the detailed pricing separate from the 5 pages for the proposal, ideally in additional pages on the spreadsheet.	Yes, detailed pricing should be separate from the 5 pages of narrative reserved for the respondents background and experience to provide the products and/or services required for the scope of work. The included rate card may be extended to provide for an appropriate level of detailed cost breakdown.
2	General	1. Is there a preference for certain positions to be onsite over offsite or offshore? For example, does the Build Master and Database Administrator need to be onsite for security concerns?	There is no preference. We are open to the recommendation of the respondents based upon industry standard practice and cost effectiveness.
3	General	2. If the team includes offsite personnel, is the offshore team expected to work during Mountain Time working hours or have a minimum number of overlapping work hours?	It would be preferable that all personnel be available during Mountain Time. However, we are open to the recommendation of the respondents based upon industry standard practice and cost effectiveness.
4	General	3. What is the tentative project kick-off date?	This is a request for information, and no formal plan for a, "kick-off" date has been formulated.
5	Spreadsheet tab, Sec 3.4	The totals in column J appear to be for only the number of months listed in column E for one person. Should that number be multiplied by the number of people listed in column D?	Please see the corrected Table in both the RFI and the Rate Card for Scope of work Section 3.4
6	Spreadsheet tab, Sec 3.4	"For positions that can be filled with a mix of staffing options, i.e Onsite and Off Shore, etc. , please add a line and provide the separate rate and total for that position." As an example on row 16 for Senior Java Engineer, with 8 positions listed, if we feel that this would be ideally staffed by 6 offshore people and 2 onshore people, should we add 1 line (the new line 17), change the quantity in line 16 to 6 and list the offshore rate, insert the quantity 2 on line 17 and list the onshore rate?	Yes, you are correct.
7	Implementation of Interfaces	Looking to know if we can propose our solution in this RFI as we see reference being made vendors to can propose COTS based solution in addition to staff augmentation services.  Our technology will not destabilize your existing web site but will offer a link (as part of integration service) to Apply for Insurance Plans and from here onwards our engines will do whatever processing is required (in the order stipulated by each State Exchanges) till the delivery of accepted health plan offers to individual Insurance company; additionally we have tracking and analytics (real-time reporting) components.	Yes, we are open to the recommendation of the respondents based upon industry standard practice, cost effectiveness and any specific COTS based possibilities.
8	Pg 10, Sec 3	Can NMHIX elaborate on the requirements around the enrolment part of the scope?	The specific solution intended is still in development.
9	Pg 10, Sec 3.1	Is it fair to assume that the scope of the SI services is limited to integration between YES_NM, NMHIX and ASPEN systems only? E.g. ASPEN connects to various state agencies for verification of data. Is the establishment of the connection to various state agencies supposed to be considered as in scope while designing our solution?	Please refer to the Context Diagram
10	Pg 10, Sec 3.1	Vendor understands that there will be integration between NMHIX, YES-NM & ASPEN. Should vendors scope of work include making any necessary integration related changes to ASPEN & YES-NM?	Yes
11	Pg 14, Sec 3.4	Is it possible that more than one vendor can be engaged for the roles mentioned in section 3.4?	We have no intention of splitting this scope of work. There is no preference. We are open to the recommendation of the respondents based upon industry standard practice and cost effectiveness. Please provide in your response if you would recommend a subcontractor, and delineate their costs. Responses are still limited to 5 pages.
12	Pg 14, Sec 3.4	Will NMHIX be open for fixed price model instead of rate card, if a single vendor is contracted to deliver the scope of the RFI?	The respondent should provide a rate card with scalable pricing options and granular pricing, i.e, per number of interface points, componenets scale, transaction volumes, etc.
13	General	Vendor recommends to build a reconciliation process based on 834 received from HIX as well as processed by ASPEN (Valid and Failed case creation cases). Please confirm if this reconciliation needs to be estimated for as part of the response.	NMHIX currently has in place an 834 reconciliation process for it's SHOP operations that may be utilized/extended into the completed solution. With this information, please provide both your recommendation and cost anticipated for this work as a separate line item within the rate card.
14	General	Vendor assumes that as part of target architecture, there is a need to build a encryption / decryption logic adopting HUB Security protocol for data transfer. Please confirm the same.	Yes, we believe this would be part of the requirements per section 1.8 and 1.9 of the Scope of Work.
15	General	From a solution perspective, can NMHIX provide inputs around specific performance requirements/constraints such as concurrent processing, expected Turnaround time etc. in target architecture	SEM - Must support 1K concurrent user authentication. Responses must be provided within 2seconds. Shared Hub - Aggregate time for all verifications for a case must be processes and responses returned within 15 seconds. Must support 1K concurrent verification requests.
16	General	Will NMHIX be interested in implementing Data Visualization techniques as part of the Dashboard/Business metrics reports?	We seek the recommendation of the respondents based upon industry standard practice and cost effectiveness. Please provide this functionality and cost anticipated for this work as a separate line item within the rate card.
17	General	Does NMHIX have a preference on following either an Agile or a waterfall model for development required by the scope of the RFI?	The current NMHIX technology development project has been largely Agile in methodology. However, we seek the recommendation of the respondents based upon industry standard practice and cost effectiveness.
18	General	What is the post-production support time period that NMHIX would require for the vendor to provide?	Various staff will be required to remain post go-live at different levels. Some staff will be required to stay onsite through open enrollment, others will be offboarded in the Novemeber timeframe, others may be offboarded shortly after go-live.
19	General	What is the support window NMHIX is looking for (24x7, 8x5...)?	Must coincide with YES-NM uptime. 24x7 with the exception of schedule maintenance performed during weekend hours.
20	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	We understand that Shared HUB will be a data broker for exchanging data among various organizations like Federal, State so on, offering 'flexibility to integrate with diverse ENV and Technologies across states, agencies & organizations'. What are the various Technologies & Environments known at this time?	The specific solution intended is still in development. As such, the respondent should provide a rate card with scalable pricing options and granular pricing, i.e, per number of interface points, componenets scale, transaction volumes, etc.
21	Scope of Work	It is our understanding that this RFP calls for three areas of work. 1) A fixed price quote for Shared HUB build corresponding to requirements listed in Sec 3.2 Pg 11, 2) A fixed price quote for Single Sign On corresponding to requirements listed in Sec 3.3 Pg 13 3) A Rate Card for Staff Augmentation to Build a Single Portal listed in Sec 3.4 Pg 14 table. Please confirm if this understanding is correct.	The respondent should provide a rate card with scalable pricing options and granular pricing, i.e, per number of interface points, componenets scale, transaction volumes, etc.
22	Scope of Work	We have attempted to depict the various systems and their interactions in the "Image" tab. Please review the representation and correct any understanding gaps. Can you please provide a flow diagram of the entire process, in terms of the different systems that will play a role and what those systems are?	Please refer to the NMHIX Systems Integrator RFI Context Diagram
23	Pg 12, Sec 3.4	What is the functionality to be built for the single portal? Please share any requirements document that you may have.	Responses received will assist in the development of final requirements
24	Scope of Work	Is the assumption that the RFI calls for building a Share Hub which will act as a broker to communicate with FDSH to validate eligibility, Single Sign On Enablement for Clients, correct.	Yes
25	Pg 12, Sec 3.3	As part of the attached image - is the Scope of work related to the items circled in Orange alone?	Please refer to the NMHIX Systems Integrator RFI Context Diagram
26	Duration of Work	What is the expected start and end date for the RFI Scope of Work?	The specific solution intended is still in development.

27	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	What is the current Application architecture of NMHIX? Please share end-to-end details including databases.	The specific solution intended is still in development. As such, the respondent should provide a rate card with scalable pricing options and granular pricing, I.e, per number of interface points, componenets scale, transaction volumes, etc.
28	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	1.4. Provide a simplified separate Application Program Interface (API) for each verification service How many verification services are required? How many of those services are real time and how many of those are in batch mode? Is batch services the fallback mechanism if real time service fails? Any specific technology preference for batch services?	This would be subject to the determination/recommendation by the vendor after investigation (If invited to participate further). Please note, a final architecture is still in development. As such, the respondent should provide a rate card with scalable pricing options and granular pricing, I.e, per number of interface points, componenets scale, transaction volumes, etc.
29	Pg 10, Sec 3.1	ASPEN will receive applications from YES-NM through a web service call which will then be validated Is Yes - NM the only source of application for ASPEN? What technology is ASPEN is built on?	Yes, YES-NM is the only online source of applications for ASPEN.
30	Pg 10, Sec 3.1	Client provided data will be validated against State sources and the Shared Hub in real time as per the appropriate verification plan Is there a need for Share Hub to store data, in order to enable verification or Does Share Hub reach out to other systems for doing the verification?	Must store information on reasonable compatibility levels. Each source will have associated business requirements that must be preserved in the hub. Must store results of all verification requests for auditing purposes. Only federal verification services are in scope for this effort, state sources are not a requirement.
31	Pg 10, Sec 3.1	Does SBM and NMHIX denote the same application?	SBM or SBE are identifiers of State Based Marketplaces or Exchanges, and although primarily references NMHIX, this does not discount the multiple connection points with Yes-NM (Shared Portal) and ASPEN (HSD Solution)
32	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	Offers flexibility to integrate with diverse environments and technologies encountered across states, agencies, and organizations What is the number of integration points /systems and corresponding technologies they are built on?	This would be subject to the determination/recommendation by the vendor after investigation (If invited to participate further). Please note, a final architecture is still in development. As such, the respondent should provide a rate card with scalable pricing options and granular pricing, I.e, per number of interface points, componenets scale, transaction volumes, etc.
33	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	Definition and specification of the design of these services should be recommended by the Respondent. YES-NM will use the services that are provided to perform Remote Identity Proofing (RIDP) and verification of information provided by clients during the application process.  What is the information used for conducting verification? Is it required to fetch data from other sources to conduct	The specific solution intended is still in development. As such, the respondent should provide a rate card with scalable pricing options and granular pricing, I.e, per number of interface points, componenets scale, transaction volumes, etc.
34	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	1.5 Incorporate flexibility on adapting the simplified API to meet changing requirements  What is the frequency, expected number and complexity of such changes?	These changes will be triggered by the Federal Data services HUB and have no set schedule.
35	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	1.6 Allow for requesting entity to pass minimum parameters required and have it come back with verified or not verified response	This is dependent upon the federal service and it's orientation, but both parameters may be necessary.
36	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	1.7 Provide storage and encryption of Federal Tax Information (FTI) What is the source for FTI information to store it in sharehub? IS Sharehub supposed to store data for FTI? How much and what type of data? Any specific encryption requirement? Will this data need to be in sync with source? Who will be the subscriber or consuming application of this information in this entire ecosystem?	FTI will be recieved from Federal Services, and the Shared HUB will be required to store this data. The remainder of this questioning is subject to the determination/recommendation by the vendor after investigation (If invited to participate further). Please note, a final architecture is still in development. As such, the respondent should provide a rate card with scalable pricing options and granular pricing, I.e, per number of interface points, componenets scale, transaction volumes, etc.
37	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	What is the expected maximum number of users for this application? What is the peak number of concurrent users for the application? How many user requests' needs to be processed in a day? Each application requires how many service calls?	The SEM must be able to support one million user accounts. The SEM and Shared Hub must be able to sustain a peak load of 1K concurrent users. The SEM and Shared Hub must be able to process 10K user interactions per day each of which may result in approximately 10 requests to the SEM and 5 to the Shared Hub.
38	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	1.7 Provide storage and encryption of Federal Tax Information (FTI) What is the projected growth rate of this storage? What is the projected growth rate of the verification results storage?	This may be extrapolated from the already provided volume information.
39	Pg 12, Sec 3.2	1.18 Allow for role based access and use of services How many Roles are to be provisioned? Are APIs required to behave differently for each role?	There will be a single API for the SSO. Please see the Context Diagram for further information.
40	Pg 13, Sec 3.3	Shared Entity Manager (SEM) / Single Sign On (SSO) will be a separate set of services to be integrated with YES-NM ?	NMHIX and YES-NM are separate systems that will require the use of the single service.
41	Pg 13, Sec 3.3	Store all user-ids, passwords, secret questions, address, first and last name, email, DOB etc. as defines the full user profile  Does this storage currently exist? Is the RFI requirement to integrate with existing storage or build a new storage from ground up, on which these services will reside.	No, the storage currently does not exist, and the respondent.
42	Pg 13, Sec 3.3	Will the front end portal for all this account management still be YES_NM?	Yes
43	Pg 13, Sec 3.3	Please provide current design for YES NM, which technology?	Spring Framework. Oracle. OpenDS. Pivotal TC server. Enterprise Redhat.
44	Pg 13, Sec 3.3	How many current user accounts are available on YES NM?	250K currently, must scope for 1M.
45	Pg 13, Sec 3.3	2.15. Support CSR password resets to temporary and/or expiring passwords to ensure security and continued access Is there a separate admin portal required?	YES_NM will be used as the admin portal
46	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	What is the number data transformations required with this ShareHub service?	This would be subject to the determination/recommendation by the vendor after investigation (If invited to participate further). Please note, a final architecture is still in development. As such, the respondent should provide a rate card with scalable pricing options and granular pricing, I.e, per number of interface points, componenets scale, transaction volumes, etc.
47	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	1.7. Provide storage and encryption of Federal Tax Information (FTI) 1.8. Encrypted communication channel with Federal data services HUB 1.8.1. Application services consuming FTI data never cache, store or modify the FTI or any data received from other Federal data services The above statements are contradictory, 1.7 calls for storing data and 1.8.1 specifies not to store data, Can you please clarify?	The differentiation is in the statement, "other Federal data services," as this simply pertains to the need for non - FTI to not be intermingled in the same storage location as FTI. In this respect these requirements are not contradictory. Also, it must be stored and encrypted immediately and not stored in transit.
48	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	1.14. Provide metrics on usage 1.15. Provide Audit logging and reporting 1.16. Provide Management Console  What type of reporting is required and how many reports are needed as per the RFI? Is Management Console another portal on top of shared hub services and if yes, what is the desired functionality?	This would be subject to the determination/recommendation by the vendor after investigation (If invited to participate further). Please note, a final architecture is still in development. As such, the respondent should provide a rate card with scalable pricing options and granular pricing, I.e, per number of interface points, componenets scale, transaction volumes, etc.
49	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	What is the SLA / response time requirement for the API service calls?	This would be subject to the determination/recommendation by the vendor after investigation (If invited to participate further). Please note, a final architecture is still in development. As such, the respondent should provide a rate card with scalable pricing options and granular pricing, I.e, per number of interface points, componenets scale, transaction volumes, etc.

50	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	Is there any technology road map defined? If yes, please share.	The specific solution intended is still in development. As such, the respondent should provide a rate card with scalable pricing options and granular pricing, i.e., per number of interface points, components scale, transaction volumes, etc.
51	Pg 11, Sec 3.3	2.10. Assume all conversion migration of data from FFM and YES NM to new HUB What does FFM stand for?	Federally Facilitated Marketplace (FFM), this is the federal exchange currently operated by Healthcare.gov. The FFM is currently providing for the NMHIX Individual Marketplace.
52	General	Can you provide a system architecture diagram showing system components, technology, system interactions?	The specific solution intended is still in development. As such, the respondent should provide a rate card with scalable pricing options and granular pricing, i.e., per number of interface points, components scale, transaction volumes, etc.
53	General	What technology is leveraged or licenses owned for Security – Identity & Access Manager, Single SignOn and Identity Federation?	For NMHIX the SOA is provided by GetInsured. Web Service Definition Language (WSDL), Universal Description, Discovery and Integration (UDDI) and Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) are the fundamental pieces of the SOA infrastructure.
54	General	What vendor software is used for Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) – IBM WebMethods, Oracle OSB/ESB/BPEL?	For NMHIX the SOA is provided by GetInsured. Web Service Definition Language (WSDL), Universal Description, Discovery and Integration (UDDI) and Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) are the fundamental pieces of the SOA infrastructure.
55	General	How many users (total and concurrently logged in) does the system support?	250K total, 1K concurrent. Must spec for 1M total and 1K concurrent.
56	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	Is NMHIX looking for the integration vendor to provide technology, including related to the state based exchange platform, and/or just perform a systems integrator role (technical SME) to assist NMHIX or its other vendors to connect all vendors/systems to the respective solution?  Is NMHIX expecting the vendor to provide an enterprise service bus (ESB) solution and/or just perform technical SME role for state to manage the vendor implementing the solution?	This RFI seeks the services of a technology integration vendor to provide the solution/technology as well as internal vendor functional management and staff to execute the scope of work.
57	General	Will NMHIX continue with the existing SHOP provider? If so who is the current vendor and what integration solution is expected from the integration vendor?	The current Shop Vendor is GetInsured, the HSD component has been provided by Deloitte, the respondent should recommend the solution to be employed to meet the scope of work and provide integration between different system providers and independent of platform if possible.
58	Pg 13, Sec 3.3	Is NMHIX expecting the vendor to provide identity management solution technology and/or perform technical SME role for state to manage the vendor implementing the solution?	Yes, this RFI seeks the services of a technology integration vendor to provide the solution/technology as well as internal functional management and staff to execute the scope of work.
59	Pg 6, Sec 1.2	Please elaborate on the division of responsibilities/activities between the Integrated Eligibility and Enrollment Systems and OHP for member management?	Please see the Context Level Diagram for Clarification.
60	Pg 14, Sec 3.4	What are the deliverables/work products expected from the team performing the staff augmentation functions?	As stated in section 3.4, the table, (and attached rate card), "denotes the NMHIX anticipated staffing needs to assist in the execution of the above described scope of work. Respondents should evaluate this table and provide estimates for positions, or recommendations for omissions based on professional experience." As such, we seek the recommendation of the respondents based upon industry standard practice and cost effectiveness. Please adjust the rate card as you see fit, and provide your specific recommendations for deliverables/work products.
61	Pg 6, Sec 1.2	Please elaborate on the COTS /customizable solution scope. What scope should the vendor address via the COTS solutions?	Specifically, the respondent should address the requirements that can be met from sections 3.2 and 3.3 scope of work. For any items form either section that cannot be provided by a recommended COTS product, the vendor must still provide a solution to meet these needs.
62	General	Is there a project plan or roadmap already developed considering the relatively short timelines leading to the 2016 Open Enrollment?	The specific solution intended is still in development. And no specific time period should be assumed by the respondent, rather, we seek the recommendation of the respondents based upon industry standard practice and cost effectiveness
63	General	Do you have the defined number of interface points for the vendor to work on in entire application or is it subject to determination by the vendor after investigation?	This would be subject to the determination by the vendor after investigation (If invited to participate further). Please note, a final architecture is still in development. As such, the respondent should provide a rate card with scalable pricing options and granular pricing, i.e., per number of interface points, components scale, transaction volumes, etc.
64	General	Do you expect the vendor to act as primary owner responsible in resolving technical issues with other vendors and overall	Yes
65	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	Does the state have any preference in terms of tech stack on which the Shared Hub needs to be developed?	There is no preference. We are open to the recommendation of the respondents based upon industry standard practice and cost effectiveness.
66	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	What is the volume of data that is expected to be processed by Shared HUB?	This may be extrapolated from the already provided volume information.
67	Pg 13, Sec 3.3	What is the number of users that the vendor should expect for SSO?	This may be extrapolated from the already provided volume information.
68	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	What kind of verification service is expected to be provided by the Shared Hub?	All Federal Data Services HUB Verification Services
69	Pg 13, Sec 3.3	What are the current functionalities and technology provided by YES NM account management?	Account lookup, password reset, ID proofing override, account profile editing, password policy rules, enable/disable account.
70	Pg 13, Sec 3.3	Who will be providing the requirements for building the single portal?	New Mexico
71	General	Is there an SLA defined for real time eligibility determination per application and if so, what is the bearing on the interface applications?	There is no current SLA. The NMHIX preference is for real time determination, however, we seek the recommendation of the respondents based upon industry standard practice and cost effectiveness
72	Pg 15, Sec 4.2	Please clarify the page limits the vendor should follow, i.e., is the complete response of no more than 5 pages inclusive or exclusive of the other page limits and responses requested? Cover Letter – 1 page Scope of Work Sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 response - (5) pages All other items specifically identified in Section 3 Scope of Work	Cover Letter – 1 page Scope of Work (Narrative) Sections 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 response - (5) pages Rate Card - Appropriate length to provide a detailed cost estimate for the respondents proposed approach
73	Pg 15, Sec 4.1	What attachments, exhibits, etc. is NMHIX requesting? Are they included in the "no more than five (5) pages in length"?	Cover Letter – 1 page Scope of Work (Narrative) Sections 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 response - (5) pages Rate Card - Appropriate length to provide a detailed cost estimate for the respondents proposed approach
74	Pg 6, Sec 1.2	Is a COTS solution required for both the Shared HUB Build and the Shared Entity Manager (SEM) / Single Sign On (SSO)?	A COTS solution is not a requirement, we are open to the recommendation of the respondents based upon industry standard practice and cost effectiveness.
75	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	How many applications are anticipated to be consumers of the Shared HUB Build? Specifically, does New Mexico anticipate the State SHOP Exchange, Federal Individual Exchange, State Medicaid system, or any other State applications to be the users of this functionality?	Yes. HSD portals, State Medicaid systems. Please refer to the NMHIX System Integrator RFI Context Diagram
76	Pg 13, Sec 3.3	How many applications are anticipated to be consumers of the SEM /SSO? Specifically, does New Mexico anticipate the State SHOP Exchange, Federal Individual Exchange, State Medicaid system, or any other State applications to be the users	YES-NM portal will require access. Please refer to the NMHIX System Integrator RFI Context Diagram
77	Pg 11, Sec 3.2	For both the Shared HUB Build and the SEM /SSO, what are the anticipated load volumes in terms of concurrent users and API calls per hour?	Must support 1K concurrent users. Will average 5-10 service calls per client session.

78	Pg 13, Sec 3.3	For both the Shared HUB Build and the SEM /SSO, what are the anticipated load volumes in terms of concurrent users and API calls per hour?	Must support 1K concurrent users. Will average 5-10 service calls per client session.
79	Pg 13, Sec 3.3	How many entities does New Mexico anticipate will be stored in the SEM /SSO? If possible, please provide a breakdown of the total by each entity type. Page 13: 3.3 Shared Entity Manager (SEM) / Single Sign On (SSO)	One million total. Breakdown unknown.
80	Pg 15, Sec 4.2	Please confirm the 5 page limit only applies to addressing sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 and that other sections, including the cover letter, qualifications and experience, and section 3.1 are not subject to the 5 page limit. Page 15: 4.2 Format and Length	Cover Letter – 1 page Scope of Work (Narrative) Sections 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 response - (5) pages Rate Card - Appropriate length to provide a detailed cost estimate for the respondents proposed approach
81	General	What are New Mexico's required service level agreements (SLAs) for support and uptime? General (no reference	24x7 other than scheduled maintenance during weekend hours.
82	General	1) Should RFI #2015/01 be viewed as a two step solicitation process; whereby only respondents to the first phase (RFI) will be qualified or invited to respond to a second phase (RFP)?  2) Or, will firms that did not respond to the first phase (RFI) be qualified/able to respond to a second phase (RFP), should the NMHIX decide to solicit Request for Proposals at a later date?	1.) No 2.)Please note the language of the RFI related to this matter, primarily, "Should this RFI lead to an RFP, the chosen Vendor will be required to work collaboratively with NMHIX and NM HSD staff and vendors," and "While NMHIX intends to issue a request for proposals to competitively solicit services related to the subject matter of this RFI, NMHIX does not make any promise or guarantee that it will issue a request for proposals or that NMHIX will award a contract pursuant to a request for proposals, in the event that NMHIX issues a related request for proposals."