

STATE OF GEORGIA TECHNOLOGY AUTHORITY

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL GTA-000011

OFFERORS' CONFERENCE

March 9, 2001

1 MR. SHEPARD: Good morning everyone
2 on behalf of the Georgia Technology Project, the
3 Department of Community Health, the Board of
4 Regents, the University System of Georgia I'd
5 like to welcome you to the Offerors Conference
6 for the Third-Party Administration Systems
7 Integration RFP GTA-11.

8 My name's Barry Shepard and I'm the
9 contracting officer for this procurement.

10 The purpose of today's conference is
11 to review and emphasize certain requirements of
12 the RFP and more importantly to allow you, the
13 offerors, the opportunity to ask questions.
14 This is not a mandatory offerors' conference.

15 I'd like to go over just a couple real
16 quick administrative rules before we get into
17 it. Again, once we start the meeting, like
18 right now, please turn your cell phones down and
19 pagers off or either to stun. And once again,
20 the GCAT would prefer we not eat in this
21 auditorium.

22 If you have not already signed in we
23 request that you sign in before you leave the
24 building. There's I believe three sign-in
25 rosters outside as you come in. And if you are

1 a government rep please let us know which agency
2 you're representing.

3 I also ask that when you -- before you
4 leave the building if you haven't, to deposit a
5 business card for us. We have a court reporter
6 who's recording the proceedings here, and this
7 will help in making sure they have the names
8 spelled and the organization.

9 As I just said, we have a court
10 reporter and I'd like to go over a little point
11 of order as far as discussing questions. If
12 during the conference you have a question please
13 raise your hand. You'll see to your left and
14 right we have wireless mikes throughout the
15 auditorium. And there will be someone to take
16 the mike to you. When the mike gets to you,
17 please state your name, your organization, and
18 if you're a government person state what agency
19 you're with and then speak your question aloud.
20 We have a pretty good sound system, but just to
21 make sure the court reporter hears it.

22 I also would ask that if we have a
23 question being asked, please allow the person
24 speaking to state the question and then an
25 answer to be given. When you have more than two

1 or three people talking it's very hard for the
2 court reporter and the microphones to pick up
3 the conversation.

4 The product of this conference will be
5 a transcript. It will be issued in the form of
6 an addendum to the RFP on March 16th. It Will
7 be available on the Internet at the GTA web
8 site, and that's WWW.GAGTA.com.

9 This morning we will answer select
10 written questions received from the bidders by
11 the cutoff of March 6th, and questions from this
12 morning's conference from the audience. We will
13 provide the answers in writing to all questions
14 received, whether written or from today's
15 conference in the addendum to be issued on March
16 16th.

17 The only answers that are binding will
18 be those in the official written addendum. And
19 this addendum will be placed out on our GTA web
20 site. We reserve the right to add to the
21 addendum additional information or further
22 elaboration, clarification or explanation to any
23 issue or question.

24 Before we proceed and I turn it over
25 to DCH I'd like to go over some more

1 administrative points. We have issued two
2 addendums to this RFP. The second one was
3 posted this morning. And I will go over some of
4 the issues for it. We have changed the due date
5 for the proposal. It is now due April the 26th
6 at 3:00 p.m. We've also changed when the letter
7 of intent is due to us. And that's March the
8 30th at 5:00 p.m.

9 On the letter of intent we ask that
10 you send no Emails. We'd like a hard copy,
11 whether you send it by FedEx or US Mail or FedEx
12 or Airborne. The reason why is we need a
13 written signature for our files.

14 Both the proposals and intent letters
15 are due to us at GTA. And our address is as in
16 the RFP, but I'll give it to you one more time.
17 It's 100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2300, Atlanta,
18 Georgia 30303. And it's mentioned two or three
19 places in the RFP.

20 We cannot accept late bids. Cutoff is
21 3:00 p.m. If you are going to use a courier
22 service, please be advised that some courier
23 services do not get there at 3:00 p.m., so plan
24 ahead.

25 I'd like to follow up with some more

1 administrative instructions for the RFP. Please
2 pay particular attention to the following. The
3 instructions for packaging the proposals, the
4 technical proposal and the business proposals;
5 make sure that they are labeled, they indicate
6 what the RFP is and that you do not have cost
7 information included in the business proposal
8 unless it's to address a question from the
9 technical proposal.

10 We have two addendums out there. I
11 know there'll be at least one more. Make sure
12 you sign the addendum sheet. That'll be the
13 first page on the addendums, identifying that
14 you have seen the addendum, and include those
15 with the proposals. Please sign and return the
16 contract and with any exceptions you have with
17 the technical proposal. Failure to sign and
18 return the documents listed in the EFT -- I'm
19 sorry, RFP will result in rejection of your
20 proposal.

21 Also I'd like you to remember that you
22 are restricted from communications with the
23 State staff except through me, the contracting
24 officer, from the issuance of this RFP until a
25 successful offeror is selected. For violation

1 of this provision the state shall reserve the
2 right to reject proposal of the offending
3 offeror.

4 I'd also like to emphasize something
5 that we have in section six of the RFP. And
6 that's that the State of Georgia encourages
7 large bidders interested in bidding on this
8 project to use local small and minority
9 businesses. As mentioned earlier, we will have
10 a transcript of the attendees of this conference
11 posted on our web site. We encourage all
12 vendors, large and small, to take a look at this
13 web site and see possible teaming opportunities
14 that there be might be there.

15 Now I'd like to introduce Mr. Larry
16 Singer, Chief Information Officer for the State
17 of Georgia and Executive Director for GTA. And
18 to his right Mr. Russ Toal, Commissioner of the
19 Department of Community Health. They will
20 introduce other members of the organization that
21 are here today with us. Mr. Singer.

22 MR. SINGER: Well, I appreciate y'all
23 coming out today. My name is Larry Singer and
24 I'm the Executive Director of the Georgia
25 Technology Authority. Many of you in the

1 audience are familiar faces and are very aware
2 of the role of the Technology Authority and our
3 large information technology projects here in
4 the State of Georgia. This certainly qualifies.

5 The authority has specific and
6 explicit responsibility for all projects
7 exceeding one million dollars in value. Russ
8 and I would love for this project not to qualify
9 for those of you who get very aggressive about
10 this bid, but we expect that it will exceed that
11 amount.

12 That responsibility, it will be
13 substantiated in a number of ways. One is our
14 participation in this RFP process itself. This
15 RFP is being conducted by GTA. Barry has taken
16 the lead for that. And as he explained, all
17 communications regarding this procurement must
18 be routed through Barry. It's been a real
19 pleasure. I know before the RFP hit the street
20 I spoke with many, many of you about this RFP;
21 now I have time to get other work done. And I
22 know Russ is in the same position. So we
23 appreciate everybody respecting that role in
24 working very hard to put together the
25 appropriate response.

1 integrate with our portal presence.

2 And then David Candler is our project
3 manager from GTA. On all projects of this size
4 and risks Georgia Technology Authority will have
5 a project -- a program manager actually assigned
6 to the project to work with the agency project
7 executive and project manager. Primarily to
8 provide oversight and assistance, quality
9 assurance and direction, and represent GTA in
10 the day-to-day management of the project and
11 communications with the host agency; in this
12 case DCH.

13 I do want to make a couple of
14 comments about this project specifically. Some
15 of you who know my history, I've been working in
16 health and human services for quite some time
17 and use of information systems to help state
18 governments achieve objective using IT as a
19 primary enabler. This project is a perfect
20 example of how information technology can be
21 used to help move forward some strategic
22 objectives of state government.

23 Managing health care, managing
24 delivery of services to those people in the --
25 in underprivileged communities who are dependent

1 on the State for providing their support and
2 insurance services is one of the most important
3 things State government engages in. State
4 employees, Board of Regents employees, the
5 benefits that we offer through our health
6 insurance programs are, again, one of the finest
7 benefits that we offer.

8 None of those benefits and none of
9 those public policy programs are worth beans if
10 they are not delivered in a high quality manner,
11 if services aren't delivered in the way that
12 people expect, if the physicians can't
13 participate in a seamless or frictionless way
14 with these programs to allow them to focus on
15 delivery of medical care and not on
16 administrative processes. This -- This program
17 will help Georgia move forward in our efforts to
18 provide the best possible services.

19 This is the first truly strategic
20 information systems project since the creation
21 of the Georgia Technology Authority. And I'll
22 tell you that one of the reasons it's the first
23 is the professionalism and the capability of DCH
24 in pulling this together. This has been an
25 outstandingly well-planned project. There has

1 been a tremendous amount of management
2 participation at every level within DCH in the
3 construction of the requirements that you'll
4 find in your RFP document. And I expect that
5 you'll find the same sort of professional
6 partnership with DCH if you're the selected
7 vendor that we at GTA have found. And I think
8 that's an important consideration.

9 This project is an opportunity for the
10 vendor as well as the State to enjoy a great
11 deal of success, to get the kind of recognition
12 we would all want when we're participating in
13 other procurements in other states. And I think
14 that the partnership with the State is one of
15 the critical success elements and I think you
16 can count on it here with DCH and the State of
17 Georgia.

18 Another point that I'd like to make
19 has to do -- and I'm sure you'll hear it
20 repeated several times, and that is our
21 governor's commitment to the participation of
22 small minority and local businesses in strategic
23 projects. This certainly qualifies.

24 This project is intended to support
25 the broadest possibility community here in

1 Georgia. Our employee base and Medicaid base
2 represent the best of the distribution of our
3 State. And the bidding team who wins will be
4 expected to also represent the people of the
5 State.

6 And so we hope that you will do -- use
7 all due diligence to find appropriate partners
8 if you are a large vendor or if you are an
9 out-of-state vendor. And work with the office
10 of small minority business of the governor's
11 office if you need introductions to small
12 businesses. And mingle with the other folks who
13 attended here today. We hope that you'll pay
14 very serious attention to that requirement and
15 expectation.

16 So I want to, again, thank you for
17 coming, thank you for your participation in this
18 procurement. We can only succeed with an
19 effective partnership with the vendor community.
20 We look forward to working with you.

21 MR. TOAL: Good morning. I want to
22 thank y'all for being here and I want to thank
23 Larry and his staff for helping to make this
24 possible. And I also want to give some due
25 credit to the Health Care Finance

1 Administration, which also has been very helpful
2 to us in this process.

3 We have two representatives here from
4 HCFA, Hugh Webster on the end, and Barry
5 Brewer. And they have been intimately involved
6 in the development of this proposal. And all of
7 you who have worked with HCFA know that they
8 will be involved through the entire evaluation
9 and selection process as well. And of course,
10 we welcome that.

11 I also want to thank my staff that is
12 here and introduce the management staff who is
13 present. To Larry's immediately right is Wade
14 Miller, who is the Systems Director for DCH.
15 Sitting next to him Alicia McCord, who has done
16 a tremendous amount of work on this project.

17 Sitting down in the audience if you
18 will just raise your hand or stand; Barbara
19 Prosser, Deputy Systems Director; Mark Trail,
20 the acting director of the Division of Medical
21 Assistance; Ms. Lurline Burke, the Director of
22 Health Care Purchasing and her deputy, Louis
23 Amis; Ms. Judy Heilman, Deputy Director of State
24 Health Benefit Plan; Ms. Gelane Hamilton. Also
25 with the State Health Benefit Plan, General

1 Counsel Paul Justice, with the sort of half
2 effort there. And Clyde Reese who is the Deputy
3 General Counsel.

4 And in the back of the room, only
5 symbolically, Carol Crawford, the Director of
6 the Office of Minority Health.

7 If there are any other DCH staff in
8 the audience that I just simply can't see,
9 if you will stand, please?

10 Okay. Thank y'all.

11 And I want to thank, again, all of you
12 for being here.

13 Larry has said quite well how
14 important this procurement is to us
15 strategically. And it is going to drive our
16 business over the next five to ten years. And
17 this is a case of where we really want systems
18 to lead us and not follow.

19 As I've said on every possible
20 occasion we want to set the standard for what
21 health care information systems can be. We want
22 to simplify the life of the provider community.
23 And we do that in large part by having a system
24 that's as electronic as possible, that's as easy
25 to use as possible, and that has one set of

1 standards for all of the State's health care
2 programs.

3 Let me also underscore the point that
4 Larry finished with, and that is that we are the
5 State and we expect our programs to be
6 reflective of the State. And let me say fairly
7 unequivocally that we expect there to be
8 minority participation and small business
9 participation in your bid. You're right it is
10 not a requirement, but it is an absolute
11 expectation on our part that in a procurement
12 that this size -- of this size that you will be
13 able to find both small and minority businesses
14 that will be able to assist you in doing this
15 job.

16 We had five hundred and thirty-three
17 questions turned in. And I'll just take those
18 in order.

19 (Laughter.)

20 A couple of ground rules here. We do
21 not, frankly, intend to respond to most of those
22 questions or even a fraction of those questions
23 today. We will submit them in -- responses in
24 writing to most of the questions on the 16th, on
25 March 16th.

1 As we told you before, and as we
2 reserve the right to do, there will be some
3 questions that we will not answer. Quite
4 frankly, some of the questions seemed to be more
5 designed to get information about possible
6 competitive bidders than it did to be -- than
7 they seemed to be interested in getting
8 information that was essential to what was
9 necessary for this procurement.

10 There are also a fair number of
11 questions that dealt on, well, what are you
12 currently doing today, describe the current
13 systems; this, that and the other. And those
14 questions must have been submitted by people who
15 have not had the privilege to hear me speak
16 before, because let me say again for the
17 umpteenth time we don't want to do what we're
18 doing today, period.

19 So one question I will answer, is it
20 okay to bid -- this is a paraphrasing, but the
21 question is, is it okay to just do a web
22 wraparound our Legacy System. The answer is not
23 no, but hell no. We do not want Legacy systems.
24 We want to, as using the phrase, cut the edge.
25 We want something new. And while we can't tell

1 you what you can and can't bid, I hope all are
2 listening carefully.

3 If you have submitted written
4 questions we would prefer that you not ask those
5 questions here today, unless you need to do so
6 to clarify the intent of your question. Because
7 as I said, we will respond to all of those
8 questions in writing.

9 Amendment Number One was posted on
10 March 1st. Amendment Number Two, as you heard
11 from Barry, was posted today. I'd like to take
12 just a little more time and go over that and the
13 change in time tables.

14 (Whereupon, a discussion was had off the
15 record.)

16 MR. TOAL: All right. Here we go.
17 Let me go over these changes again so
18 everybody's clear about them.

19 A number of those who submitted
20 questions asked for some clarification about
21 times, and frankly asked for additional time.
22 So here are the changes that are highlighted
23 there.

24 We've given ourselves two more days to
25 answer the questions. They all will be posted

1 on the end of the day of the 16th. We will put
2 the contract on the web on the 27th. A number
3 of you have asked about that.

4 We changed the intent to bid letters
5 so -- due so that you have a chance to glance at
6 the contract before you make that commitment.
7 The proposals are now due a week later than
8 original and one hour later, so those of you who
9 asked for at least a week have gotten even more
10 than a week.

11 As you see, we've extended the time on
12 technical evaluation as well. And we have
13 pushed by one week the oral presentations and
14 the vendor visits. They will occur that week of
15 Memorial Day. Not on Memorial Day, but that
16 week. The cost evaluation's completed by GTA
17 and Mercer, our consultants on this process.

18 And then the award date will quite
19 appropriately be on D-day. We did not change,
20 obviously, the implementation dates because we
21 feel like those cannot be changed. And we still
22 feel like there's ample time to get this done.

23 Now, another question -- a number of
24 other questions we think will be addressed in
25 Amendment Three, and let me give you a preview,

1 if I may. We are working on this amendment as
2 we speak, but it will address many of the
3 concerns that have been raised with respect to
4 minimum mandatory requirements.

5 Briefly let me tell you the things
6 that we will be changing. With respect to prime
7 contractor qualifications we will no longer
8 require that the prime contractor be responsible
9 for claims administration and at least sixty
10 percent of the work. As long as the proposed
11 contractor has the financial qualifications and
12 agrees to be responsible for the performance of
13 the entire team.

14 With respect to office location
15 issues, we will require the prime contractor
16 contracted to establish an account office in the
17 Metropolitan Atlanta area. And we will require
18 that some sort of operations processing center
19 for receipt of correspondence or other required
20 documents and such be in the State of Georgia.
21 But where within the State is sort of your call.

22 And the reason for that, quite
23 obviously, is that we don't want Georgia
24 providers and Georgia beneficiaries mailing
25 their stuff off to Bismark, you know. It needs

1 to be sent to somewhere in Georgia. And so we
2 expect you to have an intake capability.

3 Now, that means you can do your
4 processing, you can do all your electronic stuff
5 elsewhere. But at least we would expect this --
6 these two pieces to be here. We would like for
7 you, of course, to have the whole enchilada
8 here, but we understand the cost implications of
9 that. And so we want the most cost competitive
10 bid that we can possibly get, and we hope that
11 this will help address the concerns that have
12 been raised about that.

13 With respect to the requirement for
14 proven software, we will clarify the mandatory
15 requirement that any proposed key software must
16 have been in operation for at least one year.
17 Our intent is that we do want creative and
18 innovative solutions and will accept claims
19 processing logic code, this, that and the other,
20 for any system in production or in development
21 as long as it will be operational for one year
22 by October 1, 2002. In other words, it must be
23 in production by October 1, 2001.

24 We got a lot of questions requesting
25 current transaction flows, DT -- detailed

1 current organizational charts,
2 yada-dada-dada-da. As I said in my earlier
3 remarks we don't think those are relevant.
4 We're going to demure responding to a number of
5 those things. The DCH org chart, again, is
6 going to change. It's going to change by July
7 1. But the functions will not. And we've
8 outlined, I think, in the RFP well our
9 functions.

10 A number of folks asked about the APD.
11 The APD isn't any different, frankly, from the
12 RFP. And it is not the controlling document
13 here. And I will say the same thing is true
14 with respect to our current contracts with
15 either Blue Cross or EDS. I would argue that
16 those are irrelevant to this procurement.

17 For those who have asked for Medicaid
18 provider manuals and other such documents you
19 need to look at the DCH web page, because they
20 are there. In fact, I would have made the
21 assumption that all of you are looking at the
22 DCH web page, particularly those of you who may
23 have insomnia.

24 We will, of course, take questions
25 here today, but I want to again talk about what

1 we're trying to do. And quite simply as Larry
2 and others have said on occasion we're trying to
3 procure the best of breed. We do want to set
4 the standard for what information systems can
5 be. We want them to be as --
6 as interactive and as paperless as possible.

7 We expect the prime contractor and
8 system integrator to bid a complete team. We do
9 not expect that that team will remain constant
10 necessarily over the contract. The prime needs
11 to have the ability to use who they think will
12 do the best job, and to take advantage of
13 technology during the life of the contract. We
14 do not make the assumption that the technology
15 that will be in place at the beginning of the
16 procurement may, in fact, be the same
17 procurement that's in place at the end of the
18 bid -- or the contract period.

19 We expect you to work with us and GTA
20 and the Board of Regents as well as HCFA when
21 appropriate to develop an appropriate system
22 architecture to allow seamless two-way
23 communication between members and the provider
24 community, as well -- and DCH. Or you as the
25 DCH vendor.

1 Our intent is that this procurement be
2 nothing like the 1998 Medicaid procurement. And
3 we can tell that there's some angst based on the
4 questions that we've got. It is quite true, we
5 are trying not to be terribly proscriptive. We
6 are not going to tell you what the requirements
7 are for how you choose to break up the system or
8 what the required amount of subcontracting is or
9 what's to be subcontracted. That's your job to
10 propose in your solutions to us.

11 The populations to be served, I think
12 we've been pretty clear about. It includes not
13 just the Medicaid population. It includes the
14 Peach Care Kids -- for kids, and the State
15 Health Benefit plan, the Board of Regents health
16 plan, and such other populations as the general
17 assembly may add to our responsibility.

18 You know that we're in the last few
19 days, thank God, of the general assembly. And
20 there are some initiatives for serving the
21 uninsured in the budget proposal that's in front
22 of the general assembly right now. So we
23 anticipate that the two million people that we
24 are covering may go up slightly. And that may
25 continue to happen over the life of the

1 contract.

2 I want to clarify again that we are
3 looking for access to and consolidation of
4 program data in real time with a single
5 electronic point of entry for all transactions
6 for members and providers. We are seeking
7 consistency of programs and claims
8 administration across our populations. But we
9 do not intend to consolidate benefit plan
10 design.

11 We think that the right kind of system
12 can help us and help the provider member
13 community and program administration in easing
14 the current burdens that may exist. We
15 absolutely want you to take technological
16 improvements life of the contract with
17 continuous effort to refresh technology and
18 upgrade when possible.

19 I know we're in a period of
20 uncertainty with respect to HIPAA, but in fact
21 the system that's proposed you must commit to
22 being HIPAA compliant by October of 2002.

23 We're looking for some demonstrated
24 administrative cost savings. We do not expect
25 to get a system that's costing -- that's going

1 to cost us a whole lot more money for a system
2 that should be a whole lot easier to administer.
3 We are looking for the kind of information that
4 will enable us to make improvements in our
5 programs and services to improve the quality of
6 life and care for the DCH populations we serve.

7 Remind you again what the out-of-scope
8 services are. The decision support system will
9 remain independent. It will be re-bid in the
10 next fiscal year. The pharmacy benefit manager
11 that we just contracted with, Express Scripts,
12 Inc., will remain outside this procurement. The
13 current third -- the third-party liability and
14 coordination of benefits vendor that we have
15 under contract is outside this. But we
16 certainly will acknowledge that there are
17 third-party liability requirements imposed on
18 the contractor in this procurement.

19 We do not expect you to bid a PPO
20 provider network, but on the indemnity side we
21 are looking for that capability to be bid. We
22 do not expect you to do Medicaid or Peach Care
23 eligibility determination. And the eligibility
24 determination inside the Board of Regents and
25 State Health Benefit Plan will remain as is, as

1 well. And at least initially the Behavioral
2 Health Networks and Care Management for both the
3 Board of Regents and the State Health Benefit
4 Plan will remain outside the contract as well.

5 And finally let me say that I want to
6 let you know how serious we are about these time
7 tables in response to the question that was
8 asked. We will not back off the implementation
9 time tables. Eligibility, tracking, financial
10 systems for the State Health Benefit Plan must
11 be ready by July 1, 2002. Systems and
12 operations to support Medicaid and Peach Care by
13 October 1 of 2002. Health Benefit Plan July 1
14 of 2003. And systems and operations for Board
15 of Regents no later than January 1, 2004. We'd
16 like that capability, obviously, in place
17 sooner. And certainly we expect full
18 integration with the GTA enterprisewide Health
19 and Human Services web portal.

20 And Larry, it might be useful to talk
21 a little bit more about that for the audience
22 before we end here today.

23 Those are my comments. We'll be happy
24 -- I'll be happy at this time to turn it back
25 over to Barry. And let me say, again, that we

1 appreciate your interest in this. We hope
2 you'll give this a good effort. I hope that our
3 responses to your questions will be responsive
4 and enable you to turn in the kind of bid that
5 we'd like to see.

6 I want to assure you of the commitment
7 departmentwide of our effort to work with you
8 fully on implementation, to do all that needs to
9 be done to enable you to install these systems
10 and information systems on time.

11 And I also want to assure you that
12 this procurement has the personal attention of
13 the governor. He has been kept apprised of this
14 every step of the way. He has pushed both Larry
15 and I repeatedly to make sure that we are
16 pushing the envelope, to do all we can with
17 respect to systems innovation. He very much
18 wants this to become the model for what health
19 care information systems can be for the nation.
20 That's our commitment. That's his commitment.
21 I know it's certainly Larry's. Thank you.

22 MR. SHEPARD: Thank you, Commissioner.

23 At this time we'd like to go ahead and
24 start taking questions from the audience. As I
25 mentioned previously, we have wireless mikes on

1 the left and the right side of the auditorium.
2 If you have a question please raise your hand
3 and we'll have someone bring the wireless mike
4 to you.

5 Okay. Mr. Nixon, to your right?

6 Remember, please state your name and
7 your company that you are representing.

8 MS. PRUITT: I'm Lesley Pruitt. I'm
9 with Business Computer Applications.

10 MR. SHEPARD: I'm sorry, I can't hear
11 you.

12 MS. PRUITT: I'm Leslie Pruitt with
13 Business Computer Applications.

14 MR. SHEPARD: Yes, ma'am.

15 MS. PRUITT: I'd like to refer to
16 section 6.0 where you reference minority
17 participation in adding forty points to the
18 scoring, and also talk about the tax incentive.
19 It offers little business justification for the
20 primes to do business with minority firms. And
21 frankly the doors are being closed on us. We
22 are hearing that there is no room.

23 My question about 6.0 is on the forty
24 points, what is the criteria or the measurement?
25 How does big business get any value out of

1 this? Are the points for a local minority firm
2 that understands health care, do you get more
3 points for that, or is it for any firm? You
4 know, I'd like a little more -- you know, to
5 know a little more about how it's being
6 measured.

7 MR. SHEPARD: Okay.

8 MS. PRUITT: I also have another
9 question about the tax incentive being offered
10 to partner with minority firms, how do you
11 entice a large business to work with minority
12 firms with such a low tax package?

13 MR. SHEPARD: Okay. Mr. Singer?

14 MR. SINGER: I know the majority of
15 those questions were submitted in writing and
16 responses may or may not be available in the
17 next couple of days. Let me speak to the
18 questions broadly, not just for this
19 procurement, but more generally.

20 First of all, the governor has made
21 quite clear to the business community in Georgia
22 that when firms intend to do business with the
23 State of Georgia we are going to value and
24 encourage it every step of the way minority and
25 small business participation and Georgia-based

1 participation.

2 The law restricts the types of
3 encouragement that we can put in a specific
4 procurement document. And the types of
5 encouragement that we provide substantiate
6 themselves in a number of ways. We have
7 conferences such as these where vendors can meet
8 with one another and understand their
9 capabilities. We have other activities
10 throughout the course of the year which -- whose
11 intent it is to bring small minority businesses
12 together with larger businesses. We have the
13 governor's Mentor Protege Program to help
14 promote capabilities in the small and minority
15 business community here in the State of Georgia.
16 And to the extent allowable by law we use our
17 procurement vehicles to continue and further the
18 Governor's direction in that area.

19 But I do need to say that it's
20 incumbent on the part of small and minority and
21 Georgia-based businesses to demonstrate their
22 own individual value to other contractors who
23 are looking for partners to participate in the
24 pursuit of our business. The issue that's of
25 most importance to us is that small and minority

1 businesses are given opportunity and access.
2 It's up to the small and minority business to
3 deliver value.

4 So companies in the -- in Georgia,
5 companies that are owned by minority businesses
6 and small businesses need to be able to
7 demonstrate their value as part of the bid team
8 to the State. And that value should provide
9 more than the forty points associated with them
10 being a small business. But if they provide
11 utility to the vendor, that value will reflect
12 throughout the course of the competitive
13 evaluation process. This is an additional value
14 that the law allows us to give, and it's
15 represented in these points.

16 So we, again, absolutely expect that
17 there will be small, minority and Georgia-based
18 business participation in this response. It is
19 a large, multifaceted procurement and it's
20 impossible for me to conceive that there
21 wouldn't be a place in anyone's bid for a small,
22 minority business participation. This is as
23 strongly as we can encourage. We will continue
24 to encourage participation not only in this bid,
25 but in a variety of other bids.

1 And we'll work with the Governor's
2 office and small, minority business to provide
3 ample opportunities for training, for access and
4 other sorts of opportunities.

5 MR. TOAL: I think that was well said,
6 Larry.

7 Ms. Pruitt, I don't know how I could
8 have been more direct, other than to say what I
9 did. It is an absolute expectation that the
10 bidders are going to have that level of
11 participation. It's meaningful participation
12 too. It's not having a minority contractor for
13 the sake of having a minority contractor.

14 As Larry said, there must be value.
15 There must be some competence demonstrated on
16 the part of all bidders and vendors and
17 subcontractors and this, that and the other.
18 But I cannot conceive anyone who wanted to have
19 a good shot at this proposal and not making a
20 serious effort to involve the Georgia-based
21 firms, small businesses and minority businesses.
22 The State has been very clear about its interest
23 in all three of those.

24 MR. SHEPARD: Okay. Thank you.
25 Other questions?

1 MR. TOAL: We can repeat the
2 question. I can hear you.

3 MS. KAPUSTAY: My name is Rebecca
4 Kapustay and I'm with Wellpoint Health Network.

5 MR. TOAL: Yes, ma'am.

6 MS. KAPUSTAY: And I have four
7 questions that I would like to ask.

8 The first question is how many desk
9 bays do you have for the Medicaid, for the
10 Medicaid program, we have not gotten it broken
11 out on medical versus dental.

12 The second question is in the RFP
13 section 1.1.5. It talks about -- In the
14 amendment it talks about performing provider
15 training and provider workshop. My question is
16 does this include Medicaid as well indemnity?

17 Question number three, attachment
18 sixteen, section 4.8.2.5, it states provide
19 in-state provider representatives to assist
20 providers and conduct provider training. My
21 question is, is this Medicaid and indemnity?

22 And then question number four, section
23 it's attachment seventeen section 4.8.2.5.2, it
24 states approach to providing grievance hearing
25 and appeal support on behalf of the department

1 as required. And our question is, is this all
2 programs; Medicaid, Peach Care, Board of Regents
3 and the State Health Plan?

4 MR. TOAL: On the first question, yes,
5 it is possible to break those out, and we will
6 do that.

7 The second and third questions let me
8 come back.

9 An on the fourth question, same
10 answer, we will clarify it and give you an
11 answer on that.

12 I'm a little concerned about questions
13 two and three because I guess I have not been
14 clear about what our intent is. We're not going
15 to have one set of claim standards and issues
16 for the Medicaid providers and another set of
17 claims submission standards for Health Benefit
18 Plan or Board of Regents. We're going to have
19 one intake point with one set of standards.

20 So the provider training that has got
21 to be done has applicability across all
22 programs. And that's really fundamental to this
23 proposal. We -- So, yes, there is to be
24 training. But it's for everybody for
25 everything. The only program, health care

1 program that the State has some responsibility
2 for that's excluded here, and I would note is
3 also excluded under HIPAA, is workers' comp.
4 Which is a whole other story for a whole other
5 day. But it is not subject to the provisions of
6 this procurement. And there is no intent to
7 amend it. But otherwise it all applies.

8 MR. SHEPARD: Okay. Over here on the
9 center right, please.

10 MR. BENNETT: Tommy Bennett with the
11 Georgia Medical Care Foundation. Regarding
12 Amendment One, attachment eighteen, the nurse
13 aide training program, the amendment does not
14 mention a requirement to conduct a
15 train-the-trainer program for individuals
16 qualified to teach new nurse aide courses. The
17 federal regulations do require instructors
18 maintain certain minimal standards. The present
19 contract for the nurse aide training program
20 includes the trainer -- train-the-trainer
21 component. Would the new contractor be required
22 to include the train-the-trainer component?

23 MR. TOAL: We'll get back to you on
24 that. I think it should include it, but we'll
25 double-check that and, if so, amend.

1 MR. SHEPARD: Okay. In the back, very
2 back row.

3 MR. SINGER: We'd like you to
4 alternate your questions from the back to the
5 front so our microphone people can get aerobic
6 training.

7 MS. HARKINS: Hi, my name is Paige
8 Harkins and I'm with Enterject. I had a
9 question same amendment, attachment eighteen,
10 section 4.8.2.5.5. You mentioned that there
11 were eighty required site visits per quarter. I
12 wanted to confirm that number, that it was
13 eighty, eight-zero. And also do all the visits
14 need to be on-site?

15 MR. TOAL: We'll respond to that on
16 the 16th.

17 MR. SHEPARD: Okay.

18 MR. WRIGHT: My name is Gardner Wright
19 and I'm with Blue Cross-Blue Shield of Georgia.
20 My question is directed, Russ, to you, please.
21 Your opening comments included a reference to
22 the MEMS (ph.) system as being one of the first
23 major deliverables. I think we've recognized
24 that is a major deliverable.

25 Could you clarify, please, that the

1 MEMS system is meant specifically for -- that
2 the replacement requirement in the RFP is
3 directed specifically at State Health Benefit
4 Plan, State Health Benefit Plan plus Board of
5 Regents, or is it conceivable that the
6 membership could be a membership system that
7 would support the entire spectrum?

8 MR. TOAL: Good question. It is the
9 intent that this is for the State Health Benefit
10 plan. The board of Regents will retain its
11 current system in which the individual -- the
12 thirty-four individual units of the University
13 System are making their eligibility
14 determinations and they enter into, as you know,
15 the eligibility system of whoever the selected
16 vendor will be. We do not expect that to
17 change.

18 And at this point I don't think we
19 have -- and there's any intent to have the
20 university system adopt the MEMS replacement.
21 That is -- That would be a decision they would
22 have to make. I can tell you that at this point
23 there's been no discussion about that happening
24 at all. So the MEMS replacement would be for
25 the State Health Benefit Plan. And it would not

1 apply to the Medicaid or Peach Care. As you
2 know, eligibility is done independently for
3 those two. Thank you.

4 MR. SHEPARD: Follow up?

5 MR. WRIGHT: I have another question,
6 please.

7 The way the RFP is constructed it
8 indicates that there should be a response to
9 support Medicaid and Peach Care and a separate
10 bid to support State Health Benefit Plan and
11 Board of Regents. Where there are potential
12 synergies of being able to elevate function such
13 as call center support for provider relations,
14 is that -- is it acceptable to include that type
15 of a response in the RFP, even though the RFP is
16 calling for separate Medicaid, traditional
17 benefit plan?

18 MR. TOAL: I'm going to let Wade
19 answer that. But in general the reason for that
20 partition is that the Health Care Finance
21 Administration, for understandable reasons,
22 wants to make sure that it's not underwriting
23 the cost of the State Health Benefit Plan, the
24 Board of Regents. So that's the reason for the
25 cost partition.

1 I'm going to let Wade give you some
2 additional comments about how you might address
3 that.

4 MR. MILLER: Yeah, I think the
5 general intent for the procurement is not that
6 we create these separate units, separate
7 entities. We're looking at a way -- We're
8 really looking at having all the synergies come
9 together. And as Russ has said, treat our
10 populations consistently. So we are really not
11 expecting the vendors to bid a separate type of
12 bid for Medicaid and a separate type of bid for
13 State Health Benefit Plan and Board of Regents.

14 I think there are some instances in
15 the RFP where we do want within the claims area,
16 for example, a unit that is specialized in Board
17 of Regents, State Health Benefit Plan but also
18 potentially could do Medicaid and Peach Care as
19 well. Again, I think the main reason you read
20 into it that way is that we have to, for HCFA
21 purposes, make it clear that we need to see the
22 costs and functions specific to Medicaid and
23 Peach Care brought out in the proposal.

24 MR. TOAL: Let's let Barry speak.

25 MR. BRUDER: Okay. On that point

1 we'd like to add a little bit in terms of what
2 our encouragement in national policy is, is to
3 encourage as many Medicaid-related systems be
4 incorporated under the Medicaid management
5 information system that each state has.

6 That said, we also, due to the source
7 of the funding, have to be able to determine
8 what is not Medicaid-related because it's -- and
9 therefore may or may not be allowable for us,
10 from the federal agencies and regulatory
11 agencies to fund. So does that clarify what the
12 intent is here?

13 MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

14 MR. BRUDER: Okay.

15 MR. TOAL: Believe me, it would be my
16 preference to load it all onto Medicaid, but
17 those guys down on the end won't let me do that.

18 (Laughter)

19 On a serious note, you know, I will
20 say that we, the State, are very encouraged by
21 some of the comments we've heard from new
22 Secretary Thompson. In his recent address to
23 the National Governors' Association, which
24 Governor Barnes attended, he talked -- he spoke
25 words that could have been written by either the

1 Governor or me, quite frankly, about the
2 importance of moving towards mainstreaming of
3 the Medicaid and S-chip populations.

4 And that's -- That is absolutely part
5 of the intent here, to -- to try to make a clean
6 break from regarding Medicaid or S-chip as
7 welfare-based programs. They are not. They are
8 fundamentally health care programs. We want to
9 treat them as such. And this initiative we
10 think will help us move down that paradigm.

11 MR. SINGER: Can I say one more thing
12 to that? I think it's important to understand
13 that HCFA's interest is to make sure there's an
14 appropriate cost allocation, not that they can't
15 use common resources to support the entire
16 population intended to be served there, but
17 that the allocations can be clearly identified
18 and only those costs that are attribute to
19 Medicaid programs are reimbursable by Medicaid.
20 So we need you to identify those costs that are
21 specific to Medicaid.

22 I also -- I was able to attend the
23 National Governors' Conference with Governor
24 Barnes and heard the secretary's speech. In
25 addition to that Governor Barnes and I and

1 several other Governor's were able to attend a
2 meeting with several members of a congressional
3 committee responsible for science and
4 technology.

5 And it is their intent to introduce
6 during this legislative session a law that will
7 be explicit for O&B and GAO that no federal
8 funds for specific programs shall be -- the use
9 of those federal funds should not be construed
10 to restrict that program from participating in
11 enterprise-level systems efforts. With
12 appropriate cost allocation definitions
13 described. And so we expect that to be
14 introduced and passed and supported by the
15 administration and the new secretary during the
16 session as well, to help with clarification.

17 MR. BRUDER: If I can just add a small
18 comment to that. The restrictions that we're
19 talking about are actually driven by statute and
20 the way we can spend federal dollars. And in
21 terms of enhanced funding or fifty-fifty funding
22 or maybe no funding at all. So that's why we
23 need to be able, as a regulatory agency,
24 identify the divisions and the categories that
25 each of your goods and services fall in.

1 That said, there is still an enormous
2 opportunity before you to do something that has
3 ramifications far beyond the State of Georgia.
4 President Bush has said he's going to make sure
5 we do business better than we've done in the
6 past on Medicaid. That yes, today we're here to
7 talk about the State of Georgia, but many other
8 states are looking at the efforts that you have
9 -- the success of the efforts that you have
10 before you. And there's a chance for much
11 bigger opportunities to the extent that we are
12 successful in this particular endeavor.

13 MR. TOAL: And I might add that we
14 hope your bids will reflect that future
15 opportunity, so that we are not subsidizing the
16 benefit you may gain from all the other states
17 that like what you have done and who we've
18 helped make possible for you.

19 And that's not a joke. Let me give
20 you an example. I mean, we have gotten at least
21 ten requests for copies of our procurement
22 related to our pharmacy benefit manager, in
23 which we did the same thing, we procured one PBM
24 for all of our programs. You don't think that
25 PBM has got a leg up? They do. And this is the

1 reality of the world we're going to. And we
2 need a little recognition from you as to what --
3 as to the opportunity that we put on the table
4 here for us both. And we hope your bid will be
5 appropriately reflective of that.

6 MR. BRUDER: Mr. Toal, your success
7 stories will have national and maybe even beyond
8 our borders visibility. So what we're doing
9 here today is very important for all concerned.

10 MR. SHEPARD: Okay.

11 MS. SIDWELL: Hello. My name is Sally
12 Sidwell and I'm with Uniprise. And with regards
13 to the membership enrollment management system
14 is it possible to provide some base features,
15 because we're assuming that those would remain,
16 and also perhaps some additional information
17 regarding services that you'd like to add on to
18 that system?

19 MR. TOAL: Judy, would you want to
20 respond or would you want to respond in writing?

21 Stand up, please.

22 MR. TOAL: Judy's very quiet spoken.
23 She needs the mike.

24 MS. HEIMLER: The MEMS system is not
25 only enrollment eligibility, but it also has a

1 premium, so to speak, accounting function
2 related to it.

3 MS. SIDWELL: Yes, and are their
4 features that you would like to add to that or
5 does it pretty much fulfill the needs as it
6 stands today.

7 MS. HEIMLER: Well, this system also
8 does some things that would typically be handled
9 otherwise. It does some general letter
10 production, student status letters, our COBRA
11 notice is through that system, ID cards, etc.

12 MR. TOAL: We'll reserve the right to
13 clarify in writing if we want any additional
14 features and let you know that on the 16th.
15 Thank you for the question.

16 MS. SIDWELL: And I have a second
17 question. Page nine, section 1.1.3 states claim
18 administration system will be under the direct
19 control of the prime contractor. Does this mean
20 the prime contractor can dictate system
21 enhancements as a greater priority than an
22 organization's core business?

23 MR. TOAL: There'll be a little
24 clarification on that in Amendment Three. But
25 let me say it's certainly our expectation

1 that the prime bidder, the prime -- that they
2 are in charge. Whoever's name is on that
3 document, whether it's the SI or whoever it is,
4 we expect them to be made -- be in a position to
5 make those final determinations. And that's who
6 we will be dealing with.

7 We will not be dealing with individual
8 subcontractors. We are looking for a partner.
9 And that partner is bringing a team of equally
10 capable folks, but we're not going to involved
11 in individual negotiation with individual
12 subcontractors.

13 Whoever the prime is, that's who we'll
14 build this partnership with. And we expect them
15 to come to the table with the capability to be
16 able to not just make but to carry out
17 decisions.

18 MR. SINGER: I think it's important to
19 note as relates to technology improvement, we're
20 interested in getting certain service levels
21 delivered and having expectations met. And if
22 technology improvements are necessary for you to
23 continue to meet those, we expect you to make
24 those.

25 MR. SHEPARD: Okay. Down here in the

1 front.

2 MR. PATTERSON: Good morning. My name
3 is Walt Patterson with ACS Computer Services.
4 And the question I have relates to Appendix J,
5 matrix two, number 171 and matrix three number
6 60 where the RFP appears to require the
7 distribution of plastic member ID cards.
8 However, The RFP does not address the issue of
9 the provider community and their ability to
10 verify eligibility for the use of these cards.
11 Could you confirm whether it's a contract
12 responsibility to market this or is this is
13 going to be attached to the current EBT program
14 utilizing the same cards.

15 MR. MILLER: Our intent was not that
16 it's attached to the EBT program. What we have
17 today specifically for Medicaid is a paper card.
18 We are getting rid of paper. We want to move
19 towards more -- more innovative technology,
20 whether it be a smart card, plastic card,
21 whatever. Again, for the providers to be able
22 to verify eligibility and maybe future uses for
23 that kind of card. So the vendors should be
24 looking into smart card technology or something
25 that we might not have even thought of yet.

1 That's like the requirements --

2 MR. TOAL: Let me say, as a matter of
3 general philosophy here, that I would remind you
4 that what the bid hopefully outlines are minimum
5 requirements. So to the extent that you can
6 propose a solution that assists the provider
7 community, we welcome that. We want to hear
8 about it. How you choose to deal with that in
9 your bid price and all the rest of that is a
10 call that you've got to make. But I think we
11 welcome those solutions beyond the minimums that
12 are outlined in that document.

13 We want a demonstration of commitment
14 to this project and the process and a commitment
15 to invasion and a commitment to problem
16 solving. And -- And so I'm glad you put this
17 question on the table. That's precisely the
18 kind of thing we'd like to see folks address in
19 the bid response. Thank you.

20 MR. SINGER: I think the evaluation
21 criteria reflect that we value innovation, we
22 value the quality of the response in addition to
23 cost and so you'll have to come up with the
24 balance to ride the wing.

25 MR. TOAL: Yeah. Again, very key

1 point there, Larry. If you look at the
2 evaluation criteria we're specifically awarding
3 points on innovation.

4 MR. BARBAGALLO: I'm Tony Barbagallo
5 with BCA. As a small Georgia business I'm
6 gratified by your statements about your
7 expectations. But I may be misreading section
8 six. I don't see a specific reference to small
9 business. I believe it refers to minority
10 businesses with regards to tax advantage and the
11 points being awarded. So I would like some
12 clarification on that.

13 The other question I want to ask is a
14 follow-up onto innovation. Is the requirement
15 for the processing, volume processing
16 requirements, does that also apply to the
17 systems, the proposed systems? Because you are
18 talking about systems that could be developed or
19 have certain development requirements and
20 systems that do exist, does the volume -- The
21 quote says that the -- Experience administering
22 large volumes of claims, and there are specific
23 volumes that aren't being required. Do the
24 systems being proposed have to be doing those
25 volumes in claims?

1 MR. TOAL: I think the answer to that
2 is no. But the experience requirement is real.
3 And you know, this -- we're talking about huge
4 volume here, so there's a good reason for that.
5 The actual systems application is no. I do
6 think there is language in the RFP on small
7 business, but we'll give you a specific written
8 response to that on the 16th.

9 To underscore the point, let me remind
10 everyone again that this contract is not going
11 to be let based on price alone. In fact
12 sixty-five percent of the point are on the
13 technical side, they are on the innovative side
14 they are on the proposed solutions. And
15 thirty-five percent on the cost.

16 And it would be remiss of me not to
17 recognize, again, the cooperation we've had from
18 HCFA on this and -- and in changing the
19 historical focus, shall we say, and to
20 recognizing the importance of what we're trying
21 to do here and weighting this thing on the
22 technical side, I'm very appreciative of that.

23 MR. SHEPARD: All right.

24 MR. PERIANNAN: I'm Chandra
25 Periannan, Chandrasekaran from Sembium

1 Corporation. We are a small business. I'd like
2 to know if there's any procedures, you know,
3 that mandate due -- due diligence in the search
4 by the primary contractor for, you know, small
5 businesses in prorating, for example,
6 technology, et cetera, et cetera, or at least
7 does the agency act as a, you know, some kind of
8 an exchange so that serious consideration is
9 given, serious search is made by primary
10 contractors for small business consultants.

11 MR. TOAL: Carol, let me ask you, is
12 this something Irving Mitchell's office can
13 assist with, do you know, in the office of the
14 Governor?

15 MS. CRAWFORD: I'm not certain. I
16 think because the focus is on the minority and
17 small business development and the mentoring,
18 that if you contact the office they will give
19 you a response in writing on that.

20 MR. TOAL: Okay.

21 MR. SINGER: It's important to note
22 that neither DCH nor GTA can engage in brokering
23 any kind of engagement. We can't have contact
24 except through Barry with any vendor or
25 potential vendor. So if it's possible it will

1 have to be through that office. And we'll
2 respond in writing.

3 MR. TOAL: Larry, you -- I'm glad you
4 made that point because one of the things I
5 meant to touch on in my opening remarks, those
6 of you who corporately maybe -- may have some of
7 our Email addresses listed for general corporate
8 announcements need to look at that. We're not
9 to be getting any news from any prospective
10 bidders. We are not to be getting Emails from
11 anybody, even if they are not personal Emails.
12 There's to be no contact, intentional or
13 unintentional essentially, with us during this
14 process.

15 And I urge to you go back to your
16 corporate or communications people or this that
17 and the other and make sure that they don't have
18 our Email addresses loaded. Fair warning. You
19 know, if we get some contact after the 16th,
20 whether it's accidental or not it's going to be
21 a problem. It's going to be a problem for you
22 and a problem for us. And we don't want to have
23 those problems.

24 MR. SHEPARD: I believe we had a
25 question in the center here.

1 MR. WALTON: My name is Gerald Walton
2 from Adsystem, a minority firm. As you stated
3 that all new proposed systems have to be in
4 production for at least a year prior to this and
5 there is points for innovations, one of the
6 questions is does all components of the system
7 have to be in production for at least a year
8 when you start talking about innovative?

9 MR. TOAL: No.

10 MR. WALTON: Are we talking just the
11 main components of the system itself?

12 MR. TOAL: Yes.

13 MR. WALTON: And the last question
14 along that line with regards to innovative,
15 there was a statement with regards to the
16 innovation of technology that you guys are not
17 aware of, what would be used as a metric for
18 evaluating and who will be evaluating those new
19 technologies?

20 MR. TOAL: That's a good question that
21 I think we should respond to in writing rather
22 than give you a, you know, flip sort of reply.
23 An excellent question, and we'll get you an
24 answer on the 16th.

25 I do want to make an editorial comment

1 related to that, is to be -- if it's not
2 apparent let me be real clear that we're
3 expecting to see a commitment from the bidder
4 about refreshing technology, about a process to
5 ensure that the landscape is being surveyed and
6 that there is commitment to upgrade
7 technologies, to take advantage of new
8 technologies, to work with the State on new
9 technological solutions throughout the life of
10 the contract. We do not expect to see a system
11 that remains unchanged.

12 MR. SINGER: Let me reiterate and
13 provide some more comment on that. It's
14 important for the State of Georgia to be able to
15 engage in partnerships as regards strategic
16 systems. We know it's difficult to engage in
17 partnerships for short-term engagements.

18 This strategic procurement is a
19 long-term procurement that is going to have to
20 result in a level of partnership between the
21 State and the prime contractor that historically
22 may not have been in place with technology
23 vendors and government entities. But in order
24 to have those long-term engagements there has to
25 be a commitment to continuing to meet service

1 levels.

2 Traditional acquisitions where we've
3 specified specific technologies and this is what
4 you to deliver, it's entirely understandable
5 that a vendor says that's what we bid and that's
6 what we're delivering. This RFP is for
7 delivering of services. It's using technology
8 as an enabler of the delivery of that service.

9 For so long the technology community
10 has said you've put us into such a tight box
11 that we can't use the tools that are available.
12 The opportunity here is to say we want results.
13 The expectation that goes with that level of
14 flexibility we're providing the vendor is that
15 they will use their skills, their capabilities,
16 their access to technologies, their innovation
17 to assure that we continue to receive the best
18 quality, best value of service throughout the
19 entire procurement period.

20 For this procurement or other
21 procurements if we are going to be able to allow
22 that flexibility on the part of the vendor we
23 need the vendor to be able to persuade us in
24 their response that they are committed to
25 staying consist with technology. That doesn't

1 mean that they have to be the bleeding edge.
2 That doesn't mean that somebody in the lab has
3 something and we're going to be the beta site
4 for that.

5 And so Georgia Technology Authority,
6 one of our roles in oversight is to work with
7 DCH to determine the viability of alternatives
8 that proposed so that we can weigh in as to the
9 risks associated with the potential benefit.
10 But we are not going to specify, we are not
11 going to dictate technology. And on the other
12 hand that requires responsibility that you are
13 committed to refreshment of technology
14 throughout the course of the contract.

15 MR. TOAL: You know you asked -- As a
16 corollary to your question you asked who will
17 evaluate. I do want to make a point that --
18 that this will not -- this is going to be a very
19 broad evaluation. There will be representatives
20 not just from the Georgia Technology Authority
21 or DCH. There will be representatives from a
22 number of other State agencies. The Department
23 of Human Resources, the Department of
24 Administrative Services, the Governor's Office
25 of Planning and Budget, you know, Adult

1 Technical Education. I mean, we'll have
2 representatives from a number of different
3 entities.

4 And we will have -- Let me be real
5 clear about this, we will also have
6 representatives from the provider community on
7 the evaluation. Now, they will not do scoring.
8 It would be inappropriate for them to do
9 scoring, but they will evaluate and they will
10 provide comment. You should not be surprised to
11 see representatives of the provider or advocacy
12 consumer communities at the bidders conference
13 for on a site visit.

14 We did that in the PBM and I'm here to
15 tell you they provided invaluable assistance to
16 us in making the decisions that we did. And so
17 we may very well have a school teacher there.
18 You may very well have a school HR person there
19 or someone from the University System side.

20 I fully expect this to be a very large
21 evaluation effort and with lots of different
22 folks who are involved in different aspects of
23 it. So it's not just the people at this table,
24 believe me, that you have got to make your pitch
25 to. It's going to have to be understandable and

1 persuasive to a much broader audience.

2 MR. FRUMAN: Hi, it's Tom Fruman.
3 Tom Fruman, from IBM Global Services. Mr. Toal,
4 your comment --

5 MR. SHEPARD: Sir, can you speak up
6 just a little louder, please?

7 MR. FRUMAN: I will do my best.
8 The comment you made earlier about
9 Emails and the wording in the RFP tends to
10 eliminate all communications from any vendor,
11 even if they are currently doing business or
12 trying to do contact with this RFP, this
13 procurement. Could we get some more
14 clarification for rules of engagement?

15 MR. TOAL: Well, I'm certainly not
16 talking about communication that is related to
17 ongoing responsibilities with the State at all.
18 I mean, that's -- you know, we communicate with
19 Blue Cross and EDS and all our other vendors on
20 a daily basis, as you might imagine, and that's
21 perfectly fine. But I don't expect to -- to use
22 either one of those examples, I don't expect to
23 see news announcements about some breakthrough
24 new technology that EDS has developed. Or some
25 break -- or some new system that Blue Cross or

1 -- you know, has installed this week or anything
2 like that. That would be crossing the boundary.

3 MR. SINGER: We need to be a little
4 bit careful because we are working with these
5 vendors on other procurements where we are
6 soliciting information about technical
7 capabilities and those vendors may be
8 communicating with us about those other
9 opportunities, whether or not closed to the GTA.

10 Certainly DCH is not in the technology
11 procurement business and you need to block all
12 of those communications with DCH.

13 With GTA you need to be very concerned
14 to compartmentalize those issues that might be
15 interpreted as being directly related to MMIS
16 procurement and assure that GTA also does not
17 receive announcements, marketing, other
18 activities that could be construed as only
19 relating to this procurement.

20 And I think we expect the exercise of
21 good judgment. And the rules are relatively
22 clear; on issues regarding this procurement
23 you're not allowed to contact anyone but Barry.

24 We need to say -- I think it's
25 important to note that there are communications

1 that have come through that would be considered
2 suspect, and that people need to be much more
3 circumspect as we proceed. Err on the side of
4 conservatism here.

5 MR. SHEPARD: Folks if I can put this
6 out to you. If you have a question, please try
7 to speak louder. We have a court reporter in
8 the back and he's trying to copy down what you
9 say as fast as he can, so it would help him out
10 greatly.

11 MR. SPORTS: I have a question. I'm
12 Joe Sports. I'm a consult for several
13 companies, including TRW.

14 It seems that there's a lot of people
15 in the room that have some technology they want
16 to get across to whoever might be a prime
17 contractor, but it seems difficult to know how
18 to find a team to play on. I wonder if the web
19 site could serve as something of a clearing
20 house for that, or what other than exchanging
21 business cards it's just kind of difficult to
22 know who the four or five main prime bidders
23 might be, and how you would go about telling
24 those people what you can -- can offer.

25 MR. SINGER: I've got to tell you that

1 I have been a vendor in this community for most
2 of my career. And it is the challenge, and
3 I think it's -- probably the best way to
4 describe the challenge is effective marketing.
5 If you don't have effective marketing you're going
6 to have a difficult time competing in strategic
7 procurements.

8 We don't think it's the State's
9 responsibility, frankly, to assist you in your
10 marketing efforts on your technologies. We wish
11 you luck. We also can't tell you who the four
12 prime contractors are either because we don't
13 get to pick those. They get to pick themselves.
14 So it's very important.

15 Now, on other procurements we will
16 attempt to make information known about the
17 procurement as far in advance as possible. In
18 this one we did also. As soon as we knew enough
19 about the procurement to describe it we let it
20 be known that this procurement was coming down
21 the pike. Again, with effective marketing even
22 before we made our formal announcements people
23 understood that we were moving in this
24 direction. At this late date I don't think it's
25 incumbent upon the State to provide marketing

1 assistance to firms, technology firms.

2 MR. TOAL: I would note that we did
3 put on our web site the folks who participated
4 and companies that participated in the pre-bid
5 conference and that's out there. But I really,
6 I agree with Larry, I think that's where our
7 responsibility ends.

8 MR. SHEPARD: We will be publishing in
9 the -- on the 16th a list of attendees that --
10 of you bidders that attended our conference
11 here. So that will be out on the web site as
12 well, as a part of that addendum.

13 MR. SINGER: But it won't identify the
14 primes.

15 MR. SHEPARD: This is true.

16 Okay. Any other questions?

17 MS. SHORES: My name's Michelle
18 Shores. I'm President and CEO of EMSI, a
19 minority business located in the Castleberry
20 District.

21 This may sound like a very stupid
22 question, but it's one that needs to be asked
23 and I've not seen it in the RFP. How much
24 paper-based transactions -- Can I get a figure
25 on how many paper-based transactions you might

1 be performing currently in these systems?

2 MS. SHORES: Great.

3 MR. TOAL: We will give you an answer
4 to that, I think, on the 16th. I think that our
5 plan is to lay those out there. But I would --
6 I wasn't joking, it's way too many. And this is
7 also an example of where we're willing to help.
8 I think we're willing to say to the provider
9 community you have to have the capability, you
10 have to submit claims electronically. This is
11 the world we're going to.

12 Now, there are certain exceptions to
13 that. For example, in the Medicaid world there
14 are -- Well, let me give you the most obvious
15 example, is that there are only very, very
16 limited circumstances in which an abortion would
17 be covered under the Medicaid program. And when
18 a claim for an abortion comes in it must have
19 numerous attachments and documents with it.
20 That cannot be processed electronically.

21 But frankly, there should be very,
22 very few claims that we want to see on paper.

23 MS. SHORES: Okay. Thanks.

24 MR. TOAL: About -- I'll tell you --
25 I will tell you that the Medicaid claims volume

1 that I'm most familiar with is about
2 eighty-eight percent electronic now.

3 MR. SHEPARD: Was there a question
4 down front?

5 Okay. Any other questions?

6 Is there a question in the center?

7 Okay. It's on the way.

8 Sir, we can't hear you. Can you speak
9 a little louder, please?

10 MR. BOWEN: My name's Anthony Bowen.

11 I'm from SPARDI, a small business,
12 minority-owned engineering -- software
13 engineering firm here in Atlanta.

14 And now that we're gearing our -- our
15 engineering and thoughts towards
16 government-related projects after developing
17 leading edge tools for the private sector for
18 the past five years, I expect that we're going
19 to start turning up on -- as subcontractors for
20 some of these prime vendors over the next couple
21 of years. Can you tell me your thoughts on
22 having a subcontractor appear on more than one
23 of your prime vendors' RFPs?

24 MR. TOAL: Perfectly acceptable.

25 MR. SINGER: I would suggest that you

1 develop the capability to create what they call
2 a Chinese wall so that you are able to market to
3 multiple prime contractors. It's very
4 acceptable to us. You're going to have to have
5 the ability to assure them that there's not
6 information seeping from their bid into other
7 bids.

8 MR. SHEPARD: A question over here?

9 MR. BARBAGALLO: In response to your
10 comment that the award of this contract would be
11 quite an investment in future business, is the
12 State making a provision to accept alternative
13 pricing proposals which would take into account
14 those subsequent awards?

15 MR. TOAL: Let me first ask you to
16 state your name and who you're representing
17 again.

18 MR. BARBAGALLO: Anthony Barbagallo
19 with BCA.

20 MR. TOAL: And your question?

21 THE COURT: Is the State willing to
22 accept alternative pricing proposals which would
23 take into account subsequent awards?

24 MR. TOAL: I'm not quite sure how to
25 answer that. We expect the bids to be bid in

1 the pricing format that's in the RFP and we
2 expect -- we would hope that those prices would
3 reflect future opportunities. The State can't
4 guarantee those future opportunities. They are
5 really in your bosom and not ours.

6 In other words, if you perform and do
7 the job, the opportunity should be there. And
8 we're happy to work in partnership with anyone
9 in terms of sharing information with other
10 states and we do that with regularity. But if
11 you are asking can we bid one price and then get
12 another one that is contingent on you getting
13 additional business somewhere else, I think the
14 answer to that is no.

15 MR. SINGER: And the difficulty in
16 answering the question is alternative to what?
17 If the question is can you give an alternative
18 to the way we've required pricing then the
19 answer is no. You will have to give pricing the
20 way it's required in the RFP.

21 If it's an alternative to what you
22 think you would have to charge if you didn't
23 think you had a market opportunity then, yes.
24 We want you to think that you will have a market
25 opportunity as a result of this activity.

1 I think you've heard from the federal
2 government; while they can't explicitly promise
3 you business in another state, the federal
4 government has for quite some time especially in
5 HHS encouraged to re-use best practices from
6 other states.

7 The way this RFP has been written with
8 the cooperation of HCFA gives the potential that
9 a vendor could develop if they meet all of our
10 requirements that will be best practice for
11 health information systems in this country. And
12 I think you can expect -- If you have ever done
13 business in this marketplace, this is a fairly
14 incestuous marketplace. There's only fifty
15 state governments. There are opportunities
16 overseas but we talk to each other a lot.

17 The RFP as it's been written, anyone
18 who successfully responds to this and delivers
19 according to the expectations of the RFP will
20 have a best practices product. Now, how you
21 build that into your risk model and your price
22 model is up to you.

23 But you will have people in
24 headquarters who can help you project what
25 Medicaid information system sales are likely to

1 be over the next ten years. And you need to be
2 able to help your pricing and risk folks
3 understand the opportunity, as well as the risks
4 associated with this project.

5 I will say, though, if you have done
6 business in this marketplace, a state government
7 who gets what they look for, especially one
8 that's trying to be innovative like Georgia,
9 tends to stand up on the highest soap box and
10 say we are happy. And come and visit and we'll
11 show you why. And it happens consistently
12 throughout this marketplace. And I think you
13 should expect it to happen here.

14 MR. BARBAGALLO: So if a vendor can
15 propose -- has an opportunity to propose an
16 innovative pricing scheme which would the money
17 of the State, you don't want to accept that as
18 an alternative proposal, as a second alternative
19 cost proposal?

20 MR. SINGER: I think as they say on
21 Perry Mason, asked and answered.

22 MR. SHEPARD: Question in the back.

23 MS. JOHNSON: Hi, Peggy Johnson from
24 Oasys.

25 In regard to the MEMS eligibility

1 system you made reference to the fact that there
2 are some of the components and requirements in
3 the RFP that are typically or sometimes found in
4 a claims system. Would it be acceptable for --
5 if a prime had those aspects in their claims
6 system for the eligibility interface of the MEMS
7 to be something similar to a web or just a web
8 interface with a back-in database type of
9 application, or would you still require the
10 eligibility system to have all of the components
11 of -- such as premium billing and letter
12 capabilities that may be duplicative in a claims
13 system?

14 MR. TOAL: All right. I think our
15 position on that is you need to propose the
16 solutions you think work best for our needs.
17 And I think we've tried to give you a fair
18 amount of latitude in that. If we've missed the
19 mark for that, I apologize. But we are trying
20 to give you the ability to propose solutions and
21 not be constrained by the current configuration.
22 How it gets done, how you link it and all the
23 rest of that is really for you to propose.

24 MS. JOHNSON: But in the requirement
25 section specifically based on the eligibility

1 system could you -- would an acceptable answer
2 be that this -- it's not in the eligibility
3 system, but this would be found in the claims
4 system and there would be integration,
5 would that be acceptable?

6 MR. TOAL: Well, I'm going to ask Wade
7 to speak to this, but my view of it is, as long
8 as you can respond to the functional requirement
9 where it resides in the system is your call to
10 make. Is that --

11 MR. MILLER: Yeah, I would second
12 Commissioner Toal's comment. I mean, we tried
13 to make this RFP very function-based, tell you
14 what has to get done but not tell you how to do
15 it. So if what you're proposing would
16 accomplish the functions that MEMS currently
17 does, then by all means propose that if you
18 think that's the best solution.

19 MR. SINGER: And it's a particularly
20 difficult answer to give with the new
21 development environments out there it's hard to
22 say whether it's in something or not in
23 something. You need to meet the functional
24 requirements and architect your solution
25 appropriately.

1 MR. SHEPARD: Okay. Was there a
2 question down front?

3 Okay. Question in the center.

4 MR. FULKINS: Good morning. My name
5 is Dale Fulkins with Sybase Incorporated.

6 And I'm interested in the question
7 from section 1.1.3.1 alluding to the status of
8 the portal being developed by GTA.

9 MR. SINGER: Well, let me respond in a
10 couple of ways. And then I'll probably hand it
11 over to Bill since he -- we've never seen him in
12 a suit before and he wore one today. Come on up
13 for a second, help me answer that. Come on up
14 here.

15 First of all, I suggest that you visit
16 the Georgia Technology authority web site at
17 GAGTA.com. On that web site is a description of
18 our web portal preliminary architecture. It's
19 also in Appendix R of this RFP response. There
20 is continuing information updates available on
21 that web site that will allow you to get further
22 information about the direction we're going.

23 Bill, you want to add some comment
24 about what we're doing and how one might work
25 with that?

1 MR. OVERALL: We are very early --

2 MR. SINGER: By the way, you look
3 great.

4 MR. TOAL: I think he looks like a
5 violator of the State's child labor laws.

6 MR. OVERALL: See, this is hard enough
7 now and y'all just made it harder.

8 We're very early in our portal efforts
9 in the State at the high level. I want to say
10 this, though, about it. Our portal is a little
11 different than what other states are doing.
12 It's not just putting a nice web interface on
13 everything. We are really trying to connect
14 constituents to the services they need through
15 an enterprise portal.

16 Our constituents are, of course,
17 citizens of the State, State employees, doctors,
18 providers, all -- anybody who has an interest in
19 the State government will at some point
20 hopefully connect to the services they need from
21 the State through the State portal.

22 I think it is fair to say that it is
23 probably going to be a challenge as we go
24 forward determining how to build systems to best
25 connect those services in the systems through a

1 single portal to the constituents.

2 We have just completed the planning
3 stage, or actually discovery phase and are
4 moving into the planning stage for the statewide
5 enterprise portal. The document that is out on
6 the GTA web site is -- should be considered a
7 discovery document. There is an architecture
8 model out there that describes at a very, very
9 high level how we think that are this will are
10 work in the future.

11 As we move on, though, we will be
12 adding more and more detail. And if you will
13 watch the GTA web site you should see an update
14 document. I think this morning we actually
15 added a more detailed document.

16 I think in your proposal I think that
17 the thing to do would be to perhaps address how
18 you would deliver your services through an
19 enterprise portal at a very high level, but it's
20 going to take a partnership probably over time
21 to make that work in the best way.

22 MR. SINGER: And again, the intention
23 is that you acknowledge the necessity to work
24 through the portal architecture and acknowledge
25 where the portal architecture development is at

1 this point and your willingness to work with us
2 in its future development. That's -- that's
3 primarily what we're looking for.

4 I think it's also important to note
5 that the Governor and the legislature have
6 indicated their desire that the first
7 substantiation of this portal, statewide portal
8 will be in the area of health and human
9 services.

10 And there's been funding provided GTA
11 to provide application integration as part of
12 the house appropriation for 2002 and both houses
13 of appropriation for the supplemental bills for
14 2000 -- for this current fiscal year, I'm sorry.
15 So we will be looking to engage in partnership
16 with whoever the winner of this procurement is
17 to allow us to do that.

18 MR. TOAL: Barry, one last point I
19 want to make, because there's an important
20 business meeting tipping off at 12:30 today, is
21 that I want to be clear at the risk of being
22 inappropriately blunt, that I -- we also want
23 your -- we also want the prime's attorneys
24 primed. In other words, once an apparent
25 selected winner has been designated we need to

1 move to contract execution immediately.

2 We have -- We the State - this is not
3 just as DCH issue - you know, have had a couple
4 circumstances here lately where someone's been
5 selected, it's clear that the legal people
6 weren't part of the bid team and they want to
7 renegotiate the entire contract. They want to
8 send it to corporate, corporate's got to send it
9 to international. I don't know, they want --
10 you know how it works. We all love attorneys
11 and -- actually I do, I'm married to one, but.

12 MR. SINGER: Not all attorneys.

13 MR. TOAL: Yes. We cannot -- I'm
14 quite sincere here. Given the timetable we're
15 on we cannot have legal negotiations drag out.
16 It's our expectation that once the decision is
17 made on June 6th and announced that the contract
18 will be executed by the end of June, June 30.
19 Commitments will be made. The funds for the
20 project will be obligated and we will get
21 running.

22 And so please, just as we've asked you
23 to involve your corporate people, communications
24 people to be sensitive to the requirement here,
25 let's get the legal people involved as quickly

1 as you can. As soon as it's posted on the 27th
2 they should be looking at that contract. And
3 we're asking for your assistance in making sure
4 they understand the time deadlines and time
5 frames that we are collectively under here.

6 The general counsel for the department
7 does not have the ability to rewrite the
8 contract. You know, that contract, like
9 everything else that is part of this
10 procurement, is going to go through HCFA review,
11 it'll go through GTA review, the law department
12 is involved and we're not going to be able to be
13 able to start over.

14 And if we've got a selected apparent
15 winner who wants to start over my counsel will
16 be to go to number two. Because I'm not --
17 We're not going to get caught up in that. We're
18 not going to be sitting in July and August with
19 a bunch of attorneys across the table arguing
20 about whether they are going to sign the
21 contractor not.

22 And I hope I'm not being
23 inappropriately arbitrary. I'm not -- I'm not
24 trying to say that. We will be flexible as we
25 have demonstrated time after time after time,

1 and we will work with folks, but it is not a
2 time for rewriting the contract or bringing the
3 vendor's proposed contract or any such
4 nonsense. So please alert your folks to that
5 and be sensitive to that. Thank you.

6 MR. SINGER: In addition to the intent
7 there will be structures in place that if we
8 can't execute the contract in a timely we will
9 move quickly to the second place bidder. That's
10 very important. The time frames in here, those
11 of you who are in -- going to be responsible for
12 actual delivery on this contract, and I won't be
13 surprised if they're not in the room today, you
14 might get the delivery folks involved with, well
15 -- with the people who are responsible for
16 winning the business. The delivery folks will
17 help you reinforce with your legal staff how
18 critical it is that we get this contract
19 executed because these are very tight time
20 lines.

21 And if we eat into development time
22 with negotiating time you don't have a chance.
23 So -- and there will be penalties associated
24 with not meeting the time lines. So it's very,
25 very important that we -- and GTA is in full

1 partnership and agreement with DCH in enforcing
2 those rules.

3 MR. TOAL: Thank you.

4 MR. SHEPARD: Yes, another question
5 from Gardner Wright from Blue Cross.

6 MR. WRIGHT: I'm Garner Wright of Blue
7 Cross, Blue Shield of Georgia.

8 Russ, a follow-up question to your
9 comments on the contract posting is March 27th,
10 the intent to bid letter due the 30th. Is there
11 any vehicle during that period of time for
12 asking questions about the contract?

13 MR. TOAL: I think not.

14 MR. WRIGHT: Okay.

15 MR. SHEPARD: Question in the back.

16 THE COURT: Hi, I'm Marjorie Mitchell
17 with Oracle Corporation.

18 I have a very trivial question
19 relative to the production of the RFP.
20 Throughout the document you have page limits
21 that are designated by specific sections. And
22 having been through many, many RFPs we realize
23 that there are areas that take more to describe
24 than others. Is your goal to have a total page
25 limit or -- the entire document, or are you

1 going to hold us to specific sections?

2 And I'll give you, for example, you
3 have a two-page security limit on the --
4 two-page limit on the security section, yet the
5 functions that you ask us to address are -- from
6 yourselves are a page themselves. So just to
7 answer them there's no way we can do that in a
8 couple of pages. So can you comment on that?

9 MR. SHEPARD: Our intent on the page
10 numbering in the reference in the RFP was to
11 make sure that your answers were very
12 to-the-point and not to overload us with a lot
13 of boilerplate, a lot of -- We're looking for
14 to-the-point answers to the questions, and limit
15 it. Just we're not looking to limit the
16 specific number of pages to your proposal.
17 We're trying to make sure that the answer is
18 to-the-point and will allow us to evaluate the
19 proposal very quickly.

20 MR. WRIGHT: Okay. Thank you.

21 MR. MILLER: I'll add on to that, and
22 you know, the main point is we do not want
23 seventeen binders coming in from one prime
24 vendor on the due date. We're trying to, as
25 Barry said, get you to be to-the-point and

1 describe your capabilities and experience and
2 so on and so forth.

3 Will we throw you out if your -- in one
4 section you submitted eleven pages and we said
5 ten? Absolutely not. We would not throw you
6 out for that. But we want to emphasize you need
7 to be economical in how you respond. We don't
8 have the truckloads to be, you know, carting the
9 proposals back and forth. Nor, as Barry
10 admitted, the time lines for our evaluation of
11 your proposal is very tight as well, and if it's
12 seventeen binders we're not going to be able to
13 complete that as well. And we need to be able
14 to move forward, as we've all stated today.

15 MR. TOAL: I just want to remind you
16 too that, you know, in the oral presentations,
17 you know, we certainly have the opportunity to
18 give you the opportunity to clarify or give us
19 additional information at that time.

20 MR. SINGER: But you take the risk,
21 though, if we have a ten page limit on a section
22 and you take eleven pages that we only read ten
23 of them, so. So try and be to-the-point.

24 MR. CANDLER: You might want to also
25 note that if you refer that we'll answer that at

1 the orals is a non-starter. You need to answer
2 it in the written proposal.

3 MR. SINGER: To be discussed is not
4 acceptable. --

5 MR. TOAL: To be discussed just
6 doesn't cut it.

7 MR. MILLER: And I think one more
8 point on that too, a lot of the limit too is
9 from past experience in Georgia we tend to get a
10 lot of marketing brochures and stuff like that
11 in proposals. We do not want to see that. We
12 want your answers to the RFP, clear and concise
13 as you can be. Again, if you go over by a few
14 pages, fine, but you know, we're trying to do
15 this as quickly as we can as well.

16 MR. SINGER: That means you don't have
17 to explain why your solution's better than
18 another solution, just give us your solution.

19 MR. TOAL: Right.

20 MR. SHEPARD: Okay. Any questions.

21 Okay. Well, looks like we are getting
22 to the close of our conference. I'd like to
23 thank everyone for attending. I can't emphasize
24 enough to check the GTA web site on the 16th.
25 We'll have the addenda placed out there with the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

G E O R G I A)
)
F U L T O N C O U N T Y)

I, Kevin R. King, Deposition Officer and
Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of
Georgia at Large, do hereby certify that the
foregoing transcript is a true and complete record of
the hearing of March 9, 2001, taken in my presence;
that I am neither a relative nor an employee nor
attorney nor counsel of any of the parties, nor
relative nor an employee of such attorney or counsel,
of any of the parties, nor a relative nor an employee
of such attorney or counsel, nor financially
interested in the action.

Witness my hand and official seal at
Atlanta, Fulton County, Georgia, this the 12th day of
March, 2001.

KEVIN R. KING, CCR# B-1225

(SEAL)

