



State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

PO BOX 360
TRENTON, N.J. 08625-0360

www.nj.gov/health

MIKIE SHERRILL
Governor

DR. DALE G. CALDWELL
Lt. Governor

DR. RAYNARD E. WASHINGTON
Acting Commissioner

To: All Interested Bidders

Re: 01-30-26-28DPA Evaluation of Scientist Research Grant Applications and Progress Reports – Peer Review

Current Quote Submission Due Date: February 25, 2026 (2:00 PM Eastern Time)

Bid Amendment #2

The following constitutes Bid Amendment #1 to the above referenced Bid Solicitation/Request for Quotes (RFQ):

- For Q&A Question and Answer (Q&A) period has closed with ten (10) public questions received; certain questions provided by the State are also answered for convenience.

#	Bid Solicitation/Request for Quotes Section Reference	Question (Bolded) and Answer
1	PDF Documents	<p>When trying to open a Portable Document Format (PDF), I am receiving an error message and am unable to access the PDF. How should I proceed?</p> <p>It is recommended that users utilize Microsoft Edge to view PDFs. Certain PDF forms cannot be opened in the Chrome or Firefox built in PDF viewers that are enabled by default. If using Chrome or Firefox it is recommended that the file is downloaded instead by clicking the download button in the upper right-hand corner of the browser after an error message is received. An alternative option is to disable the built in PDF viewers in Chrome or Firefox.</p>
2	Quote Submission	<p>Should I check that I have properly completed and attached all of the required documents with my submitted Quote?</p> <p>Yes. Prior to the Quote Opening Deadline, a Bidder should review the documents comprising the submitted Quote to ensure that all of the required documents have been completed and attached. Oftentimes a Quote is deemed non-responsive because a Bidder fails to attach a required form or attaches a blank form.</p>

#	Bid Solicitation/Request for Quotes Section Reference	Question (Bolded) and Answer
3	Quote Submission	<p>Please confirm a Bidder may deliver a hardcopy quote instead of submitting a response electronically.</p> <p>Please be advised that all Quotes shall be submitted electronically via email to centralprocurement@doh.nj.gov.</p>
4	Quote Submission Requirements	<p>3.7.13 STATE OF NEW JERSEY SECURITY DUE DILIGENCE THIRD-PARTY INFORMATION SECURITY QUESTIONNAIRE</p> <p>• No questionnaire/form link is provided in the RFQ document or on the Bids webpage. Will the questionnaire be provided or should this only be submitted if requested later by the State?</p> <p>Please be advised that the form is available at the following link: https://nj.gov/state/elections/assets/pdf/electronic-poll-books/sonj-sdd-third-party-information-security-questionnaire-v1.0.pdf</p> <p>The Bidder should complete and submit the State of New Jersey Security Due Diligence Third-Party Information Security Questionnaire (Questionnaire) with its Quote. If a Bidder does not submit the completed Questionnaire with the Quote, the Bidder must comply within seven (7) business days of the State's request or the State may deem the Quote non-responsive.</p>
5	Quote Submission Requirements	<p>3.10 CONTRACT SCHEDULE</p> <p>• Is there an anticipated contract start state? Should timelines provided in the requested CONTRACT SCHEDULE be approximate and in general terms?</p> <p>The start date for this contract and deliverables must begin no later than April 1, 2026. The DOH will provide the LOIs and/or the grant applications to the vendor which will initiate the process of matching with a vendor expert scientist reviewer. The Vendor will have 60 days (8 weeks) from the start date of April 1, to prepare the leader boards and submit to the DOH.</p>
6	Quote Submission Requirements	<p>3.12 A. STATE-SUPPLIED PRICE SHEET INSTRUCTIONS</p> <p>• Does "approximately 250 Scientific Peer Review services per year" include both research grant applications and progress reports? If so, what is the approximate expected volume for each type of review service?</p> <p>Yes, the 250 number references the number of grant applications that DOH may provide to the vendor per year, and it should be a flat rate that is inclusive of the cost to review annual progress reports. The 250 is on the high end of grant applications to be provided to the vendor, per year. As an example, last year (2025) DOH sent 113 grant</p>

#	Bid Solicitation/Request for Quotes Section Reference	Question (Bolded) and Answer
		<p>applications and a total of 34 progress reports for a grand total of 147 documents to the vendor. However, our experience indicates that this number increases exponentially with each grant cycle. Progress reports will rarely, if ever reach the amount of applications in any given fiscal year.</p>
7	Quote Submission Requirements	<p>3.12 A. STATE-SUPPLIED PRICE SHEET INSTRUCTIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the provided Quote Price Sheet, it is stated "This price must reflect 250 completed Scientific Peer Reviews, not the price per review." This seems to indicate that the Vendor will only ever provide 250 reviews (for applications and progress reports). Is this correct? In other words, if 200, 300, or any number of Scientific Peer Reviews of applications and progress reports are completed in a year, is it correct that the vendor is still paid the quoted all-inclusive price for 250 Scientific Peer Reviews? If not, how would volume variations be addressed? <p>It is a best guess that the total of grant applications received for Cancer and Autism will not exceed 250. The pricing should be calculated with the 250 grant applications expected as the ceiling per year. However, payment shall be prorated and based on the actual number of the applications and progress reports. Also, please see the answer to Question # 6.</p>
8	Scope of Work	<p>4.1.1 DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the responsibilities table provided, there are four entries related to "relevancy review." What does this entail and what are the criteria to be used to determine relevancy? Is this relevancy to the RFA? Or how would this be different from the Administrative Review done by ORI on the letter of intent? If this concerns RFA relevancy, does ORI assess this in the Administrative Review? <p>A relevancy review refers to compliance with the categorical RFA (Cancer or Autism), Mission of the Commission (Cancer or Autism), and for Autism only alignment with at least one of with the Interagency Autism Coordinating Committee (IACC) objectives, and the NIH grant review simplified framework, e.g. importance of research, rigor and feasibility, and expertise and resources. The RFAs will be provided to the Vendor. For this grant cycle there are # 2 RFAs with 5 grant categories for Autism and # 1 RFA with 4 grant categories included for Cancer. Also please note there are appendices attached to each RFA that serve as guidelines to help applicants prepare their proposals and allow vendor reviewers to focus their critiques.</p>
9	Scope of Work	4.1.1 DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

#	Bid Solicitation/Request for Quotes Section Reference	Question (Bolded) and Answer
		<p>• "The number of grant applications received can vary each year and therefore an approximate range of 250 research grant applications has been established as a baseline. The corresponding annual progress reports should also be calculated in the total cost." This section indicates a "range of 250 research grant applications" and "corresponding annual progress reports." It is not clear how the volume of corresponding annual reports should be estimated. Could some guidance be provided on minimum/maximum number of peer review services per year and the approximate breakdown between applications and progress reports per year?</p> <p>This number is based on the State's past experience with the volume handled and not a guarantee of future availability of funding such grants. Therefore, there is no guarantee of minimum or maximum volume and is only an estimate.</p> <p>The total cost should be based on the projected range of 250 grant applications and is inclusive of the progress reports for each year. Please see the answer to question # 6.</p>
10	Scope of Work	<p>4.1.1 DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES</p> <p>• "5. All reviews conducted by the Vendor's scientist experts, shall be due to the ORI within 60 days after receiving the list of research grant funded awards." Could this line be clarified further? It is not clear if this is only referring to progress report reviews. Also, "within 60 days after receiving the list of research grant funded awards" does not seem correct as this would be a list of what projects are funded; should this be: 60 days after the Vendor receives the progress reports from ORI (as is indicated later in this section)?</p> <p>This was an oversight of a discrepancy in the RFQ, and should read: The Progress Report reviews are due to DOH 60 days after the vendor receives the Progress Report from DOH.</p>
11	Scope of Work	<p>4.1.1 DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES</p> <p>• "The Vendor will submit a review and written critique for each final progress report provided by ORI no later than 60 days after receiving the final progress reports from ORI." This section notes "final progress report" - is "final" correct here? It is stated later that the vendor be responsible for both progress reports and final reports but that "Progress Reports that have received consistent, and favorable reviews, within the scope of work, will be exempt from a final Progress Report evaluation and written critique by the Vendor."</p>

#	Bid Solicitation/Request for Quotes Section Reference	Question (Bolded) and Answer
		<p>This applies to Autism only: the vendor will be responsible for both progress reports and final reports, except when Progress Reports have received consistent, and favorable reviews within the scope of work, the final Progress Report, will be exempt from review and a written critique by the Vendor. However, Cancer will only submit the annual Progress Reports to the vendor. The Cancer final Progress Reports are not sent to the vendor.</p>
12	General Contract Terms	<p>5.1 CONTRACT TERM AND EXTENSION OPTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the RFQ it is stated: “The base term of this Contract shall be for a period of three (3) years. This Contract may be extended up to two (2) years with no single extension exceeding one (1) year, by the mutual written consent of the Contractor and the State...” However, on the State’s Bids webpage, it is stated that: “Contract Term: The base term of this Contract shall be for a period of 6 months for administrative purposes; however, the Contract shall terminate upon Using Agency certified completion of all contractual activities.” Please clarify which contract term and extension options are correct. <p>The contract term and extension are what is stated in the RFQ. “The base term of this Contract shall be for a period of three (3) years. This Contract may be extended up to two (2) years with no single extension exceeding one (1) year, by the mutual written consent of the Contractor and the State at the same terms, conditions, and pricing at the rates in effect in the last year of this Contract or rates more favorable to the State.”</p>
13	General Contract Terms	<p>5.5 DELIVERY TIME AND COSTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Unless otherwise noted in the RFQ or on the State-Supplied Price Sheet, all delivery times are 30 calendar days after receipt of order (ARO)..." To confirm, a schedule provided as requested under Section 3.10 CONTRACT SCHEDULE, seems to provide more latitude for determining contract support and delivery timelines? In other words, the "30 calendar days after receipt of order (ARO)" would not apply to grant application peer review products? 60 days is noted in the RFQ as the timeline for progress reports. <p>That is correct. Where it is otherwise noted as 60 days, they are due within the 60 days.</p>

It is the sole responsibility of the Bidder to be knowledgeable of all of the additions, deletions, clarifications, and modifications to the Bid Solicitation/RFQ, as set forth in all Bid Amendments.

All other instructions, terms, and conditions of the Bid Solicitation/RFQ shall remain the same.

