



REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

ACQ-2015-1218-RFP

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS DOCUMENT

January 28, 2016

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) published the Request for Qualifications and Quotations, ACQ-2015-1218-RFP, on January 19, 2016 for Quality Assurance Consulting Services for the Information Networking Hub (INH) Expedited Data Exchange (EDE). As required under Section 1.10 – RFQQ Schedule, answers to Vendor submitted questions are provided below.

- Q1: Please describe the project's governance and organization structures, all relevant stakeholders and participants with whom the AOC's QA vendor is expected to engage; including those who are required to participate in and/or receive input (e.g., QA reports, analysis, etc.).
- A1: The project is governed by a steering committee with representatives from AOC, King County District Court, King County Department of Judicial Administration, and King County. The steering committee, which meets monthly, will be the target audience for all QA reports, which are the planned contract deliverables. . The Judicial Information Systems Committee also will review accepted QA reports and may request the contracted Vendor to attend meetings. See RFQQ Appendix B for additional information. t. Additional information regarding the JISC can be found at www.courts.wa.gov//committee/?fa=committee.home&committee_id=74.
- Q2: Sections 1.4 and 5.1 of the RFQQ provide requirements for engagement. There are several areas that leave the degree and frequency of engagement somewhat open. To help establish an appropriate level of effort that meets the needs of the AOC, please explain the anticipated project meeting structure and communication plan and, if possible, where the AOC expects QA participation (e.g., type, frequency and location of meetings).
- A2: AOC project status meetings occur weekly. Technical meetings between King County stakeholders and AOC occur monthly. Steering committee meetings occur monthly. In addition, the AOC project management team will be available as needed

to provide information to the QA Vendor. See RFQQ Appendix B for additional information.

Q3: The RFQQ and Exhibits define various intended, relevant projects. Please describe if there is/are procurement(s) anticipated and the expectation for QA involvement. Specifically the AOC's expectation, as relevant, in requirements development and/or validation, solicitation development and/or validation, vendor evaluation process validation or oversight, contract reviews). Please also provide, as available, project schedules (formal or anticipated dates) that are relevant to aligning QA support.

A3: The AOC expects the contracted QA vendor to review how the AOC manages the engagements of other contracted Vendors and the processes by which deliverables are reviewed and accepted in line with meeting project goals.

Q4: Please describe the anticipated level of involvement in reviewing project management artifacts, project and/or vendor documents. Please provide a list of expected documentation that will require QA review.

A 4: The artifacts and documents that will need to be reviewed include, but are not limited to, project charters, steering committee charter, project management plan, risk management plan, issue management plan, change management plan, communication plan, vendor deliverables, deliverable acceptance processes, and project status, monitoring, and control artifacts.

Q5: Sections 3.5.1 (Vendor Business References, Exhibit B), 4.1.1 (Minimum Organizational Requirements) and 4.2.1 (Vendor Qualifications) each request information for 3 relevant client engagements. While 4.2.1 "encourages" vendors to provide different client engagements than are provided for 4.1.1, it is not clear how each of these three requests for references vary from each other. Please clarify the differences among them that we should consider to ensure that we meet AOC's requirements.

A5: RFQQ Section 3.5.1 requires Vendors to provide business references, which AOC may contact at its discretion. References must be provided utilizing EXHIBIT B and must demonstrate services comparable in size and complexity to AOC's project. All requirements under RFQQ Section 3 will be evaluated based on a pass/fail score. RFQQ Section 4.1.1 requires acknowledgement and project details related to engagements similar to the QA services required under the RFQQ. RFQQ Section 4.2.1 requires Vendors to provide detailed client engagement information related to the integration efforts of third party COTS application solutions similar in size and scope of the INH EDE project. All requirements under RFQQ Section 4 will be evaluated based on weighted score. See RFQQ Section 8.1 for more information.

Q6: Does the AOC have an architectural approach for the INH EDE that can be shared? For example, will the future state solution be a net new build or will existing components of the JIS be reused/repurposed and incorporated into the development

effort? To help us understand and align appropriate skillsets to meet the project needs, please describe any assumptions or strategies that have been established for solution development.

- A6: AOC will provide technical documentation to the Apparent Successful Vendor following contract execution. AOC will modify existing JIS applications to provide and source data from the Enterprise Data Repository in order to meet the needs of the courts.
- Q7: Section 2.1.3, Volume III of the Mandatory Proposal Format section includes the Fixed Price Certification form (Exhibit F), but does not include the Cost Proposal Sheet (Exhibit E) as defined in section 7.1. While we would assume that the Cost Proposal Sheet is to be included in Volume III, will an amendment be issued to specify where it should be provided?
- A7: See Amendment No. 1 as posted in Washington's Electronic Business Solution (WEBS) and at www.courts.wa.gov/procure.
- Q8: Section 2.1.3 identifies one of the components of Volume III as "Summary Key Deliverables Cost Sheet (See RFQQ Section 8.4.) Section 8.4, however, is not the section as identified but instead describes Mandatory Scored Requirements: Cost Proposal. No section of the RFQQ identifies a "Summary Key Deliverables Cost Sheet" section. Will an amendment be issued to resolve this discrepancy?
- A8: See Amendment No. 1 as posted in WEBS and at www.courts.wa.gov/procure.
- Q9: On page 6 of the RFQQ, you have included an item labeled: **Exhibit G – JIS Data Standards for Alternative Electronic Court Records Systems**. There is no Exhibit G on the WEBS system to download. Will you please post Exhibit G so we can review its contents?
- A9: Exhibit G has been posted in WEBS as an attachment to RFQQ Amendment No. 1.
- Q10: Is the QA contract only for the initial INH EDE Pilot Project?
- A10: Per RFQQ Section 1.6, the contract awarded as a result of ACQ-2015-1218-RFQQ allows for additional optional terms beyond the initial one (1) year term. Per RFQQ Section 1.4, Item 8, under these *optional* terms allow for an expansion for the scope of work for the EDE early adopter courts.
- Q11: Is there a high level or a more detailed project schedule available that AOC can share?
- A11: A detailed project schedule is currently unavailable Once King County District Court has contracted with a Vendor and developed a schedule for implementation of their new case management system, AOC will develop a detailed project schedule for the INH EDE project..

Q12: Is there a Business Case and/or Project Charter available that AOC can share?

A12: AOC will provide these documentations to the Apparent Successful Vendor following contract execution.

Q13: Is there Technical documentation describing the envisioned Data Repository and Data Exchange available that AOC can share?

A13: AOC will provide technical documentation to the Apparent Successful Vendor following contract execution. .

Q14: Who is expected to develop and implement the Data Repository and Data Exchange; AOC, System Integrator, COTS vendor, etc.?

A14: The development and implementation of the Data Repository and Data Exchange will be completed with a combination of AOC and contracted resources.

Q15: Is the Judicial Access Browser System (JABS) referenced in the SOW page 1, currently active and in operation?

A15: Yes, JABS has been active and operational since 2001.

Q16: The RFQQ states that contract execution is expected on or before March 4, 2016 (1.10 Acquisition Schedule, page 5). The Statement of Work provides for a Task 2.10, Post-Implementation QA Report Deliverable that is due in June 2017. Appendix A, Payment Schedule, states that each (of the five) year's annual fixed fee will be pro-rated over 12 months.

Should "Year 1" of the contract be treated as an "Initial Period" of 16 months, running from March 2016 through June 2017, with four optional 1-year periods after June 2017? If so, should the "Year 1" pricing be for 16 months, rather than for 12 months? Alternatively, should "Year 1" be assumed to run from March 2016 – February 2017, with the possibility that Task 2.10 will not be fulfilled if the first option year is not exercised by AOC (since the contract would end in February 2017, well before June 2017)?

A16: No. No. Yes. Per RFQQ Section 1.6, AOC intends to execute a contract with the Apparent Successful Vendor (ASV) for an initial one (1) year term. Section 2.2 of RFQQ EXHIBIT C states "the term of the SOW shall not exceed the term of this Contract".

Based on deliverable due dates provided in APPENDIX B of RFQQ EXHIBIT C, the expected QA consulting services are expected to extend beyond the initial one (1) year term. If a Contract is executed with the ASV in March 2016, then a contract amendment would be required to be executed in February 2017 utilizing the first *optional* one (1) year contract term to allow the Vendor to complete the remaining project deliverable under an additional 1 year contract term. Per RFQQ Section 1.4,

Item 8, “*optional* contract terms will be made at AOC’s discretion based on project needs and funding availability”.

Any modifications to the RFQQ required as a result to answers provided by AOC will be provided as an amendment to the RFQQ. Any such amendment will be published as a separate RFQQ document and will be available in WEBS and at www.courts.wa.gov/procure/.