



REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

ACQ-2016-0415-RFQQ

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS DOCUMENT

May 12, 2016

The Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) published the Request for Qualifications and Quotations, ACQ-2016-0415-RFQQ, on April 28, 2016 for Quality Assurance Consulting Services for the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (CLJ) Case Management System (CMS) project. As required under Section 1.10 – RFQQ Schedule, answers to Vendor submitted questions are provided below.

Q1: RFQQ Section 4.6 – ONSITE SERVICES: Does AOC have an expectation for the amount time that services are to be performed onsite?

A1: It is unknown; however, the frequency of meetings with the various stakeholder groups can be used by Vendors in determining this allotment of time. Some meetings may be held via teleconference versus onsite. See A2 below for more information.

Q2: RFQQ Section 4.6 – ONSITE SERVICES: Can AOC provide an estimate for the frequency of the following meetings?

- INH EDE Project Steering Committee
- Judicial Information Services Committee (JISC)
- AOC and Vendor Project Teams
- Other Stakeholders

A2: The reference to the INH EDE Project Steering Committee is incorrect, but should have referenced the CLJ-CMS Steering Committee instead. Provided below are frequency estimates for meetings required for the selected QA Vendor:

- CLJ-CMS Project Steering Committee – Monthly
- JISC – Annual schedule for JISC meetings are available at <http://www.courts.wa.gov/jis/?fa=jis.ShowMeetingInfo>.

- AOC and Vendor Project Teams – Varies. Currently, the project team meets once a week in Olympia. Once the CLJ-CMS solution Vendor is selected, other recurring project related meetings will be scheduled as required.
- Other Stakeholders – Currently, the project work group meets once a month in Sea-Tac.

Q3: RFQQ Section 4.8 – STAFF REFERENCE ENGAGEMENTS: The scope of work contained in APPENDIX B to EXHIBIT C does not agree with the scope of work in Section 5.1 PROJECT CONSULTATION. For example APPENDIX B references monthly reports rather than bi-monthly reports. Yet, Section 4.8 requires that staff reference engagement narratives include:

*Concise descriptions provided for each engagement **must include details regarding the approach to performing the services outlined in APPENDIX B to EXHIBIT C** that the individual performed as a QA service provider for each proposed staff member in five (5) pages or less.*

We assume that APPENDIX B to EXHIBIT C is a sample scope of work related to the sample contract, and that staff reference engagements should reflect the scope of work presented in Section 5.1 PROJECT CONSULTATION. Please confirm that Section 5.1 PROJECT CONSULTATION contains the required scope of work for this engagement.

A3: APPENDIX B to EXHIBIT C is the required scope of work for this engagement. RFQQ Section 5.1 must be used by the Vendor in preparing responses (e.g., QA consulting approach, methodologies, etc.), and associated documents (e.g., sample project plan, etc.) as part of their proposal to provide AOC for evaluation. Proposal content provided in response to RFQQ Section 5.1 should demonstrate the Vendor's QA knowledge and skills and capability in delivering the scope of work set forth in APPENDIX B.

Q4: RFQQ Section 5.1 – PROJECT CONSULTATION: With regard to bi-monthly visits and reports, please clarify whether AOC defines “bi-monthly” as occurring: a) twice monthly or b) every two months.

A 4: The correct interpretation for “bi-monthly” is every two months.

Q5: RFQQ Section 5. 4 – RISK MITIGATION: Please confirm that AOC requires examples of high severity risks associated with the delivery of IV&V services as opposed to risks associated with the project as a whole.

A5: ACQ-2016-0415-RFQQ is limited to Quality Assurance consulting services for the CLJ-CMS project. Independent Verification & Validation (IV&V) consulting services are out of scope.

Q6: RFQQ Section 6.3 VENDOR INTERVIEWS: Instructions for Section 6.3 VENDOR INTERVIEWS reads:

*This section establishes the requirements for the Vendor Interviews related to this RFQQ. **Vendors must respond and provide detailed information for all items***

designated Mandatory Scored (MS) requirements. Provide all information in the exact order specified in this section. The section numbers and titles must be restated in Vendor's proposal.

Please confirm that this is a requirement for the interviews, and that AOC is not expecting a response to Section 6.3 in the Vendor proposal.

A6: See Amendment No. 1.

Q7: RFQQ Section 8.10 – COST PROPOSAL: The Vendor cost proposals will be evaluated based on alignment with AOC's budget and "reasonable market pricing". Will AOC provide its expected budget for this scope of work?

A7: No. AOC will not be sharing the expected budget for this scope of work.

Q8: RFQQ APPENDIX B – Scope of Work, Task 3: If APPENDIX B to EXHIBIT C is the correct scope of work (see question 3 above), how does AOC define a Critical Event? Are these key project milestones? Will AOC provide a high-level implementation schedule or a list identifying anticipated Critical Events?

A8: "Critical Event" is defined as an implementation event (e.g., pilot, early adopters, etc.) Yes, they are considered key project milestones. Not at this time. However, AOC will be providing a high-level projected implementation schedule to the QA Vendor following contract execution. Once the contract with the CLJ-CMS solution Vendor is executed, a more detailed schedule representing their implementation approach will be provided to the QA Vendor.

Q9: RFQQ EXHIBIT C – DRAFT CONTRACT, Section 4 - Pricing: Section 4.3 indicates that prices may not be increased during any term of the Contract. Please confirm that this requirement will not apply to any requests by AOC for increases in the contracted scope of work. What is AOC's process for requesting scope increases and amending the agreement?

A9: AOC does not plan to increase the work effort as prescribed in Appendix B – Statement of Work for the selected QA Vendor. Any modification of scope changes would be negotiated between the parties. Provisions allowing modifications to the agreement are provided under Contract Section 25.

Q10: RFQQ EXHIBIT C – DRAFT CONTRACT, Section 15- Background Investigation: Please clarify whether AOC or the Vendor will be responsible for conducting the background investigations.

A10: Background investigations must be completed by the Washington State Patrol Criminal History Unit as requested by the Apparently Successful Vendor (ASV).

Q11: RFQQ EXHIBIT C – DRAFT CONTRACT, Section 35 - Insurance: Some insurance requirements appear to be in excess of industry standards and others are different than the requirements in our existing contracts with other State agencies. Are these requirements negotiable?

A11: Refer to Section 2.3.14 regarding Exhibit D – Exceptions, Modifications and/or Additions to the Contract.

Q12: RFQQ EXHIBIT C – DRAFT CONTRACT, Section 44 – Disputes and Remedies: The draft contract provides for a three-day period for several dispute resolution steps, which seems to be a very tight timeframe. The dispute resolution periods are more than three days in our existing contracts with other State agencies. Are the timeframes negotiable?

A12: See A11 above.

Q13: Since a crime insurance policy is specific to a project/client and the costs of the policy would, under all reasonable circumstances, be included in each vendor's pricing to AOC, would AOC be willing to revisit the insurance requirements for "crime insurance" to a level of coverage more commensurate with the likely value of the CLJ-CMS QA contract?

A13: Yes. See RFQQ Amendment No. 1 for modification to insurance provisions related to crime coverage as provided in EXHIBIT C – Draft Contract.

Q14: Should Vendors number the sections in the response for each Volume to coincide with the numbering in the RFQQ? (i.e., Volume I, start the numbering at 2.3 Administrative Requirements; 2.3.2 Letter of Submittal, etc.)?

A14: See RFQQ Section 2.1.3.

Q15: RFQQ Section 4.5 - Resumes on page 27 states that "AOC prefers for the required services to be provided by a single individual but recognizes that multiple staff may be needed at times to provide all requested services." Do you anticipate that the role for the single individual will be full-time?

A15: It depends on the Vendors work plan for delivery of the services required

Q16: Is there an incumbent QA vendor?

A16: No.

Q17: Has AOC established a budget for this project? If so, will you provide that information?

A17: No. See A7 above.

Q18: RFQQ Section 5.1.2 - states in part: "Vendor will be required to evaluate documentation provided by the AOC staff and be prepared to provide expert recommendations during the RFP acquisition process and project implementation and initial rollout during a bi-monthly on-site visit."

The term bi-monthly has two possible meanings. Could you please clarify whether in this case bi-monthly means once every other month or two times each month?

A18: See A4 above.

Q19: Could you please post Word versions of the forms for submittal?

A19: Yes. See Amendment No.1 for MS Word formatted versions of Exhibits A and B.

Q20: What is the expected duration of the project?

A20: See RFQQ Section 1.6.

Q21: Is there a maximum budget that can be shared with vendors?

A21: No. See A7 above.

Q22: Section 4.2.1: May we use the same client engagements that we have used in Section 4.1.1 or 4.2.1 in response to the request in section 3.5.1?

A22: 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 CLJ-CMS project.

All requirements under RFQQ Section 4 will be evaluated based on weighted score. See RFQQ Section 8.1 for more information.

Q23: Section 4.8: May we use some of the same client engagements for staff references as in Sections 3.5.1, 4.1.1, or 4.2.1 if they played a key role of those projects?

A23: See A22 above.

Q24: Section 6: Is there anything in this section that we must respond to in our proposal?

A24: No.

Q25: RFQQ Section 4.8 – Staff Reference Engagements ask for detail about 3 recent service engagements for each staff member proposed for the QA project. There is a page limitation on the description, which we interpret to mean each person has 5 pages to describe all 3 of their engagements. Can you please confirm our understand of the page limitation requirements?

A25: This interpretation is correct.

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/.

STATE OF WASHINGTON

1206 QUINCE ST SE • P.O. Box 41170 • Olympia, WA 98504-1170
360-753-3365 • 360-586-8869 Fax • www.courts.wa.gov