

Questions 11/06/2008

**1) Question for WA State Courts AOC:** Are the RFP deliverables fully achieved by answering all portions of Appendix A and Appendix B by the November 21st deadline?

**Answer: No**

**2) Question for WA State Courts AOC:** Can you please clarify the level of detail the Court desires in Appendix A, Section B? For example, in looking at RFP Section XII, Deliverables A (Work Plan and Schedule) and B (Discovery and Analysis) are pretty well defined in terms of what level of detail the Court is seeking for deliverables during the consulting engagement. What level of detail is the Court seeking in terms of response to this RFP? For example, is the Court seeking a description of our consulting methodology for the proposed work plan, a list of the types of roles the consulting team members would play, types of consulting tools to be used, procedures typically used during this kind of consulting engagement as well as our approach to discovery and analysis?

**Answer: Bidders determine appropriate level of detail in response to this RFP**

**3) Question for WA State Courts AOC:** Is the Court seeking any response in the RFP to Appendix A, section B in regard to Deliverables C (Findings and Recommendations) and D (Option to Execute)? If so, please clarify what kind of response is requested.

**Answer: Please read RFP**

**4) Question for WA State Courts AOC:** Even though the RFP is written in a way to suggest business process re-engineering services, we've also heard that the services work should be more tactical, that is, IBM would provide architects to assist the AOC in defining use cases and establishing a reference architecture as the deliverable. Would our response be inappropriate if we took the latter approach?

**Answer: Bidders determine approach best suited for their particular response**