



REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND QUOTATION

ACQ-2012-0115-RFQQ

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS DOCUMENT

February 1, 2012

The Administrative Office of the Courts published the Request of Qualifications and Quotations, ACQ-2012-0115-RFQQ, on January 13, 2012 for Quality Assurance Consulting Services. As required under RFQQ Section 1.8 – Acquisition Schedule, answers to Vendor submitted questions are provided below.

- Q1: Will the consultant who prepared the feasibility study be eligible to respond to this RFP? In general, will the QA Policy #132 issued by the State's Chief Information Office and effective on October 1, 2011, regarding consultant eligibility be enforced for this procurement?
- A1: **No. The Vendor who prepared the feasibility study for the Superior Court Case Management System has been precluded from submitting a proposal in response to this RFQQ.**
- Q2: In order to estimate reasonably the effort and fees required to deliver the QA services, it would be helpful to understand the size of the SC CMS project. What is the current total budget for the SC CMS project?
- A2: **Current total budget for AOC's SC-CMS project is available in the [SC CMS Feasibility Study Report](#). Please refer to Appendix E – SC CMS Cost Benefit Analysis: Centrally Hosted Commercial CMS for information regarding net present value (NPV) of the investment and an internal rate of return (IRR).**
- Q3: To whom will the selected QA consultant report, including serving as the acceptance authority regarding QA deliverables? For example, will the QA consultant report to the project's executive sponsor, project manager, CIO or some other person or entity?
- A3: **The selected QA Consultant shall report to the WA State Court Administrator. Additional information can be found in Schedule B – Draft Statement of Work.**

- Q4: Can you please provide or discuss a high-level SC CMS project organization chart, including the governance structure?
- A 4: Please refer to the [SC CMS Feasibility Study Report](#), pages 69 and 71: Figure 7 – Proposed Project Team and Figure 8 – Project Organization for Implementation Phase.
- Q5: How many QA consultant hours per month does the AOC anticipate for this project?
- A5: Please refer to RFQQ Section 6. Hours will be determined by the Vendor for the services requested in this RFQQ.
- Q6: Regarding the types of insurance coverage stated in the sample contract, should we assume these are mandatory for purposes of this proposal?
- A6: Per RFQQ Section 2.14, Vendors are required to submit Exhibit F with their proposal to identify any contract terms and conditions the Vendor would like AOC to review and consider for modification.
- Q7: Are there any restrictions against consultants being selected who are currently working, or have previously worked with, the AOC?
- A7: Some restrictions apply to current AOC Vendors depending on the project they are currently working and will be considered on a case by case basis. Other than Vendors who have already been notified of preclusion from this RFQQ, no restrictions apply to Vendors previously under contract with AOC.
- Q8: Can the AOC share its anticipated budget for QA consulting services?
- A8: See A2 above for a response.
- Q9: Has the AOC determined an estimated cost for the SC-CMS project and, if so, what is it?
- A9: See A2 above for a response.
- Q10: Does the AOC have Ts & Cs that its consultant will need to agree to, and will the AOC allow suggested modifications to those Ts & Cs?
- A10: See RFQQ Exhibit C – Draft Contract and its associated schedules. See A6 for additional information.
- Q11: The RFQQ states that the SC-CMS is the first application of the agency's new application portfolio. Does the AOC have a roadmap for the entire suite of applications it intends to implement?
- A11: AOC's strategic direction will be provided to the selected QA Practitioner.

Q12: Aside from releasing its RFP for COTS products early in 2012, does the AOC have an anticipated timeline for the procurement of the SC-CMS COTS product?

A12: The SC-CMS procurement timeline is currently in development and will be clearly identified in the RFP acquisition schedule.

Q13: Does the AOC have a PMO in place?

A13: Yes, AOC has a Project Management Office in place within the Information Services Division.

Q14: RFQQ Section 1.8. Answers to vendor questions may reveal information or result in an RFQQ amendment that requires significant proposal changes. Only 2 business days are scheduled from release of answers and possible amendments to the proposal's due date. Will AOC extend the due date for the proposal to February 3?

A14: Amendment 1 provided for an amended proposal due of February 7, 2012.

Q15: RFQQ Section 2.6 and Exhibit C - Insurance requirements are more extensive than typically required of QA providers on similar projects in our experience. Will AOC allow negotiation of the insurance requirements to consider the size and nature of the QA contract that will result from the procurement?

A15: Insurance requirements as provided in RFQQ Exhibit C are identical as provided in the Personal Services Model Contract under the State Technology Manual, Policy 121- Investing in Information Technology, Appendix C as available at <http://ofm.wa.gov/ocio/policies/manual.asp>. For further information, see A10.

Q16: RFQQ Section 4.1.2 - AOC appears to assume that the vendor will be on site only twice monthly, will provide a report of each visit, and will present the report from a remote location via Go-To-Meeting. The project plan requested also appears to assume this engagement structure. We are bidding Olympia-based QA consultants. Our anticipated QA approach on this project, as used on similar Washington State projects, would involve more frequent participation in project activities and interaction with project leadership, team meetings, and stakeholders. Will AOC consider QA interaction and reporting approaches other than the structure described in this section?

A16: Yes

Q17: RFQQ Section 4.1.2 – AOC appears to require twice monthly QA reports. We typically provide monthly reports and find this to be a good cycle considering time required to review work, discuss preliminary findings, review drafts, finalize, and present to stakeholders. Will AOC consider a monthly reporting cycle that includes more frequent interaction and communication of findings leading to the monthly report?

A17: Yes

Q18: RFQQ Section 6 - Cost Proposal: The cost proposal requests only yearly lump sums for each technical requirements section. While we are willing to certify a fixed bid and provide yearly lump sums, we also would like to communicate our expectations for how the fixed bid will be allocated to monthly deliverables that we assume will be billed monthly. Can the lump sums be supported with our expectations for monthly deliverables and the prices for those deliverables?

A18: No. AOC will not consider modification to the pricing model as provided in the RFQQ. Vendors must be compliant with the information and requirements are set forth in RFQQ Section 6

Q19: Feasibility Study Section V.E. - What is the current status of the Information Networking Hub project? What scope components from Appendix A of the feasibility study are dependent on an operational INH to meet functional expectations?

A19: INH is being implemented using a phased approach. The first two phases include building the foundation components and two pilot data exchanges for production implementation. The foundation components consist of data governance/data quality standards and framework, an enterprise data repository, a service development framework "factory model", and the infrastructure/security needed to support pilot service development and future SC CMS integration. The remaining four phases include development of the business service data exchanges necessary for the SC CMS integration. The primary focus of all INH phases is to be ready to support the planned roll out of SC CMS.

An AOC Project Manager has been assigned and is conducting initiation and planning activities for the foundation and pilot services phases. Project teams have been formed and work has started gathering requirements, developing an architectural solution and securing a court to participate in the pilot. A data exchange consultant has been hired to assist AOC in developing a Technical Lead Plan to guide the implementation of INH. All of the SC CMS in-scope components in Appendix C of the feasibility study are dependent upon the completion of the INH project.

Q20: Feasibility Study Section IX.E. - The description of Independent Quality Assurance in this section includes Independent Validation and Verification. The OCIO QA policy clearly separates independent QA from I, V and V. The RFQQ does not appear to include I,V and V. Please confirm that this is the case. Will a separate I, V and V vendor be used or will this be the function of AOC software quality assurance?

A20: The RFQQ does not include the services for Independent Validation and Verification (IV&V). AOC does not intend on contracting with a separate IV&V vendor at this time and will be a function of the software quality assurance as needed and requested if applicable.

Q21: Feasibility Study Section X.A. - Some text is obscured in Pages 76-77. Can the document be reissued to eliminate the obscured text? The passage noted seems important to assessment of risk and AOC's expectations for QA.

A21: Please check the [SC CMS Feasibility Study Report](#) as a corrected version of this document has recently been uploaded which does not obscure any text.

Q22: Feasibility Study Section X.A. - What is the source of the business SME's needed for the design and configuration process? What is the expected role for the Court User Work Group in design and configuration of the SC-CMS?

A22: a.) Team members to be utilized as Business Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) for the SC-CMS project will likely be drawn from knowledgeable staff currently at the AOC and from other sources of individuals who understand the operations of the Superior Courts in Washington.

b.) Throughout SC-CMS Project Phases II through V, policy questions may arise that need to be resolved by the court community. The Court User Working Group will be a policy-working group consisting of representatives from the various court districts in Washington. It will include judges, court administrators, and County Clerk staff, and will meet periodically to consider operational policy issues identified by the project team and its assigned SMEs. The state project manager will disseminate documented issues to the group for consideration and the development of recommendations, which will then be sent to the Executive Sponsor Committee for adoption. The court user working group will establish task groups to analyze and recommend operational policies.

AOC may invite each court district to send a representative to participate in the court user working group, and may invite several larger courts to include additional staff as needed. AOC will manage the composition of the group to ensure an adequate representation of judges, court administrators, and County Clerks. The frequency of group meetings, which will normally occur monthly, will be based upon the number of issues that need resolution. Work group members will be expected to address issues outside of the scheduled court user working group meetings. The Court User Working Group will influence how the SC-CMS application is configured and how business operations will be integrated with the new SC-CMS application.

Q23: Feasibility Study General - To what extent will the SC-CMS be integrated with the JIS Accounting system during the project?

A23: The current plan is that JIS Accounting will be integrated with the SC CMS.

Q24: Feasibility Study General - How District Court case management requirements influence the acquisition and implementation of the SC-CMS?

A24: No.

Q25: RFQQ Section 3.8 - Staff Reference Engagement: Does the 5 page limit for the response to this section apply to each of the three engagements for each staff member or to the total pages for all engagement descriptions for all proposed staff members?

A25: The limit of "5 pages or less" applies to each of the three engagements, not to total pages for all engagement descriptions.

Q26: Is the firm that prepared the feasibility Study (MTG) eligible to bid on this QA services RFQQ?

A26: No, MTG has been precluded from submitting a response to this QA services RFQQ.

Q27: When scoring, what is more important to AOC:
a. Extensive QA experience (breadth and depth) with some knowledge of JIS
-or-
b. Extensive JIS knowledge with some QA experience?

A27: Of these two items, expert level QA experience, as identified throughout the RFQQ, is the most important to AOC.

Q28: RFQQ Section 3.8 - Staff Reference Engagements - Is it necessary to provide all three means of contact for each reference (email, phone, mobile) or will one out of the three be acceptable? Some references are reluctant to disclosure their email address and/or mobile number in a public document.

A28: RFQQ Section 3.8 states Vendor must provide three (3) recent service engagements for each staff member that closely relate to the Services prescribed in this RFQQ. For each reference, information for a single contact must be provided. For each engagement, Vendor must provide the information as required in the bulleted list on page 21.

Q29: RFQQ Section 4.1 - Project Consultation: Is a separate response for each of 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 necessary? Or will one response for Section 4.1 suffice? A QA Plan (4.1.1 should contain all that is required in Section 4.1.2)

A29: a.) Yes. b.) No. c.) AOC is requiring separate responses for each subsection of section 4.1. Section 4.1.1 requires the Vendor explain how they would develop a QA plan. Section 4.1.2 requires the Vendor to provide a sample project plan so that the evaluation team can confirm consistency to the response provided in section 4.1.1.

Q30: RFQQ Section 4.1 - Project Consultation: It is understood that the response must include an organization chart.

A30: This is not a question.

Q31: RFQQ Section 4.4 - RISK MITIGATION: Please clarify whether the risks to be identified in the response to this Section are the same risks to be identified in the response to Section 4.3?

A31: The risks are different as stated in Sections 4.3 and 4.4.

Q32: What are the SDLC implementation / development models, methodologies, and / or best practices (i.e. CMMI, Six Sigma, ITIL, TQM, etc.) that Washington Courts may have in place today?

A32: The Washington State Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) has undertaken several initiatives in the last two years to acquire enhanced maturity in several areas. Many of these initiatives were based on Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) and Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL). However, AOC has not fully implemented any Software Development Life Cycle (SDLC) implementation/development models, methodologies, and/or best practices.

Q33: Does Washington Courts have any documented QA auditing processes and/or procedures in place today? If so, can Washington Courts share those processes, and / or procedures?

A33: a.) Yes. b.) ISD is currently finalizing an QA policy which is closely based on Policy #132 from the State Technology Manual. Modifications have been made to capture differences between agencies' authority for the judicial and executive branches of WA State government. The finalized QA policy will be shared with the selected WA Practitioner.

Q34: Does Washington Courts have any documented QA processes and / or procedures in place today? If so, can Washington Courts share those processes, and / or procedures?

A34: See A33 above for a response.

Q35: Can you share the Implementation vendor's high level project schedule and Scope of work for this project?

A35: At this time, there is no implementation Vendor under contract with AOC. The release of the RFP for the Superior Court Case Management System is expected to be released in Spring 2012.

Q36: What is the Period of Performance for this project's Implementer / Developer?

A36: See A35 above for a response.

Q37: Will specialized development and testing environments be setup for this project?

A37: See A35 above for a response.

Q38: In the past, has Washington Courts ever been involved with similar projects? If so, can Washington Courts share lessons learned?

A38: Yes. "Lessons Learned" documentation from that project will be provided to the selected QA Practitioner.

Q39: In the section where you ask the bidder to describe their QA methodology you limit the response to two pages. Other sections limit responses to five pages. Could you the methodology section to five pages to allow a more complete response e.g. So we can provide brief illustrations of our approach?

A39: See A25 above for a response.

Q40: Is this request covered by existing MSA agreements with WA State DIS?

A40: No, this is not a 2nd-tier competition.

Q41: Can you provide us with an overview of your proposed budget for this request?

A41: See A2 above for a response.

Q42: Are you working with an existing vendor? If so, are they precluded from bidding on this request?

A42: AOC is currently working with a Vendor to assist in the development of the RFP for the Superior Court Case Management System. This Vendor has been precluded from submitting a response to this RFQQ.

Q43: We understand that you have assigned page limitations to a number of sections. With that in mind, do you have any limitations to Section 4.1 in the RFQQ?

A43: There is no page limit set for Vendor proposals specific to RFQQ Section 4.1.

Q44: Are Appendices excluded from the total page count limitations?

A44: Total limitations for page count does not include appendices.

Q45: The RFQQ states "Vendor must list three (3) recent service engagements that closely relate to the Services described in this RFQQ for the acquisition and implementation of an information technology solution similar in size and scope. Vendor must provide a concise description of each engagement identifying specifically those engagements that require work for Quality Assurance consulting services related to an IT project similar in size and scope of the SC-CMS project in five (5) pages or less including its role, scope, service deliverables, timeframe and final status." We have significant recent experience providing Quality Assurance services for public agencies at both State and local levels in Washington. Many of these projects are similar in scope to the Superior Court Case Management System project. However, most are for either acquisition OR implementation, not BOTH acquisition and implementation. Will this level of experience meet this requirement, or are you looking specifically for QA experience for projects that span BOTH acquisition AND implementation?

A45: AOC is seeking QA service engagements that include both acquisition and implementation phases for projects similar to the SC-CMS in size, scope and budget. See RFQQ Section 1.2, 3.1 and 4.12 for additional information.

Q46: What is meant by “recent” engagements? Can the State identify a specific range (e.g., five years) it is looking for?

A46: a.) Vendor responses regarding "recent" engagements should be limited those occurring within the past five (5) years. b.) Yes. See previous response in A46.

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 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