DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES/OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY FOR HUMAN SERVICES (OTHS)
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) FOR
AUTOMATED FISCAL SYSTEM (AFS) MODERNIZATION PROJECT

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES #10

Question 52: Please describe in more detail for which external systems and standard protocols including direct application integration is needed for the exchange of data. What are examples of the types of integration needed and in what formats?

Answer: **See response to Question Series #9, question #44.**

Question 53: What is meant by "change fiscal month" in the requirement – "The ability that enables authorized users to change fiscal months for one or more companies?"

Answer: **Per the Functional Requirements Worksheet, Item FR-7: C, of Attachment V, the intention of this requirement is to allow administrative users to make exceptions for fiscal month reporting.**

Question 54: Does this mean add a new fiscal year in the requirement – "The ability that enables authorized users to change fiscal years for one or more companies?"

Answer: **Similar to question 53, this requirement, as found in the Functional Requirements Worksheet, Item FR:7-D of Attachment V, is intended to allow administrative users to make exceptions in fiscal year reporting.**

Question 55: Can we receive a sample copy of the A/P Expense Distributions Report?

Answer: **A sample report is not available at this time.**

Question 56: What type of integration is required with the CHESSIE system?

Answer: **Currently the CHESSIE system sends check receipt information to AFS via a batch process. This information will be required in the future application**

Question 57:   Is batch processing required if the functions required can be fulfilled without needing a batch process?

Answer: **No. The State will be interested in making improvements to existing processes wherever they provide benefit to the State.**

Question 58:   Would you be interested in a mid-market accounting system rather than an enterprise ERP system?

Answer: **Yes**

Question 59:   Re: FR-1: J - What is a two-way check status?

Answer: **The ability to send check status information (e.g. cashed, voided, etc.) between the AFS or CHESSIE systems.**

Question 60:   Re: FR-1: K - Please provide more details on the 302 reporting process.

Answer: **The 302 Report is a monthly expenditure report that provides substantive details related to child care oversight, some of which includes: (a) OTO Adoption Services, (b) Non-Recurring Guardianship Expenses, (c) Educational Transportation Costs (d) Monthly Clothing & Incidentals Payments, (e) Transportation Services, and (f) other ancillary fees relating to Child Protective Services. See Attachment BB, Amendment #4.**

Question 61:   Re: FR-3: R - Please provide details on the external systems; what are these systems?

Answer: **Please see the "Legacy System Consolidation" worksheet in Attachment V.**

Question 62:   Re: FR-9: G - What information needs to print on the 3 lines of check advice?

Answer: **Memo related information that provides subsidy related details.**

Question 63:   Re: NFR-1: E - What are DHR Security requirements?

Answer: **See RFP Section 3.4 Security Requirements.**

Question 64:   Re: NFR-2: A - What are the 3rd party applications?

Answer: **Third party applications include any application that facilitates use of the application or in any way enables the data exchange between the system. This includes compatibility with VPN software for connectivity or FTP for secure transfers.**

Question 65:   Re: LEG-1: B - What type of costs is assigned to funding sources?

Answer: **LEG-1: B refers to a fund control requirement to enable the state to allocate federal grants to various departments or units. For example, 25% of the grant is payable to Department A, while 75% is payable to Department B.**

Question 66:   What historical data do you need migrated to the new system and for what level of details?

Answer: **See Amendment #2 as well as the responses to Questions #19 and #20 of Question Series 3.**

Question 67:   Given the length of our audited financial statements (more than 200 pages), can we provide these documents in an electronic format on a CD only?

Answer: **Yes.**

Question 68:   The RFP restricts page size to 8 ½ X 11-inch paper. For complex documents like Microsoft Project plans and architecture diagrams, may Bidders use larger paper folded down to 8 ½ X 11-inch size?

Answer: **Yes, as these could be defined as foldouts. Per Section 4.4.6, unless specified otherwise in the RFP, page size shall be 8.5 x 11 inches, not including foldouts.**

Question 69:   The RFP requires the bidders to respond using a 12-point font. May the bidders use a similar, still readable font for the following: headers and footers, requirements text, exhibits and tables?

Answer: **Information that the Offeror is required to type in response to the RFP must be in at least 12 point font. Pre-printed or .PDF forms do not need to meet this requirement; but, must be legible and readable.**

Question 70: Several requested documents/samples do not comply with font restrictions and they are not available in a native MS Office format for font adjustments. Please confirm that it is permissible to submit those documents as is.

Answer: **Yes. See the response to Question #69.**

Question 71: Can the bidders number the pages by each tab (i.e., A-1, B-1)?

Answer: **Yes.**

Question 72: Can the bidders exclude signed forms, attachments, tables of content, etc. from the sequential numbering requirement?

Answer: **Yes.**

Question 73: Table 1 lists TAB D as References with a page limit of 5 pages whereas Section 4.2.2.5 on page 73 lists this Section as "Minimum Qualifications Documentation." Please clarify section name and associated page limit.

Answer: **See Amendment #4**

Question 74: Responses to several requirements in this attachment will exceed the space provided for the same. Can this Attachment Q be provided in Word please?

Answer: **Yes. See Amendment #4 and the WORD version of Attachment Q posted on DHR's website.**

Question 75: Please confirm that the resumes, letters of commitment and the project schedule are excluded from the page count.

Answer: **The referenced documents are excluded from the Work Plan page limit per RFP § 4.4.2.6; but, may still be subject to the page limitations per the RFP § 4.2.2.**

Question 76: In order to provide a complete and quality technical response, we would request you to increase the page limit of the Offeror Technical Response to RFP Requirements and Proposed Work Plan section from 50 pages to 75 pages

Answer: **See Amendment #4.**

Question 77:   We would like clarification for the structure of the proposing firm. We have multiple entities partnering as a prime with subs and seek clarification as to what the proposing entity should be. Should we submit as a prime with subs or is it preferred that a single firm/joint venture submits the proposal.

Answer: **Offerors may submit proposals using a Prime Contractor, who will be the responsible entity for all services, terms and conditions under the contract. Offerors may also choose to submit a Proposal as a Joint Venture. Again, this entity will be responsible for all services, terms and conditions under the contract. Subcontractors may be proposed under either method. Offerors must ensure that the roles of the entities are defined in the Offeror's proposal. Per Section 5.2.5, the criteria to be used to evaluate each Technical Proposal will include Offeror Qualifications and Capabilities, including proposed subcontractors.**

Question 78:   What is the precedence in determining passing criteria to meet the minimum qualifications?

Answer: **Personnel proposed must meet <u>all</u> of the minimum requirements identified for their respective labor categories. See Section 5.2 for the Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria.**

Question 79:   Can we use the collective capabilities of the prime and subs to satisfy the minimum qualifications and all requirements?

Answer: **Yes. While there are no Offeror minimum requirements, Offeror must demonstrate through its proposal how its organization and subcontractors intend to meet the requirements of the RFP. See RFP § 4.2.2.8.**

Question 80:   Would the State please confirm that the SLA requirements outlined in Section 3.12 apply only to the deployment of the SaaS solution and that the SaaS vendor's SLA, unless otherwise agreed upon, will apply to the operation of the SaaS applications?

Answer: **The SLAs described in RFP § 3.12 only apply to SaaS products. Once the system has been configured, tested, and deployed, the system will be considered ACTIVE (as denoted with an Activation Date). Once the system is Active, SLAs as defined within the solicitation will be binding and the Contractor will be liable for liquidated damages as described in the RFP for any failed or missed SLA during the term of the Contract.**

Question 81: Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) Subcontracting goal – 35% How will meeting/not meeting the subcontracting goal be scored?

Answer: **The MBE Utilization and Fair Solicitation Affidavit and MBE Participation Schedule (Attachment D-1A) requires the Offeror to certify that it will make a good faith attempt to achieve the MBE subcontractor participation goal stated in the RFP. As per Section 5.5.2 (A), the Procurement Officer will first determine that the MBE Affidavit and Schedule (D-1A) is included and is properly completed. Per Attachment D, if the Offeror fails to accurately complete and submit the MBE Affidavit and Schedule (D-1A) with the proposal as required, the Procurement Officer shall deem the proposal non-responsive or shall determine that the proposal is not reasonably susceptible of being selected for award.**

Question 82: Section 1.1.1 – Can we propose a hybrid solution that is both COTS and SaaS?

Answer: **Yes. The Offeror must detail components of the solution that are SaaS versus COTS.**

Question 83: Section 1.37, Non Disclosure Agreement – Please identify what documents are in the reading room.

Answer: **There are no documents related to this RFP available at this time.**

Question 84:   Section 1.38 (c) Does this audit provision only apply to the safeguarding of returns or return information? Are there any parameters around the frequency of this audit right or the provision of notice prior to an audit?

Answer: **Section 1.38 refers to IRS returns or return information. In light of recent changes in the IRS regulations regarding the frequency and nature of background checks and audits, please see Amendment #4.**

Question 85:   Section 3.3.9 Custom Source Code – What is the scope of this audit?

Answer: **This audit will investigate whether or not Contractor's solution, which has been modified through custom source code, will compromise State data in any way, whether at rest or in transit.**

Question 86:   RFP Section 3.3.16 Configuration/integration of the new AFS – This section states that the solution will need to integrate with legacy applications. Can you please identify the legacy applications and the underlying technology for each?

Answer: **See Attachment V, Legacy Systems worksheet.**

Question 87:   Section 4.2.2 Table - 1 Tab D is called References and refers to Section 4.2.2.5. However, section 4.2.2.5 addresses Minimum Qualifications. Please clarify.

Answer: **See Amendment #4**.

Question 88:   Can we have a breakout of the current system users based on roles and number of named users?

Answer: **See Attachment AA, AFS User Counts and Roles included with Amendment #4.**

Question 89:   If DHR procures the proposed software licensing through an existing enterprise agreement we are assuming it is not included in MBE/WBE participation since it is already discounted for public sector agencies. Is this correct?

Answer: **No. Offerors must propose a solution that meets the requirements of the RFP and Attachment V; and must make good faith efforts to comply with the MBE goals and subgoals. Per RFP Section 3.3.16, the Contractor is responsible for configuring and integrating its proposed solution through the use of its subcontractors, including MBE subcontractors.**

Question 91: RFP Section 3.3.14-The RFP requirement states that "The State shall require different types of training materials and techniques for the various user roles. The Offeror awarded this Contract shall provide the training defined below for each user role." Please provide a list of user roles that the state is planning to use.

Answer: **See the response to Question #88.**

Question 92: Please provide 1099 flat file data elements and 302 monthly assistance report sample files or layout.

Answer: **See Attachment BB, Report of Expenditures and Source of Funds and Attachment CC, Flat File of 1099 Data Elements included with Amendment #4.**

Question 93: Section3.2- Agency/Project Background - Can you provide a breakdown of 26 million records by finance modules (AP, AR, G/L, Budget, etc.)?

Answer: **This information is not available.**

Question 94: Is full compliance with section 508c & relevant ADA standards a must have requirement?

Answer: **Yes. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicap or disability. Section 508 pertains to information technology with the purpose of requiring equal accessibility to electronic and information technology to ensure that the service allows: (1) the disabled employees to have access and use of information and data that is comparable to the access and use of the information and data by non-disabled employees; and (2) disabled individuals of the public seeking information or services from the department must have access and use comparable to the**

access and use of the information and data to non-disabled individuals.

REVISED RESPONSE TO QUESTION 50 – SERIES 9.

Question 50:   The SOC2/Type II reports outlined in Section 3.11 are made available by SaaS vendors to all customers and not susceptible to tailoring for individual customers. Please confirm that the requirements outlined in Section 3.11, including specific timelines, are not applicable to SaaS vendors that provide compliant SOC2/Type II reports as part of their standard operating procedures.

Answer: Please refer to Section 3.11.10. After award, the Department will make an independent determination whether the reports referenced in the question or any other information security assessment performed meets the requirements of Section 3.11 of the RFP and may be used in lieu of the SOC 2 Report.