

RFP# 2010-MITA-01

**IV&V / QA RFP Vendor Post - Conference Questions and Answers**

Item	RFP Para	Page	Question
146	RFP Cover Sheet		The RFP Cover Sheet that must be signed and returned requests that we provide the total price of our bid. Should this cover sheet be submitted in the separately sealed package with the Pricing Schedules rather than with the Business/Technical Response?
Yes			
147	2.4	51	The RFP states that the QA SME will be located on-site until the system has been certified by CMS. According to the timelines distributed at the Vendors Conference, the implementation will take twenty-four (24) months. Does this statement extend the project timeframe from December 13, 2010 through May 30, 2014 or forty-two (42) months?
<p>It is true that the State believes a QA SME is necessary on-site through the CMS Certification Period which is six months beyond the Recipient Subsystem's Initial Operational Capability.</p> <p>However, there is uncertainty regarding how long the project's Phase II will be, since the RFP for the Phase II vendor is still being developed, and there is no vendor proposal with schedule to base an IV&amp;V performance schedule on. The State envisions that should circumstances warrant, at the end of the IV&amp;V contract period, the contract may be extended for periods of up to one year if mutually agreeable.</p> <p>The State requires an IV&amp;V proposal planning horizon that is equitable across IV&amp;V vendors so as to establish a basis for comparing proposals. For that purpose, the time period of 24 months is selected. The State recognizes that the six months of Certification may be beyond the end of that period, and that the individual resource costs during that period will be similar to those of the preceding development period. For these reasons, for the purposes of sizing, costing and comparative evaluation of this RFP, the State will establish that the six month period of more limited staffing in the Certification period will not be included in the scope of this RFP, but will be the subject of a contract extension.</p> <p>Vendors should presume that the 24 month period will involve comprehensive support to the Phase II vendor's development life cycle up to and including User Acceptance Testing, Initial Operational Capability and State acceptance of the system.</p>			
148	3.2.2.3	62	Are subcontractors required to complete the Disclosure Form?
Yes. The Disclosure Form should be completed by both the Prime Contractor and any Sub-Contractors.			
149	Q&A #112 & 113		The State's response to Q #112 says that no

			<p>financial information or references need to be provided by subcontractors. However, the State's response to Q #113 states that the requirements of the Relevant Business Section are required by subcontractors. The answer to 113 seems to contradict the answer to 112. Please clarify.</p>
<p>The State's intent was that financial references for subcontractors would not be required. However, the relevant business experience is an important part of the evaluation and differentiation of each overall proposal. Therefore relevant business experience for subcontractors should be included.</p>			
150	3.2.3.2 and Q&A #119		<p>Section 3.2.3.2 requests information regarding the proposed project team's experience. However, the State's response to Q #119 seems to indicate that this section is referring to the company's experience. Please clarify if responses to 3.2.3.2 should be for the individual project team members' experience or the company's experience.</p>
<p>Section 3.2.2 is a Business Response section which requests information regarding business overview, experience and methodology. While the methodology discussion is clearly tailored to the needs of the RFI, it is regarded as a 'business' input.</p> <p>The State's response to question 119 was intended to differentiate between Business Response and Technical Response content. The State incorrectly referred to the Technical Response section as being more detailed. In fact, this section is intended to address the project team being proposed, literally.</p>			
151	3.2.2.7	63	<p>For the 10 most recent projects performed, should vendor's include projects currently underway as well as those completed?</p>
<p>Yes</p>			
152	4.6.5	80	<p>Will the state clarify the number of months to be proposed in the cost proposal? The RFP states twenty-eight (28) but at the bidder's conference thirty (30) months were used. Also in the Contract Terms, twenty-four (24) months are stated.</p>
<p>The State has provided information regarding the plans it has, but those plans have significant variables. For the purpose of sizing this RFP, the State is establishing a period of 24 months, ending with a presumed UAT, Initial Operational Capability and State acceptance of the system developed in Phase II.</p>			
153			<p>Please clarify the State's response to Question #142 from the Vendor Conference Q&amp;As: Are the Price Sheets to be included in our Technical Response, with the full Technical Response bound and sealed separately from our Business Response? Or are the Price Sheets to be bound and sealed separately from our Business and Technical</p>

			Responses?
The State's intent is that the cost information associated with each proposal be sealed. The Price Sheets should be sealed separately from the Business and Technical responses.			
154		Bidders' Conference Questions, #3	<p>According to the answer to this question, "vendors should base their pricing on a period of 24 months." This appears to contradict information contained in section 4.6.5, which refers to "the projected twenty eight (28) month term of the contract." Does the answer to this question effectively amend section 4.6.5 so that all bidders will consistently submit pricing for 24 months?</p>
The State has provided information regarding the plans it has, but those plans have significant variables. For the purpose of sizing this RFP, the State is establishing a period of 24 months, ending with a presumed UAT, Initial Operational Capability and State acceptance of the system developed in Phase II.			
155		Bidders' Conference Questions, #11	<p>According to the answer to this question, the subcontractor experience "should be described similarly to that of the prime contractor", which includes a detailed matrix of the 10 most recent projects. Should subcontractors' experience be included in the section "Use of Subcontractors"? If so, will the State consider extending the page limitation of this section (3 pages) or, as an alternative, exclude the matrix from the page count?</p>
The State acknowledges the need to have relevant Subcontractor experience included and will exclude this matrix from the page count.			
156	21	1.1.33 Granting of Contract	<p>In the second paragraph, this section states that the Agency reserves the right "to negotiate with the successful Proposer other additions to or deletions from, and/or changes in the language in the contract, provided that no such addition, deletion or change in contract language shall alter the scope of work required and/or the evaluation criteria set forth herein."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May Proposers include requested changes to the language in the contract in their proposals?</li> <li>• Will the Agency treat such requested changes as a failure to comply with Section 1.1.20, Acceptance of RFP Terms, and disqualify the proposal?</li> <li>• Will the successful Proposer be given the opportunity to request proposed changes to the language</li> </ul>

			<b>in the contract? If so, when and how will the successful Proposer be given the opportunity to request proposed changes?</b>
Vendors may include requests for these language changes in their proposal. The State will not regard these requested changes as a failure to comply with 1.1.20. The State will not act on these requests during the comparative evaluation since they will not involve scope or evaluation criteria changes. After the State selects an apparent winning vendor, the vendor will be notified and final contract approvals will be executed pending CMS vendor selection approval. Vendor negotiation of language changes not impacting scope or evaluation criteria may occur at that time.			
<b>157</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1.1.33 Granting of Contract</b>	<b>Will the Agency extend the period for finalizing contract discussions and resolving exceptions from seven to ten working days?</b>
The discussion period is extended to 10 working days.			
<b>158</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>3.2.2.15 Financial Status</b>	<b>Our most recent audited financial statement report is 291 pages in length and is available on our company website. Is it acceptable to provide a summary of our financial information in the body of the proposal with a link to the full audit on our website or do you desire the 291 page document to be included as an attachment to the proposal?</b>
A summary is acceptable. The State will use the link if it needs to.			
<b>159</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>5.1.13 Non-Assignment</b>	<b>Will the Agency modify this section to provide that the contract may be assigned without the Agency's written consent to an affiliate of Consultant or in the event of a change in control of Consultant?</b>
No.			
<b>160</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>5.1.15 Firm and Fixed Price</b>	<b>Can the Agency confirm that the reference to 1.1.25 Proposal Prices should be to 1.1.23 Proposal Prices?</b>
Yes			
<b>161</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>5.2.2 Termination for Default</b>	<b>Will the Agency modify this section to add a provision that the Consultant may terminate the contract for default if the Agency fails to perform its material duties and obligations?</b>
No.			
<b>162</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>5.2.4 Termination for Convenience</b>	<b>Will the Agency modify this section to require that the Agency provide at least 30 days prior written notice of termination for convenience under this section?</b>
No.			

<b>163</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>5.4.6 Additional Terms and Conditions for Consultant's Personnel</b>	<b>Is the Agency willing to agree that the Consultant may terminate any of its personnel assigned to the project for a violation of law or company policy without the Agency's prior approval?</b>
Yes			
<b>164</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>5.4.6 Additional Terms and Conditions for Consultant's Personnel</b>	<b>Can the Agency clarify how liquidated damages described in the fifth paragraph of this section will be determined and how this section relates to Section 5.8.1 Liquidated Damages?</b>
Section 5.4 deals with Employment, and provides guidance related to employment including the State's right to approve or disapprove staff, changes to staff, and removal of staff. Section 5.8 deals with Damages arising from contract performance. The State will determine the severity of each instance of potential damages on its own merits, and may apply up to 10% Liquidated Damages of the proposed project price in each instance. Section 5.8 describes other options the State may employ to attempt to correct shortcomings in performance. The State's objective in these measures is to restore the original contract performance agreed to by both parties.			
<b>165</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>5.5.14 Novation</b>	<b>Will the Agency agree to replace this section with a provision that the Contract shall extend to and be binding upon both parties' successors and assigns?</b>
No.			
<b>166</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>5.7.2 Inspection of Records</b>	<b>Is the Agency willing to modify this section to limit the Agency's right to access Consultant's books and records, except as otherwise required by law, to an annual audit of those books and records directly related to the services provided under the Contract; provided that (i) the Agency gives Consultant at least thirty (30) days prior written notice of such audit (ii) the audit is conducted at the Agency's own expense in a manner that does not disrupt Consultant's business, and (iii) the Agency abides by all Consultant work rules and security regulations while conducting such audit?</b>
No.			
<b>167</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>5.8.1 Liquidated Damages</b>	<b>Can the Agency clarify how the limit of 10% of the total proposed project price in the sixth paragraph will apply to instances of noncompliance with personnel requirements? Is this an aggregate limit or a per occurrence limit?</b>
Damages are a potential State option for dealing with any vendor failure of contract performance. The severity of any vendor personnel contractual shortcoming will be determined at the time of the failure by the State. Damages will be applied only after careful consideration of all possible options. The State may assess up to 10%			

damages per occurrence. The State believes it likely that a vendor with multiple contractual shortcomings would probably be terminated before being assessed Liquidated Damages on several occasions.

168	98	5.8.3 Limitation of Liability	Is the Agency willing to modify this section to provide that the limitation of liability applies to the Consultant's direct liability to the Agency under the Contract from any cause whatsoever, including, without limitation, liability for liquidated damages, liability arising from an indemnification obligation, and liability arising under the Business Associate Addendum?
-----	----	-------------------------------	---

No.

169	99	5.9.1 Inspection of Work Performed	Is the Agency willing to modify this section to limit the Agency's right to enter the Consultant's or any subcontractor's premises to conduct inspections, except as otherwise required by law, to an annual inspection of those locations where services are being provided under the Contract; provided that (i) the Agency gives at least thirty (30) days prior written notice of such inspection (ii) the inspection is conducted at the Agency's own expense in a manner that does not disrupt Consultant's or subcontractor's business, and (iii) the Agency abides by all Consultant or subcontractor work rules and security regulations while conducting such inspection?
-----	----	------------------------------------	---

No.

170	102 – 109	Appendix B: Alabama Medicaid Agency Business Associate Addendum	Is the Agency willing to negotiate the terms and conditions of the Business Associate Addendum?
-----	-----------	---	---

The Agency regards the Business Associate Addendum to be a standard agreement. Vendors may request a change to this agreement

171			Is the Agency willing to consider an additional contractual term to provide that Consultant and Agency will not be liable to each other under any theory for special, indirect, incidental, consequential (including lost profits), exemplary or punitive damages; regardless of whether such damages were foreseeable or either party was advised of the possibility of such damages?
-----	--	--	--

No.

172			Transitioning from mainframe application
-----	--	--	--

			<p>to a windows-based application can generate a lot of uncertainty and fear in an organization and requires a significant amount of cultural change and organization management to address the “people” component of implementing a new system like this.</p> <p>Does the Agency have a plan for Cultural Change Management?</p> <p>If so, can this plan be shared for planning in response to this opportunity?</p>
<p>The State agrees that the change being introduced by the system will have substantial impact on the culture of the organization. It has identified actions to address this need. In addition it will expect this need to be addressed as part of the Phase II vendor’s proposal – which we do not have yet. There is no documented plan yet that can be shared.</p>			
<p><b>173</b></p>			<p>There are a number of project plans that will be required to execute all the tasks referenced to—the MITA BPR Phase II, the RS-R&amp;R and the QA/IV&amp;V. All of these separate plans have dependent tasks and Agency resources will be required to support multiple tasks across all of these plans.</p> <p>Is there a higher level integration plan that also includes all of the Agency activities (i.e., Agency field staff training) and provides coordination and overall guidance for all of these different plans?</p> <p>Does the integrated project plan identify the work breakdown structure for each of the different contractors?</p> <p>Can the Agency provide that integrated project plan to assist the vendors in developing realistic plans for this project?</p> <p>Is the quality assurance plan that is developed by the QA function intended to cover all Phase II activities or only those of the QA team?</p>
<p>Phase II of the Recipient Subsystem Modernization Project will involve the development vendor (RS-R&amp;R vendor), the IV&amp;V / QA vendor and numerous State activities. There will be a Phase II Master Plan and Schedule to coordinate these activities. However, the definition of these Phase II activities will not be possible until the State completes its Phase II vendor RFP, and that will be substantially modified by the acceptance of a Phase II vendor proposal and schedule.</p> <p>It is envisioned that the Master Plan and Master Schedule will be a high-level compilation of subordinate milestones and key event supported by subordinate, more detailed plans and schedules reflecting the full WBS in each effort.</p>			

The Agency cannot provide these detailed plans at this stage of the project. IV&V / QA vendors will develop their proposal responses on the basis of the information that they have been provided, and their own understanding of IV&V / QA functions supporting an industry best practice application development life cycle.

The QA Plan is intended to describe the activities of the QA team as the team provides QA support to the State and Project PM regarding QA oversight to Phase II development vendor production.

174	Follow up to Q&A #13		<p>The Agency has indicated that the organization and environment for the Phase II RFP will be available for RS-R&amp;R vendor to consider while preparing the response to the RFP. This information would be extremely helpful to better understand the potential roles and subject matter experts may be needed to staff QA activities.</p> <p>Can the Phase II Agency organization and environment be made available for this RFP to clarify the Agency staff involvement in the Phase II tasks and activities?</p>
-----	----------------------	--	--

No. While the State understands the desire of every vendor to fully understand the environment of the Agency, additional detailed descriptions are not available. They are not considered by the State to be a prerequisite to IV&V / QA vendor responses. The State understands that this information has not been provided, and will evaluate proposals on the basis of what limited information has been shared.

175	Section 1.1.5 Scope Q&A questions #53 & 54 follow up	Page 2	<p>It is important to have access to Agency staff that has a full view of the purpose, processes and operations of the eligibility system from a policy, operations and technical perspective. To plan for Agency participation, it is critical to understand the Agency's intent for staff participation on the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the Agency provide a policy, operations and technical SME as resources to be available to work with the QA staff?</li> <li>• Can the Agency assign 1 FTE for each business area as a Functional Process Owner for the duration of the project?</li> <li>• Can the Agency identify the number of FTE's that will be available during the lifecycle of the project?</li> <li>• How is participating staff (policy, operations and technical) being prepared for their project role?</li> <li>• Proportionally for QA activities, what is the distribution of work</li> </ul>
-----	--	--------	--

The QA staff will operate under the State functional supervision of the Deputy Project Manager. The Deputy will work with State-Designated 'Coordinators' whose function it is to coordinate and authorize State resource support to the project.

The project can designate a Functional Process Owner as an appropriate State Resource when one exists. The Agency cannot estimate the number of State FTEs that will be available for the project. The State is operating under very serious resource constraints and will not be able to assign full time people to support the project, outside of project staff. Optimizing existing support to project development vendor and QA vendor demands will be a function of the Deputy.

State Staff has been participating in Phase I requirement specification activities. They will be oriented to the Phase II development vendor plan after the State selects a Phase II development vendor.

The State is not in a position to determine proportionality of QA activities or distribution of work. The State expects vendors to determine what needs to be done to achieve the RFP scope of work.

176	Section 1.1.5 Scope Q&A questions #9 & 128 follow up	Page 3	<p><b>The RFP and follow up questions have made it clear that the QA consultant will be responsible for some level of support for Agency staff for User Acceptance Testing. Since this is a firm, fixed price contract, it is very difficult to plan for the level of support (time, resources, and expertise) that will be needed by the QA consultant without additional information from the Agency.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the QA function only be responsible for review of the Agency's test plan, scripts and test cases and for working with the Agency staff where deficiencies are found in the testing artifacts?</li> <li>• If the QA function will be responsible for executing test cases, can the Agency identify some metric (% of test cases, # of hours) that should be used to estimate the level of support the vendor can be expected to provide as part of the firm, fixed price?</li> </ul>
-----	---	--------	---

The State acknowledges this to be an issue. It regards User Acceptance Testing to be a function that occurs throughout a life cycle, and includes State acknowledgement and acceptance of interim, incremental deliveries of functioning software as well as a classic UAT that encompasses the entire system after system testing has been complete.

The State envisions that the QA effort will be composed of an underlying set of ongoing routine activities, but that the focus of the QA effort will be largely oriented to the State's identification of risk. Since that risk has not been established, it is not possible for the State to identify the QA activities in more detail. The State expects QA vendors to understand the general nature of these activities, and to be able to make reasonable assumptions regarding likely support demands. After the contract has been awarded, the Deputy will make any necessary State trade-off decisions regarding how best to apply available QA resources within existing resource constraints.

177	Section 1.1.5	Page 4	For a given business process within
-----	---------------	--------	-------------------------------------

	Scope		<p><b>Member area does the MITA assessment already completed, identify the desired characteristics within each business area capability (i.e. timeliness, efficiency, data access and accuracy)? What types of characteristic metrics or process thresholds are available for monitoring and/or validation (i.e. reduce time to process application from 30 days to 15 days)?</b></p>
<p>The State has stated that it did not want to make the MITA State Self Assessment or other similar reference documents available because of concerns over interpretation and relevancy to the need to develop a general approach plan for IV&amp;V and QA services. This information will be made available to the selected vendor, who will use it to continuously refine and improve its plans. The State expects vendors to incorporate into their proposals explanations of what would be done, rather than to have explicit data to incorporate.</p>			
178	<p><b>Section 2.2.1 Independent Verification &amp; Validation Q&amp;A question #16 follow up</b></p>	Page 28	<p><b>“The State intends to use the time between IV&amp;V/QA Consulting arrival and Phase II vendor arrival as an opportunity for the IV&amp;V/QA consultants to participate in Phase II vendor reviews, to become thoroughly familiar with Agency and project plans and systems (including SharePoint) and to develop and review IV&amp;V and QA approaches so as to be fully ready when the Phase II vendor arrives.”</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Does the Agency expect the QA function to review and assist in the evaluation of the Strategy and Approach documents submitted with the RS-R&amp;R proposals?</b></li> <li>• <b>Does the Agency have a knowledge transfer plan to familiarize the IV&amp;V/QA functions with the Agency, project plans and systems?</b></li> <li>• <b>Also, this statement alludes to project plans that are available for review prior to the selection of the RS-R&amp;R vendor. Can the Agency identify what project plans are referred to in this statement and make them available for planning purposes of this proposal?</b></li> </ul>
<p>The State has not established a definitive set of QA activities regarding the review of Phase II vendor proposals. It is clearly in the State’s interest to have the most senior personnel available to review them. The state will rely on vendors to determine an approach to this need as part of its Plan or Options.</p> <p>The State has announced its intentions to transfer knowledge of the organization, technical environment and project to the selected vendor in a way that supports the vendor’s evaluation of the Phase II vendor RFP and subsequent proposals. The specific activities of this transfer have not been decided upon or documented yet. The plan for transfer activities may be modified by the Project Manager after recommendations from the selected</p>			

vendor.

State planning is continuous, and plans will be documented when determined to be appropriate. No other plans, however, will be provided to IV&V / QA vendors for the purposes of this RFP.

<b>179</b>	<b>Section 2.3.2.4 Section 2.3.8.3 IV&amp;V QA Consultant Requirements Validation Responsibilities Q&amp;A questions #7 &amp; 17 follow up</b>	<b>Page 32 &amp; 42</b>	<b>The Requirements Validation activities for system development projects require substantial knowledgeable user participation in order to derive value for the client. It is often necessary to have management, operations and subject matter experts (SMEs) available to provide the direction and clarification needed to promote a common understanding of the requirements between the client and the developer.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>What is the Agency's plan for the level of participation?</b></li><li>• <b>Should the QA function be prepared to supplement the SME's to provide perspective on industry best practices?</b></li></ul>
------------	--	-------------------------	--

The State agrees that requirement validation and subsequent design activities require an extraordinarily level of State staff participation. The precedence for such support has been established in the Agency. This project's Phase I activities have included several hundred meets involving up to 30-40 or more relevant staff for such purposes as MITA Assessment, BPR design, baseline requirement definition and Joint Application Requirement sessions. The State expects this kind of support to the Phase II vendor.

The State would expect the IV&V and QA staff to be prepared to contribute their perspectives on industry best practices.

<b>180</b>	<b>Section 2.3.8.8 QA Consultant User Acceptance Testing Responsibilities Q&amp;A question #9 follow up</b>	<b>Page 44</b>	<b>We understand the Agency has the responsibility to develop the User Acceptance Test Plan and the QA function may assist the Agency in creating its UAT Test Plan. That plan will be a critical component for understanding the role of the QA analysts during the UAT phase.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Has the Agency adopted a strategy and methodology for development of the User Acceptance Test Plan?</b></li><li>• <b>If so, can the strategy and methodology for development of this plan be shared at this time to assist in identifying the appropriate set of resources and planning for response to this RFP?</b></li></ul>
------------	---	----------------	--

The State has not documented its UAT strategy and it is not available for the purposes of responding to this RFP.

<b>181</b>	<b>Section 1.1.7</b>	<b>Page 11</b>	<b>Will the Agency grant an extension for</b>
------------	----------------------	----------------	---

	Schedule of Activities		submission of proposals for two weeks?
The State does not envision granting an extension to its deadline for submission of proposals.			
182			<b>Will it be possible for HCL to bid as phase II DDI service provider even if we bid now for IV&amp;V and Q&amp;A services?</b>
No. While the State is willing to accept the risk of having the same vendor provide IV&V and QA services, it feels that there is a built-in conflict of interest to have members the same company checking on itself in a contract as large as the Phase II DDI contract. The State will not allow the same company to fill both major roles.			
183			<b>Will there be any clash of interests as we'll be having our teams in both QA-IV&amp;V &amp; Development roles?</b>
The State has determined that it is an acceptable risk to have one company provide both IV&V and QA services, provided there are safeguards between the two. The State believes it is an unacceptable risk to have teams from the same company fill QA-IV&V and Development roles.			

## IV&V / QA RFP Vendor Conference Questions and Answers

### 1. How can vendors propose solutions to perceived State needs without being forced to price their proposals with one firm, fixed price?

The State will allow vendors to propose a core RFP designed to meet minimum State needs with up to three options for service delivery. If a vendor chooses to include options, they will be explained in their narratives. Price Schedules must be submitted for the Core Proposal and for each option showing the additional incremental cost of that option. The State will evaluate the Core Proposal and options. It will select those options it considers desirable and will regard the Core Proposal and options selected as one proposal for the purposes of evaluation.

### 2. What is the exact timeline for contract award, addressing vendor selection, notification and award? When will the vendor know that they are selected?

Upon the Agency's selection of an apparent winning vendor, the vendor will be notified that they have been selected as tentative winning vendors, subject to CMS and Legislative Review Committee approval. This date is October 22, 2010.

Shortly after October 22, a letter identifying the apparent winning vendor will be sent to CMS for their approval. At the same time, the apparent winner will be asked to sign contracts and those contracts will be forwarded to the Legislative Review committee for their review.

At this time, it appears that the project will not be able to have its review before sometime in January, 2011. We now intend instead to have our Commissioner to declare a State of Emergency to the Governor regarding the procurement. This will mean that the contract can be approved without Legislative Review for up to 60 days. In practice, it will mean that the day we get notification back from CMS that they approve our winning vendor, we have the Commissioner's letter sent to the Governor. The process should take about a week. When the Governor approves the declaration, the contract can be executed and work can start.

Our Commissioner has already issued one State of Emergency declaration regarding a procurement for the project. We believe we have precedent working for us. This process should actually take less time than would otherwise be the case. We are evaluating the schedule impacts now.

**3. Are there any security related prerequisites to this contract?**

No.

**4. The presentation in the conference had a range of completion dates for Phase II. What period of time must the vendor plan on for the length of this contract?**

Vendors should base their pricing on a period of 24 months. The State will evaluate proposals based on this 24 month period.

The RFP states: "This contract shall begin on the date of award and shall continue for 24 months, and may be extended for 12 additional months at the option of the Agency. The contract may also be mutually extended as hereinafter provided."

**5. Can the Phase II vendor RFP be reviewed in Phase I by both IV&V and QA staff?**

Yes. It is the intention of the State to have the most senior and experienced people possible review the Phase II RFP. The State does not see a conflict of IVV – QA separation in this instance.

**6. Is it possible to modify section page counts in the two 30 page sections , so long as the 60 page limit is not exceeded?**

Yes.

**7. Will there be issues by having IV&V staff and QA staff physically co-located in the project at the Agency?**

No. The State acknowledges that IV&V and QA staff will be working in close proximity, and will endeavor to keep the teams separate to the extent possible. The State believes, however, that if the separation guidelines are clearly understood by all and the IV&V and QA teams are working for different State managers, the risk of losing team independence and integrity is low, and acceptable.

**8. Will the IV&V and QA teams be independent if they are from the same company?**

The State acknowledges that having each team come from a different company would be an ideal way to maintain separation between the teams. It has, however, decided to follow precedence found in other States who have used one company for both purposes in order to avoid having to have two RFP procurements. The State believes the level of risk in proceeding this way is low. See number 3 above.

**9. Can vendors meet the requirement for 5 years of IVV or QA experience by providing evidence of contracts which may not have been named IV&V or QA, but which incorporated IV&V or QA work?**

Yes. Vendors should explain the circumstances.

**10. Is it possible to move staff between the IV&V and QA teams?**

Yes, provided such moves are approved by the Project Manager and occur only once.

**11. Can the State email copies of the Sign In sheets and a copy of the PowerPoint slides used in the presentation to the attendees?**

Yes.

**12. Will the experience of any subcontractors be evaluated along with the experience of the prime contractor?**

Yes. Although physically separated, the vendor explanation of experience should be described similarly to that of the prime contractor, and will be assessed with that of the prime contractor for an overall experience score for the proposal.

**13. Will there be a period of time after the vendor initially arrives to evaluate the Phase II RFP during which the vendor may become familiar with the organization, its systems and context prior to evaluating the Phase II vendor RFP?**

The State recognizes that a vendor would benefit from having time available to become familiar with the organization and its environment in detail prior to reviewing the Phase II vendor RFP. The State intends to provide an intense orientation upon arrival for that purpose, and will have documented the organization and environment in the Phase II RFP for that vendor's similar needs. While the nature and duration of this orientation and review requirement may be adjusted with vendor input after arrival by the Project Manager, the State does not foresee a lengthy period being made available for that purpose.

**14. Can you provide the current project Phase I and Phase II dates?**

Yes.

Category	Phase I Finish	Development	IOC
BEST	April, 2011	1 Yr 6 Mo (18 Mo)	September, 2012
WORST	July, 2011	2 Yr (24 Mo)	June, 2013
MOST LIKELY	May, 2011	1 Yr 9 Mo (21 Mo)	February, 2013

**15. Can you explain the relationship between Price Sheet labor hours and deliverables?**

This was discussed and illustrated at the vendor conference. The distinction between labor hours and deliverable costs arises because of the historical tradition in the Agency of procuring with an Invitation To Bid (ITB) rather than an RFP. Vendors should account for labor hours as

labor, and determine a cost for deliverables using some factor to distribute a portion of overall costs to the deliverables.

**16. Should vendors distinguish between IV&V and QA roles in the labor sections of the price list?**

Yes.

**17. Can vendors obtain additional information about the Oklahoma Online Enrollment system the Agency has permission to copy?**

No. The State believes that the Oklahoma system information, like other potentially available references such as the State MITA Self-Assessment could, without the benefit of face-to-face coordination, would lead to misinterpretations or misunderstandings. The State believes these items would, if offered, require each vendor to perform a lengthy analysis that would not materially alter a vendor's approach.

**18. Is the project aware of and integrated to initiatives such as HIE?**

Yes. The project operates in an environment of coordination with multiple programs and initiatives, and often addresses the goals of these initiatives through delivery of the project itself. It relies on the senior executive staff of the Medicaid Agency to guide the project in this regard. The project has the Deputy Commissioner for Beneficiary Services and Director of Certification Support on its Change Control Board to ensure the project is aware of new requirements.

**19. Is the Oklahoma system COTS and SOA based? Does it incorporate an Enterprise Service Bus?**

Yes. It is a locally developed .NET application using some C Sharp that incorporates a COTS rules engine (InRule) and a ESB.

**20. Does the term 'Open Systems' used in the RFP slide presentation discussion mean the Recipient Subsystem will incorporate an industry defined Open System approach?**

No. The Agency has committed to a major, long term strategic partnership with Microsoft. The Agency has built an infrastructure based on Microsoft products. The phrase "Use of a state-of-the-art open platform technology to allow the system to interface effectively with other related systems and information sources" is intended to convey the idea that the Recipient Subsystem must have an architecture that facilitates interfaces and connectivity, rather than one of propriety standards or constraints.

**21. Is it permissible for vendors to communicate with each other? The RFP strictly warns vendors concerning communicating with other vendors.**

It is true that the State prohibits collusion among vendors to fix prices or operate in a way that may be contrary to law or ethical practices. At the same time, the State encourages partnering between contractors to provide the best possible group of skill sets in the delivery. Collusion is bad. Collaboration and coordination that results in stronger teams is good. The State expects that vendors conduct themselves accordingly.

**22. There will be an election in November in which the Governor may be replaced. Will this impact the projected project schedule contract reviews and approvals?**

The State is aware of the possible impacts and has taken them into account where possible. There are many other State projects and initiatives in the same situation as we are, however, and the Legislative Oversight committee should announce how it will accommodate the need for reviews and approvals in this period. The project believes the schedule impacts will come from this legislative review requirement, not from a need for a Governor's signature to approve a contract.

## General Questions Posted Prior to Vendor Conference 9 September:

1. **Can you provide copies of the RFP?** Copies of the RFP and the Requirements Specification are posted on the Agency's web site:  
[http://www.medicaid.alabama.gov/news/rfps\\_rfis.aspx](http://www.medicaid.alabama.gov/news/rfps_rfis.aspx)

2. **Can you provide an estimated contract value?**

There is no announced value – we are depending on each proposer to competitively estimate their services against what we understand of the system's requirement specifications.

3. **Is there an incumbent vendor currently or previously providing this service?**

There is no incumbent – these services will be provided to a new development effort.

4. **Is there an existing Recipient Subsystem that is being modernized or is this a new sub-system that is being developed from scratch?**

The Recipient Subsystem is a modernization effort involving a patchwork of legacy based mainframe and manual functionality. The future system will be developed from scratch. The Agency has committed to accomplish that development within the SharePoint environment to the maximum extent possible.

5. **Has the contract to develop/modernize the Recipient Subsystem already awarded?**

The contract to develop the Recipient Subsystem has not yet been awarded – it was a goal of the agency to allow the IV&V Consultant to review the developer's Initiation-To-Bid (ITB) before the ITB was released.

6. **Who would organize and facilitate JAD sessions? It would seem to be either the State or IV&V consultant.**

The vendor will organize and facilitate the JAD sessions. The IV&V function during JAD sessions would be similar to other life cycle activities – to verify that the process is followed and likely to produce the results expected from it.

7. **While both QA and IV&V participate in JAD and other requirements gathering, is the IV&V responsible for ensuring right requirements are collected and QA pick up the ball to ensure products and deliverables conform to these requirements? What is the State's preference since there are different approaches and significant overlap possible between these two functions?**

The State sees the function of IV&V as literally independent, and not a part of production. IV&V will be able to sample, review and critique all parts of the Vendor's production activities and the State's oversight of those activities.

It sees the QA function as potentially part of, or close to production. QA may support testing as a representative of the State in the evaluation of vendor production, or perform functions such as routine reviews of products.

**8. What type of testing approach does the State use, iterative or waterfall approach, etc?**

The State will adopt the vendor's test plans. The State will draft and score the RFI in such a way as to encourage the adoption of iterative, agile and pragmatic test efforts. These efforts may not be easily characterized as either 'agile' or 'waterfall'.

**9. Does the IV&V or QA develop the Testing Plan or primarily review and validate?**

The IV&V and QA functions will not produce the vendor's test plan. The QA function may assist the State in creating its User Acceptance Test Plan.

**10. Can a high level project plan be provided or phases for Phase I and Phase II? This may provide the framework for mapping a more defined IV&V and QA Project Plans.**

The Plan for Phase I will not assist vendors in determining the support requirements needed in this IV&V RFP. A Plan for Phase II will be prepared after the ITB/RFP for Phase II is written. The State does have a very high level time frame that is provided in response to other questions.

**11. RFP Sections 1, Administrative Section, pages 1-24, and 2, Statement of Work, pages 24-57. Throughout these sections, the primary point of contact for the Agency is referred to with multiple titles (Agency RS-R&R PM, RFP PM, Alabama Medicaid Agency PM). Please clarify that a single Agency PM will oversee both the IV&V/QA Contractor and the Phase II Vendor and indicate the desired title to be used.**

The single Agency PM that will oversee the IV&V and QA effort is commonly referred to as the Recipient Subsystem Project Manager. This person is responsible to the Agency for delivering the Recipient Subsystem and for managing the IV&V and QA effort. The State supervision of the Phase II vendor will be performed by the Deputy Project Manager.

**12. RFP Section 1.1.4, Purpose, page 2. We are a full service QA and IV&V consulting services vendor with deep experience in Medicaid Management Information Systems development. As such, we plan to propose a team consisting entirely of our own employees. Does the statement in RFP 1.1.4 encouraging partnering with other organizations preclude the Agency's acceptance of bids from a single vendor?**

No vendor will be penalized for not partnering with other organizations. The State's intent was only to encourage vendors to provide the best skill sets possible to the proposal.

**13. RFP Section 1.1.7, Schedule of Activities, page 11. Given the number of questions posed, with responses not due until one week prior to the Proposal Submission Date, would the Agency consider extending the proposal due date by two weeks?**

No extension is being considered at this time.

- 14. RFP Sections 1.1.10, Medicaid Agency RFP Project Manager, page 12, and 1.1.11, Project Coordinators and MMIS Coordinator, page 13. In these sections the titles MITA Coordinator and MMIS Coordinator seem to be used interchangeably. It is apparent that a single position is intended. Please clarify what the Agency prefers the position be called.**

The term 'MITA Coordinator' and 'MMIS Coordinator' are the same person. The Agency would prefer the person to be called the 'MMIS Coordinator'.

- 15. RFP Sections 1.1.35, Proposers Qualifications, page 22, and 2.4 (3), Consultant Staffing Requirements, page 51. Section 1.1.35 states, in part, "Key staff must have experience and knowledge with Medicaid health plans and claims/eligibility systems, including at least two engagements within the past four years. Prior experience must include at least one client reference for an IV&V project and one client reference for a QA project." Section 2.4 (3) states, in part, "Key staff must have experience and knowledge with Medicaid health plans and claims/eligibility systems, including at least two engagements within the past 5 years. Prior experience must include at least one client reference for an IV&V project and one client reference for a QA project."**

**Does the requirement for both an IV&V and a QA project reference apply to the proposed team or to each individual who is bid? And, is the required experience to be for engagements within the last four years or the last five years?**

The requirement for Proposer company experience (1.1.35) is that companies have at five years of experience in the services defined by the RFP, and that key staff must at least two engagements over the last four years. Prior experience must include at least one client reference for an IV&V project and one client reference for a QA project. It was the State intention that these prerequisites apply to the Proposer team, not to each individual.

The State's intent regarding the requirement for Consultant Staff Experience (2.4(3)) is that key individuals have at least two relevant engagements within the last 5 years, and that the Proposer team have key staff with at least one client reference with an IV&V project, and one client reference with a QA project.

- 16. RFP Section 2.2.1, Independent Verification & Validation, page 28. Are there any procurement related tasks planned for the IV&V team during the period after the RS-R&R RFP is released and an award is made? Can the Agency estimate the target date for award of this contract?**

There are no procurement related tasks envisioned in the project after the RS-R&R RFP is released.

It is the State's intent to have the opportunity for IV&V / QA review of the draft RFP for the Phase II development vendor before the RFP is sent in final form to CMS for their review and approval. This necessitates an IV&V / QA presence on site in December, 2010 for that purpose. There will follow a period of time after the IV&V / QA review until the Phase II vendor proposals are evaluated and a winning vendor is selected. There will be more delay after that while the contract award is reviewed and approved by CMS.

The State intends to use the time between IV&V / QA Consultant arrival and the Phase II vendor arrival as an opportunity for the IV&V / QA consultants to participate in Phase II vendor proposal reviews, to become thoroughly familiar with existing Agency and project plans and systems (including SharePoint), and to develop and revise IV&V and QA approaches so as to be fully ready when the Phase II vendor arrives.

The review and approval time periods cannot be determined in anything but broad time periods. These represent risks to the project's schedule. Proposing vendors will not be penalized for unexpected project delays.

At the present time, it is expected that the Phase II vendor will arrive and start work in June, 2011.

**17. RFP Section 2.2.2, Quality Assurance, page 29. Does the Agency anticipate the QA tasks will begin when the RS-R&R contract is awarded?**

The State is receptive to plans for QA support. It expects that support to be minimal during requirements validation and design, but should rise as iterative development starts, and probably peak in the last third of the project as systems and User Acceptance Testing occurs. The vendor will be responsible for product testing up to the UAT. The State expects to have the opportunity to observe and participate in iterative, incremental testing throughout the life cycle.

**18. RFP Section 2.2.2 (1), Quality Assurance, page 29. Does the Agency have a target date for release of the RS-R&R RFP?**

The current public release date is projected to be March, 2011 with a vendor selection date in June, 2011.

**19. RFP Section 2.3.2.8 (c), IV&V Consultant Integration, System, and Operational Readiness Testing Responsibilities, page 33, and 2.3.8.7 (b), QA Consultant Integration, System, and Operational Readiness Testing Responsibilities, page 44. These referenced sections for IV&V and QA services, respectively, both state the following identical requirement: "Develop and implement a verification strategy document for the objectives, scope, approach, standards and procedures, tools, etc., to be used in the verification effort." Please clarify the requirements for each team for a verification strategy document.**

It is the State's intent that the Consultant develop and implement a strategy to be used in their services that addresses their objectives, scope, approach, standards and procedures, tools, etc. This strategy was intended to be captured in a document for IV&V services, and a document for QA services.

Please regard the 2.3.8.7 (b) reference on page 44 as dealing with QA.

**20. RFP Sections 2.3.3, IV&V Consultant Deliverables, page 35, and 2.3.9, QA Consultant Deliverables, page 47. We have a number of questions related to the duplication of deliverables found in these two sections.**

- **The MITA Assessment Verification Document is listed as a deliverable under System Design and UAT sections. Is this deliverable required of both the IV&V and QA teams?**

The intent of this item was to document that the design of the Phase II vendor system was consistent with the CMS MITA architecture and this Agency's own MITA Self-Assessment. The tasks were included in both sections because the production of the document was regarded as a QA task that was to be validated by IV&V. The State is receptive to vendor proposals as to how to best match IV&V / QA services to this need.

- **The Preliminary Certification Assessment is listed as a deliverable for both IV&V and QA. Please confirm that this deliverable is required of the QA team only and should be removed from the IV&V deliverable list. Please confirm that the Risk Assessment Report is required to be compiled and delivered by both the IV&V and the QA teams.**

The tasks were included in both sections because the production of the document was regarded as a QA task that was to be validated by IV&V. The State is receptive to vendor proposals as to how to best match IV&V / QA services to this need.

The Risk Assessment Report is a deliverable from both the IV&V and QA teams because the teams were seen as performing two different functions. If the QA team is directly involved on behalf of the State with a limited set of activities, it will be best positioned to document risk in those activities. It was envisioned that the IV&V tasks would involve sampling and verification, but also a higher level of standards and process-based validations that would position it to observe a different set of risks.

- **Please confirm that the Go/No-Go Implementation Assessment is required to be compiled and delivered by both the IV&V and the QA teams.**

As stated above, the State envisions that both teams bring unique perspectives to this assessment and that their separate deliveries are warranted.

- 21. RFP Sections 2.3.8.3 (e), QA Consultant Requirements Validation Responsibilities, page 42, 2.3.8.5 (e), QA Consultant Data Conversion and Interfaces Responsibilities, page 43, and 2.3.8.6 (f), QA Consultant System Development Responsibilities, page 43. Please clarify that the Agency intends to have the QA team review the work of the IV&V team.**

The State does not intend to have the QA team review the work of the IV&V team.

In each of the references noted, the intent was that the QA team would review all available information as they were attempting to perform QA activities on the functionality involved. If IV&V reports existed, they would be reviewed. The QA team comments were to be regarding the Phase II vendor, not the IV&V team.

- 22. RFP Section 2.4, Consultant Staffing Requirements, page 50. This section states, in part, "Consultant must provide a resume and two professional references related to IV&V services for IV&V staff or QA for QA services staff for each of the following key personnel: IV&V Lead Consultant and QA Recipient Subsystem Subject Matter Expert." Is this a clarification of the requirements on p. 22 and p. 51?**

See Question 15 above.

- 23. RFP Sections 3.2.2.8, Approach and Methodology for IV&V Services, page 64, and 3.2.2.9, Approach and Methodology for QA Services, page 65. RFP 3.2.2.8 states there is a 20 page limit to propose the approach and methodology for IV&V Services. RFP 3.2.2.9 states there is a 25 page limit to propose the approach and methodology for QA Services. Further, RFP Section 2.3.2 (page 30) contains the statement, “Each requirement must be addressed in the offeror’s proposal.” It is understood that the Agency does not want a rewrite of the RFP requirements, however in order to address the SOW, which itself is contained on 25 pages (pages 24 to 50 of the RFP) covering both the IV&V and QA tasks, would the Agency consider increasing the page limit specified in Sections 3.2.2.8 and 3.2.2.9 to 30 pages each?**

The page limits of sections 3.2.2.8 and 3.2.2.9 are raised. See Question 88.

- 24. RFP Sections 3.2.2.8 (6), Approach and Methodology for IV&V Services, page 64, and 3.2.2.9 (6), Approach and Methodology for QA Services, page 66. Both referenced sections state “Assists the Project Management Office” as an item to be addressed by IV&V and QA. Please clarify the role of the PMO for this project, including its position in the project organization chart shown on p. 28 (Section 2.1.4).**

The Recipient Subsystem Modernization Project is a complex combination of multiple State and vendor efforts. It is envisioned that at the end of Phase I and throughout Phase II, there will be a PMO directly subordinate to the Project Manager to assist in coordinating and managing the overall project effort.

The intent of 3.2.2.8 was to have vendors address how they would manage their own efforts, and coordinate that management with the management of the overall project. The PMO activity will be performing scheduling, tracking, communication and other functions under the direction of the PM. They in turn will coordinate with the management of the IV&V and QA services being provided.

- 25. RFP Section 3.2.2.8 (11), Approach and Methodology for IV&V Services, page 64, and 3.2.2.9 (11), Approach and Methodology for QA Services, page 66. The paragraphs containing the special instructions referenced in these two sections are identical and describe the IV&V requirements. Please clarify the area of the SOW referenced for the QA Approach and Methodology.**

The State views these as Approach and Methodology sections for IV&V and for QA. While the outline of broad responsibilities appears similar, the nature of IV&V functionality and QA functionality are seen as differing significantly from each other. The intent was to elicit appropriate responses for each within each section.

The ‘Special Instructions’ for Section 3.2.2.8 (11) correctly refers to section 2.3.2, “IV&V Responsibilities”. The “Special Instructions for Section 3.2.2.9 erroneously refers to the same section. It should refer to Section 2.3.8 “QA Responsibilities”.

**26. RFP Section 3.2.2.13, Proposed Staffing, page 68. Is there a page limit for this section?**

There is no page limit for this section.

**27. RFP Sections 3.2.3.3, IV&V Approach to Phase I and II, page 72, and 3.2.3.4, QA Approach to Phase I and II, page 72. These sections both state “...describe in five pages or less your approach to meeting the requirements in Phase I. Describe your transitioning strategy into Phase II.” Please clarify the IV&V and QA tasks required in Phase I. Also, does the MITA & BPR Phase I Project Vendor have any responsibilities in Phase II? Is the MITA & BPR Phase I Project Vendor permitted to bid on Phase II?**

A challenge to the project is its mandate to have IV&V and QA services to help to ensure the highest quality Phase II vendor RFP is prepared before its final approval and release to the public. There is a long period of time (January 2011 – June 2011) from the Phase II vendor RFP being finalized to the time a winning vendor is selected. How to best use that time while having the IV&V / QA vendor continue services after Phase II vendor arrival is the challenge.

The State believes this period of time can be useful to IV&V and QA staff to both support Phase II vendor evaluations as well as to become familiar with the Agency’s technical architecture, functional organizations, existing Recipient Subsystems and future application environments such as SharePoint. The State welcomes vendor proposals as to how they might best support this period before vendor arrival.

The MITA BPR vendor will transition to providing project PMO services and Agency organizational Business Process Engineering Services and process improvement activities during Phase II. The MITA BPR vendor may not bid on either the IV&V / QA RFP nor the Phase II vendor RFP.

**28. Please describe all the tasks/sub-tasks that the QA Consultant is expected to carry out in Phase I & II? The RFP does not describe this in detail.**

See question 7 and 17. The State expects vendors to be able to describe their high-level, industry best practice methodologies in a fashion tailored to the needs of the Agency. Approaches should include how ambiguity can be resolved and work successfully managed in this environment. The combination of this IV&V RFP, the Baseline Specification Requirements and industry best practice should provide enough detail to respond.

**29. How many QA Consultants will be required during phase I & II?**

Each vendor must estimate and cost and resources required to meet the requirements of the RFP.

**30. Will certification by CMS be in reference with any particular model/standard? (E.g. CMMI, ISO, etc.)**

Medicaid Certification deals with systems implementation. See [https://www.cms.gov/MMIS/09\\_MECT.asp](https://www.cms.gov/MMIS/09_MECT.asp)

**31. Are you HIPAA compliant? Will HIPAA compliance be verified as a part of certification by CMS?**

Yes. Yes.

**32. What is expected to be included in the QA strategy and Methodology described during the proposal stage? Without knowing the full landscape and ways of working for this Company, preparing a detailed and effective strategy during this time will be difficult. Should we assume a high level strategy is sufficient?**

The State expects responding vendors to be familiar with industry best practices and standards for IV&V and QA services, and how those practices and standards can be applied here. A high level strategy is important. Tailoring concepts to apply that strategy within the project are also important.

**33. The RFP mentions MITA Maturity Levels 1 & 3. Will the QA roles be given training on MITA ?**

The State will expect vendor familiarity with MITA Architecture concepts. This information is available from the CMS web site.

**34. It is not clear whether or not Testing (execution) is a part of the QA Consultant's assignment? Please describe the tasks required for test execution.**

QA resources will be used for both Quality Assurance and Quality Control, but they will be used as State resources. The Phase II vendor will be responsible for testing. QA resources may participate in reviews, evaluations, assessments, perform UAT test planning, and participate as State representatives in the vendors iterative testing process. It is expected that vendors will be able to propose QA activities that are appropriate to the Agency's needs as described in the RFP.

**35. Is an existing QMS (Quality Management System) currently in place? Please provide details.**

There is not an existing QMS or methodology that will be implemented.

**36. What are Data Conversion and Interfaces Tasks? Please provide details. This will help us to create the QA strategy.**

Testing practices for Data Conversion, Interfaces and other tasks are industry best practice. While the Phase II vendor may be responsible for executing tests, QA Consultant resources may review plans, observe tests, or assess risk in these activities.

**37. What are the Stabilization Tasks? Please provide details. This will help us to create the QA strategy.**

Stabilization tasks are industry best practice that have to do with ensuring a system continues to operate successfully after its initial implementation.

**38. Please describe the Certification Tasks.**

See question 30.

**39. The Consultant staff shall be available after hours as required by the Agency Project Management. This implies overtime billing is allowed. Please confirm.**

This provision is included to provide for emergency response to unforeseen events. Overtime is essentially not used in any part of the project. Should after hour work be required by the project manager, the IV&V / QA vendor would determine appropriate compensation and invoice the Agency. Since the RFP will result in a fixed price contract, the impact of additional costs will be assessed by the Project Manager and appropriate adjustments in other work will be made.

**40. Is QA required to verify the Product or only the process compliance and effectiveness? Please clarify.**

QA will assist the evaluation of product deliveries by the Phase II vendor to the State. While the vendor will be delivering according to their own process and life cycle, QA resources will be positioned to observe and comment on process issues and process effectiveness as they perform QA related activities.

**41. Please provide the planned Org structure for IV&VS, QA and Agency.**

The organization structure of the Agency is not relevant to a response to this RFP, except as described in the RFP. The vendor organization of IV&V and QA services a requirement to responding to this RFP.

**42. The section on Medicaid Provided Facility and Equipment Requirements does not mention a scanner. We will need the scanner to test. Therefore, please confirm that the state provides all versions of the scanners for testing.**

The State will ensure scanning equipment is available to both the Phase II vendor and the IV&V / QA vendors when needed.

**43. Appendix A: Recipient Subsystem Baseline Requirements is missing**

The requirements document is posted along with the IV&V RFP for download on the Agency's public website.

**44. Please provide a list of all testing tools (test management and test execution) that are currently in use. Please describe the overall adoption / usage of these tools.**

There are no dedicated test management or execution tools currently in use in the Agency. The Phase II vendor may use such tools.

**45. What are the timelines for Phase 1 and Phase 2? Please provide the start and end dates for each phase.**

Phase I started in September of 2009 and is expected to end in June of 2010. Phase II will start with the sending of the name of the selected Phase II Vendor to CMS for validation in June.

Phase II will depend in part on vendor responses to the Phase II RFP, but is projected to last up to two years.

**46. Is test estimation done on the basis of defined methodologies? Or on the basis of experience?**

Vendors are expected to be familiar with test methodologies and able to apply that knowledge to the project's needs whether it is in support of State controlled testing such as UAT, or in support of vendor controlled iterative testing.

**47. Are standardized processes (including processes for testing) followed across all projects?**

No.

**48. Is it mandatory to respond to both the positions ( IV&V & QA) or can we respond to only individuals ?**

It is mandatory that the entire RFP be responded to by vendors responding to the Agency. It is possible for vendors to team with one another as a Prime Contractor and Subcontractor in one response.

**49. Evaluation Criteria on Technical and Business are missing. Please provide it.**

The general evaluation framework for Technical and Business responses is included in the RFP. The Agency has a Proposal Evaluation Plan which further decomposes these criteria, but will use it for internal purposes only.

**50. Is Phase II a single project or comprises of multiple projects? Why is the CMS certification is needed in phase II ?**

The Recipient Subsystem Modernization Project will ultimately result in a major system being delivered to the Agency. CMS certification of the ultimate system is a requirement related to their funding its development. Certification details are available from the CMS Toolkit information on the CMS website.

**51. Will the State provide any related APDs during the procurement?**

The State does not intend to provide any related APDs during the procurement.

**52. Will Fox and/or Beacon Analytics be precluded from responding to this solicitation?**

Fox and Beacon Analytics are precluded from responding to this solicitation.

**53. 1.1.5 2 - and 3 – Last paragraph on #2 and continuing to Page 3: Please clarify the role of the QA consultant further. Is it the State's intention that the QA consultant would support State staff or actually augment (provide staff) for the project team.**

The QA resources of this RFP are State resources. They are not intended to replace those of the Phase II vendor. The State will encourage an iterative development of the system, however, and may need state representation in iterative delivery and acceptance testing.

**54. 1.1.5 2 - and 3 – Last paragraph on #2 and continuing to Page 3: Will QA consultant staff be required to provide Alabama policy and procedure interpretation?**

It is an expectation of the State that the vendor will require a ‘customer’ presence in many activities. State resources are severely constrained. The project may have QA resources participate in reviews, discussions or other activities it believes appropriate, given the circumstances and skill level of the resource involved. It is not expected that QA resources will originate interpretations of policy and procedure, but may be familiar enough with it to guide discussion or raise issues for resolution.

**55. 1.1.5 3 3rd paragraph – At what levels within Alabama State Government has the ITB been reviewed or is expected to be reviewed prior to IV&V/QA consultant review and assessment?**

The project has recommended that the ITB be made into an RFP. The RFP will be drafted but will not be considered final for staffing prior to IV&V and QA vendor review and comment. When the Project Manager believes it appropriate, it will be reviewed by the project’s Change Control Board, Executive Steering Committee, General Counsel, and Commissioner.

**56. 1.1.5 3 5th paragraph – Please provide clarification as to when the detail requirement sessions will be conducted and who will conduct those sessions? Is this the DDI vendor?**

The Phase II vendor RFP is not yet complete, nor has a vendor proposed a delivery schedule. The Phase II vendor will facilitate the requirement validation and design sessions.

**57. 1.1.5 3 Does this statement, “The IV&V activities must be accomplished independent of the QA activities and cannot be performed by the same staff.” preclude staff, with the appropriate skills from participation in both activities at different, example; if an individual’s IV&V assignment has ended, could that individual transition to a QA assignment later in the project?**

If this were a one time transition to a different team, and approved by the Project Manager, it is feasible.

**58. 1.1.5 3 Should this reference be to Appendix A? “However, the subsystem will meet the baseline requirements located in the Appendix B, meet all CMS certification requirements, and be aligned with MITA standards.”**

The reference at 1.1.5.3 should be to Appendix A, not Appendix B as stated.

**59. 1.1.5 4 The RFP specified the use of MITA 2.01. What provisions have been made in the event that a complete version 2.01 has not been approved by CMS prior to the initiation of Phase II?**

It is the intent of the Agency to be guided by the principles in the MITA Architecture as it evolves. If a complete version is not approved, a decision will be made at the time as to how to interpret the architecture or what actions to take, if any, in assessments.

**60. 1.1.6.2 6 Does the state intend to continue to maintain the Recipient Subsystem after Phase II is completed or will a contractor?**

At this time the State intends to not to adopt a long term contractor support relationship to the system after implementation. That does not preclude contract augmentation to its own programming staff to facilitate the transition to Agency-centric support.

**61. 1.1.7 11 To ensure that the State staff have the appropriate time to respond to the second round of questions, would the State consider a 30-day extension to the due date?**

At this time the State does not intend to extend the proposal due date. It will of course strive to expedite the answer to any subsequent questions.

**62. 1.1.9 11 Please clarify the level of involvement by the Executive Steering Committee in the review and approval of project deliverables. Will all project deliverables be reviewed by the committee? Will presentations or walk-throughs of the deliverables be required for the Executive Steering Committee on a routine basis?**

The Executive Steering Committee will not be involved routinely in review of deliverables. There may be, on occasion, key deliverables or decisions which the Committee may make. Routine coordination, review and acceptance of deliverables are made by the Project Manager and Project Change Control Board. The Board has levels of authority starting with the PM, then a Weekly CCB consisting of the PM and a CCB member, and monthly meetings with the entire CCB. The PM will determine the level of review and approval necessary. Reviews have been accomplished by SharePoint document review, and by focused meetings of the entire CCB.

**63. 1.1.13 15 Is the cost of a deliverable to be included in Price Schedule II to only include the staff hours required for the physical generation of the deliverable? Are the staff hours to be included on Price Schedule I to include the hours that IV&V/QA staff will provide support to project tasks (for example attending facilitated work session)?**

The Pricing Schedules reflect the State precedent of costing labor separately from deliverables. Schedule 1 is intended to reflect labor hours. Schedule 2 is intended to reflect the cost of deliverables themselves. While the two are clearly related, the State recommends that each vendor apply a sizing factor to determine the deliverables costs.

**64. 1.1.19 18 What is the proposed system(s) or type of systems the Evaluation Committee would be asking for additional information during the oral presentations from the IV&V/QA consultant?**

The use of oral presentations is not expected unless found to be required by the State. Details regarding additional information required will be determined when oral presentations are found to be necessary. Vendors will be informed of those details at that time.

**65. 1.1.20 20 Do these certifications need to be made within the proposal or is the submission of the proposal implying these certifications?**

When the Proposer signs the proposal, these certifications become binding. It is not necessary to include them within the proposal.

**66. 2.1.2 25 Does the State wish for work only to be performed on their PCs or may work be performed on QA/IV&V laptops as long as they are approved by Medicaid's Associate Director of Network and Systems Support and HIPAA requirements?**

Routine work may be accomplished on personal PCs so long as they have been scanned by the Agency and certified as virus free. Should work with Protected Health Information (PHI) be required, it will be accomplished on Agency computers. Agency computers can be also made available to the teams.

**67. 2.1.1 26 Last paragraph in section – How will IV&V/QA consultant be compensated for periods of delays, changes in deliverable due dates, or timeframes that are not caused by the IV&V/QA consultant or over those for which there is no direct control?**

It is the intent of the Agency that vendors not be penalized for unanticipated events outside their control. The Project Manager is responsible for determining how best to recover from these events so as not to harm a vendor in a fixed price contract. The PM and vendor counterpart will attempt a good faith adjustment of scope and schedule resulting from this kind of event. Should that not be possible, the problem will be escalated and may result in a contract modification.

**68. 2.1.4 27 2nd paragraph – Is it really the intent that all project status, risks, and performance would be issued to all project stakeholders or is this intended to be a smaller subset of the many stakeholders that could exist? What is the definition of a stakeholder in this instance?**

The intent of the State was that IV&V observations would be included by the Project Manager in the project's reporting to its stakeholder community, as the Project Manager determined appropriate. It was not that the IV&V vendor would be reporting directly to State stakeholders.

**69. 2.3.2.1 30 Item b: Please provide some guidance on the basic timeline that should be used by proposers to develop the work plan. Without some guidance, proposers will be submitting very different timelines that will cause inconsistencies in the evaluation of the material.**

See questions 16 and 27.

**70. 2.3.2.8 33 The RFP states "Perform random sampling of test results during the testing phases to verify that the system performs according to documented results." Will the sampling**

**testing be done in a live parallel testing environment or just a validation of a deliverable document?**

The function is generic, and will be applied to the project where ever it can be. At the start of the project, there will be primarily documentation. As time goes by, segments of the system will become available, culminating in integration, system and user acceptance testing. This sampling function can be planned for in test plans, observed at points in the development effort was those points become available.

**71. 2.3.3 36-39 Are there any timeframes (how many days before or after something) for the TBA deliverable to help in preparing the work plan?**

The list of deliverables does not contain interdependencies or the context of the underlying Phase II vendor schedule. The State will normally review for acceptance within 5 days but in practice has often reviewed more quickly, and without causing a sequence of delays in a series of deliverables.

**72. 2.3.4, 2.3.5, and 2.3.6 39-40 The items are not addressed in response to Section 3.2.2.8. Are vendors expected to provide a response to these sections?**

Vendor responses are not expected for 2.3.4, 2.3.5 or 2.3.6.

**73. 2.3.6 40 What are some examples of “standard dictated by the PM” that will be applied to deliverables?**

The Project Manager will be the decision authority for determining standards questions of ‘how much is enough?’ or ‘What is not enough?’ There is an inherent need to balance risk, cost and impacts in a dynamic way to determine what is best for the Agency. This is a pragmatic question, not an academic one.

The project will operate in an environment in which absolute standards (ie, how many errors of which categories in document are considered acceptable? Unacceptable?) won’t exist. The Project Manager will apply his experience in quality, software engineering, management and existing organizational standards to decide on a case-by-case basis what is acceptable, and to establish project policy or process to address these issues when appropriate.

**74. 2.3.8.1 41 Item B: Please provide some guidance on the basic timeline that should be used by proposers to develop the work plan. Without some guidance, proposers will be submitting very different timelines that will cause inconsistencies in the evaluation of the material.**

See questions 16 and 27. The State expects vendors to produce the best planning documents they can with the information they have. Plans will be added to over time as information becomes available.

**75. 2.3.8 44 The RFP states “Participate in User Acceptance Testing, performing testing as directed by the PM.” Will the State or the IV&V vendor be responsible for conducting UAT?**

The State will be responsible for conducting the UAT, and may choose to conduct it using vendor support or QA support. The IV&V vendor would be expected to perform the same level of independent verification and validation of UAT as other activities throughout the life cycle.

**76. 2.3.8.13 46 Item d, e, f: What the expectations for the level of assistance if documentation must be provided by the RS-R&R consultant and they fail to do so? Is there an expectation that the QA consultant would develop the documentation?**

The State will define deliverables in the RFP, and may include the requirement for deliverable specification approval prior to use. If the RS-R&R vendor fails to perform in any respect as required, the State will escalate and correct that failure as it determines necessary.

The State has an expectation that QA and IV&V activities may require an industry expertise not commonly available, and that a constructive explanation and mentoring to both the developer and State staff would be routine aspects of their work. The State does not expect the IV&V or QA teams to have to literally train the vendor or design solutions for them.

**77. 2.3.9 47 -50 Are there any timeframes (how many days before or after something) for the TBA deliverable to help in preparing the work plan?**

The State has not determined the interdependencies or timelines for these deliverables. The timeframes are Phase or Event related and will, in most cases, depend upon the Phase II vendor's schedule. We do not have that schedule. State review and approval periods will range from 3-5 days, depending on the size of the deliverable.

**78. 3.2.1 58 Are the Business and Technical Responses to be provided in separate binders? Are they to be separately sealed?**

The Business and Technical Responses do not have to be provided in separate binders. They do not have to be separately sealed. They should be easily identified or tabbed.

**79. 3.2.2.7 63 This section refers to an Appendix H. Could the State please provide this appendix?**

There is no Appendix H. Vendors should disregard the reference but produce the requested matrix of relevant projects.

**80. 3.2.2.8 64 Given the amount of information requested in this section, would the State consider increasing the page limitation to 40 pages?**

The limit is raised. See question 88.

**81. 3.2.2.9 66 Given the amount of information requested in this section, would the State consider increasing the page limitation to 40 pages?**

The limit is raised. See Question 88.

**82. 3.2.2.10 67 Given the amount of information requested in this section, would the State consider increasing the page limitation to 10 pages?**

The limit is raised to 10 pages.

- 83. 3.2.2.11 67 Given the amount of information requested in this section, would the State consider increasing the page limitation to 10 pages?**

The limit is raised to 10 pages.

- 84. Section 3.2.1 (p 58) Per Section 3.2.1, the proposal must be submitted using 8.5 x 11-inch paper. Is it acceptable to submit a limited number of pages that are printed on larger paper but fold-down to 8.5 x 11 in order to fit in the binder?**

The use of 8.5 x 11 paper is required. Fold out pages are not allowed.

- 85. Section 3.2.2 (p 59) The outline of the Business Response in Section 3.2.2 does not require a Table of Contents. Is it acceptable to include a Table of Contents either after the Cover Page or after the Letter of Transmittal?**

Yes.

- 86. Section 3.2.2.1 (p 60) Per Section 3.2.2.1 (page 60), the Proposal Sheet must be signed and notarized; however, the Proposal Sheet (first page of the RFP) does not include a space for the notary to sign/stamp. Should the notary's signature/stamp be placed in the box along with the Authorized Vendor Signatory?**

It may be placed in the box or anywhere in the open space at the bottom of the page.

- 87. Section 3.2.2.7 (p 63) Section 3.2.2.7 points to a matrix in Appendix H. The RFP does not include an Appendix H.**

There is no Appendix H. Vendors should however, produce the matrix of projects described.

- 88. Section 3.2.2.8 (pp 64-65) and Section 3.2.2.9 (pp 65-66) Please clarify the page limitations for these sections. Specifically: Is the page limit for the section entitled "Proposed IV&V Approach & Methodology" a total of 20 pages or a total of 40 pages (20 pages for responses to #1 through #10 and 20 pages for #11 a through n). Is the page limit for the section entitled "Proposed QA Approach & Methodology" a total of 25 pages or a total of 50 pages (25 pages for responses to #1 through #10 and 25 pages for #11 a through o).**

Page limit sizes for 3.2.2.8 and 3.2.2.9 are as follows:

3.2.2.8 Approach – 30 pages  
Responses – 30 pages  
Total for 3.2.2.8, 60 pages.

3.2.2.9 Approach – 30 pages  
Responses – 30 pages  
Total for 3.2.2.9, 60 pages.

**89. Section 3.2.2.10 (p 67) and Section 3.2.2.11 (pp 67-68) Is the Gantt chart included in the five page limit for each of these sections?**

The page number in each of these sections is now 10 pages. A Gantt chart is counted within that number of pages. The State would discourage literal project schedules, unless sections were blown out to illustrate the level of planning detail for a given class of activities.

**90. 3 1.1.5 This section notes that the QA staff will ‘supplement State personnel during Phase II’. Understanding that the Proposer to this RFP will provide a staffing plan; does the Agency currently know how many State staff are anticipated for the RS Modernization Project management effort, in terms of FTE’s?**

The State staff will be required to support the Phase II vendor’s development plan. There is no vendor plan yet, so the level of State staff supported is not possible to determine.

**91. 9 1.1.6.5 Can the Agency provide access to the MITA/BPR assessment for prospective Proposer’s to review in preparing their proposals?**

The State believes the introduction of this document would not materially change the RFP responses but would introduce a major new analysis requirement to the RFP response process. For this reason, the MITA BPR Assessment will not be made available to prospective vendors.

**92. 15 1.1.13 The third paragraph of this section refers to a “Project Lead”, which is also referenced in Section 1.1.35 on page 23. Please confirm or clarify that this individual is separate from and in addition to the IV&V Lead Consultant and the QA Recipient Subsystem SME named as Key Staff.**

The term ‘Project Lead’ was not intended to signify a requirement for dedicated staff for this function, but rather the person who has these duties. This person may be the IV&V Lead Consultant or QA SME.

**93. 15 1.1.13 Please confirm that hours not specifically tied to deliverables will be invoiced on a monthly basis, while work tied to fixed price deliverables will be invoiced upon completion of that deliverable.**

Labor hours will not be tied to deliverables. The cost of deliverables will be determined by the vendor using a factor to determine their value. Each month the labor hours for that month and the deliverable values will be invoiced.

**94. 15 1.1.13 Will completed deliverables be invoiced at the fixed price for each deliverables, or will the payments be adjusted based on actual hours used?**

See question 93 above.

**95. 16 1.1.13 Can hours be shifted between resources as long as the total price does not exceed the original fixed price?**

Yes.

**96. 22 1.1.35 This section states that key staff must have experience on least two engagements within the past four years. If a staff member has worked on one large engagement that has spanned all four years, is that sufficient?**

Yes.

**97. 22 1.1.35 This section states that prior experience must include at least one client reference for an IV&V project and one client reference for a QA project. Is this a corporate qualification requirement, or is it a requirement for each key staff member? If it applies to key staff, and if some staff members are proposed for only IV&V tasks or only QA tasks, do they still need to demonstrate experience with both areas?**

It is a corporate requirement.

**98. 23 1.1.35 This section states that the resumes must include experience with any Medicaid Management Information Systems or comparable systems. Will experience with recipient eligibility systems be sufficient for meeting this requirement?**

Yes. The State does not intend "MMIS" to mean simply the claims processing component of the system, but the Recipient or Eligibility Systems as well.

**99. 29 2.3.1 Please clarify or further define "or incidental to" as it relates to Contractor's performance of work under this scope of work.**

In the discussion of the scope of work to be performed under this contract, the consultant will do all things necessary to, or incidental to, the performance of work set forth herein. That means that there are specified and implied tasks. The term 'incidental to' refers to the implied tasks.

**100. 30 2.3.2.1 Where are the "all requirements and documents" of the RS-R&R consultant itemized or otherwise located?**

The RS-R&R RFP has not yet been finalized. The RS-R&R requirements were made available to vendors as a draft document and can be downloaded from the Agency's web site.

**101. 37 2.3.3 Table 2 IV&V Consultant Deliverables, Data Conversion and Interfaces, includes references to "data cleansing". Please clarify this term as it relates to this task.**

This term is intended to refer to the effort to ensure that only data appropriate to a given data field is contained in the database for that field. Often data fields are used for purposes other than that for which they were originally intended, and contain data that may not process as expected because of it.

**102. 38 2.3.3 Table 2 IV&V Consultant Deliverables, User Acceptance Testing, includes a required IV&V project deliverable "MITA Assessment-Final". This deliverable is not described or otherwise addressed in the IV&V scope of work. Please clarify.**

The State's intent was to ensure that the Recipient Subsystem conformed to the MITA Architecture. The State has performed a MITA Self-Assessment, and is endeavoring to continue updates to its maturity improvement roadmaps. This document can assist in determining that conformance.

- 103. 39 2.3.3 Table 2 IV&V Consultant Deliverables, Implementation, includes a required IV&V project deliverable of “Preliminary Certification Assessment”. This deliverable is not described or otherwise addressed in the IV&V scope of work. It does appear, however, to be included in Section 2.3.8.11.g as a QA responsibility. Please clarify.**

The State believes that IV&V and QA support would be necessary throughout the system development period, but that development would essentially stop upon the system’s Initial Operational Capability or Go Live date. CMS certification of the operating system takes another six months. It was envisioned that IV&V support during this six months would not be necessary. QA support to respond to defects in the system during this six month period would be.

- 104. 41 2.3.7 Please clarify or further define “or incidental to” as it relates to Contractor’s performance of work under this scope of work.**

In the discussion of the scope of work to be performed under this contract, the consultant will do all things necessary to, or incidental to, the performance of work set forth herein. That means that there are specified and implied tasks. The term ‘incidental to’ refers to the implied tasks.

- 105. 41 2.3.8.1.e How does this requirement differ from that specified for the IV&V in Section 2.3.2.1.e?**

The State envisioned that the IV&V effort could involve sampling to attain its goals. It envisioned QA resources as being potentially made a part of the routine production review process. The requirement to track was meant to be aware of what was being produced and what its status was. This will be accomplished by the PMO as well.

- 106. 42 2.3.8.3.d How does this requirement differ from that specified for the IV&V in Section 2.3.2.4.D?**

Both sections use the term ‘all’ when describing the work scope of attending meetings, etc. The State does not intend that every meeting be attended by both IV&V and QA staff. Which meetings are attended and the tasks to be accomplished in those meetings can be determined by the Project Manager and the IV&V / QA leads.

- 107. 2.3.9 Table 3 QA Consultant Deliverables, System Design, includes a required QA deliverable “MITA Assessment Verification Document/Updates.” This deliverables is not described or otherwise addressed in the QA scope of work. Please clarify.**

See question 102.

- 108. 2.3.9 Table 3 QA Consultant Deliverables, User Acceptance Testing, includes a required IV&V project deliverable “MITA Assessment-Final”. This deliverable is not described or otherwise addressed in the QA scope of work. Please clarify.**

See question 102.

- 109. 52 2.4 In #4 of this section, it’s noted: “The consultant staff shall be available after hours as required by the Agency Project Management.” Can the Agency provide some guidelines as to what “after hours” indicates?**

See question 39.

- 110. 59 3.2.1 Font size of 11 is noted in the Business Proposal Response. Does the Agency have a body font type preference (i.e. Times New Roman, Arial)?**

The State does not require a body font. It routinely uses Arial.

- 111. 62 3.2.2.3 This section specifies that the Transmittal Letter must provide the percentage of total contract price to be performed by the prime contractor. Please confirm that, in the absence of the actual contract price, inclusion of this information will not violate the provision against referral to “any element of cost”, which will disqualify the proposer.**

Inclusion of the requested percentage, without reference to any actual monetary price, will not violate the referenced provision.

- 112. 63 3.2.2.6 In this Section, Use of Subcontractors: Are any other business Proposal requirements required for subcontractors, such as financial information or references? If so, should they be placed in the relevant section or in the subcontracts section?**

This information is only required for the prime contractor.

- 113. 63 3.2.2.7 This Section requires that the Proposer provide Relevant Business Experience. If sub-contractors are to be used, is this also required for the sub-contractor, as well?**

Yes

- 114. 64 3.2.2.7 This section requires the proposer to “provide details for each project not completed on time or within budget.” Does this include those projects where delays were incurred by the DDI vendor or the State, thus extending the IV&V or QA project schedule and/or cost beyond the original schedule or budget?**

No. The State requires information regarding those projects not completed on time or on budget as the result of vendor performance.

- 115. 66 3.2.2.9 Should the “Approach and Methodologies for QA Services” refer to Section 2.3.8 rather than the stated section of 2.3.2, which is the IV&V Consultant Responsibilities section?**

Yes.

- 116. 66 3.2.2.9 Should the Proposer address responsibilities a-o on pages 66-67 rather than the states a-i responsibilities?**

The State believes that responsibilities a-o on pages 66-67 are legitimate questions for vendor response. In many cases, one vendor will provide both IV&V and QA personnel, and information regarding the elements of a QA Plan are appropriate to request.

- 117. 69 3.2.2.13 Please clarify the term “specific personnel” as it relates to the imposition of liquidated damages. Does this refer to key personnel only? If not, what other personnel. Please define how liquidated damages will be calculated, up to the ceiling of 10 percent of the total project price.**

The specific personnel regarded as key for this purpose are the IV&V lead and the QA Recipient Subsystem SME. The amount of any liquidated damages will be determined based on the extent of the absences and their impact on the overall project.

- 118. 72 3.2.3.2 Please confirm that the requirements for the project team's experience with web-based development and SOA, EAI, ESB, etc. are for working on projects that involved those technologies, and not necessarily to have done them (e.g. a web developer is not required; IV&V on a web-based project is sufficient).**

The State's intent was the team had members who had experience in the environment and the IV&V or QA processes that might be appropriate in those environments.

- 119. 72 3.2.3.2, 3.2.3.3 & 3.2.3.4 Please clarify the difference between these sections, which describe our Relevant Technical Experience and IV&V and QA approaches in the Technical Response with requirements of Sections 3.2.2.7, 3.2.2.8 and 3.2.2.9, which also describe our IV&V and QA approaches in the Business Response.**

The State intends that the Business Response Section describes the company and its characteristics as a whole. The Technical Response Section allows for a more detailed treatment of complex technical topics. If a vendor feels that their Technical Response section will have exactly the same information as that provided in the Business Response Section, they may refer to it there.

- 120. 110 Appendix C Please confirm that Price Schedule I should include only those hours that are not specifically tied to deliverables.**

It is the State's intent that labor hours be included in Schedule 1, and that the costs of the deliverables themselves be established separately.

- 121. 115 Appendix D Should the Total Fixed Price Bid shown at the bottom of Price Schedule II be a sum of the IV&V Deliverables, QA Deliverables, and the Grand Total Price from Schedule I?**

Yes

- 122. What is the planned project schedule for release of the RS-R&R ITB and the initiation of the subsequent contract? What is the planned Phase II schedule?**

The RS-R&R RFP is expected to be awarded to a vendor and validated by CMS in June, 2011. The expected duration of development is 2 years. That duration may be influenced by the winning vendor's schedule.

- 123. Does the Agency currently use any specific document management/PMO tools for the project? Is it the State's intention that the Proposer proposes and/or maintains a separate set of document management/PMO tools?**

The project will use tools available in MS Office, including MS Project. IV&V vendors are not required to maintain their plans in MS Project, but may use other tools such as Excel to define their plans. The State expects the IV&V and QA leads to provide the project PMO with planning information in a form that is easy to understand and update project schedules with.

- 124. If separate, would State personnel require access to the document management tool?**

The State does not require access to any vendor's internal document management tool. The State will expect vendors to support the project's SharePoint site and document management system.

**125. Is the document management tool intended to be left behind after the Proposer has completed its requirements and obligations under the contract?**

The State intends to use SharePoint as its document management system. It will be left behind after the project is gone. All information relevant to the project will be maintained on the State system. Vendors may use their own systems as they see fit for internal use, but those systems will not be maintained after the vendor leaves.

**126. Are there any restrictions as to what can be included in the appendices?**

Additional information is required to answer this question. The State does not desire page limits to be circumvented by the use of appendices.

**127. Section 1.1.5 Page 3 Would the State consider a vendor's bid to be acceptable if an individual staff member was proposed to perform specific QA tasks for a specific time frame and that same individual staff member was proposed to perform specific IV&V tasks for a specific timeframe that did not overlap with the QA activities?**

The State desires to keep the IV&V effort independent, and not a part of the production of the project. It believes that moving a person between the two tasks for convenience would defeat that goal. The State will consider moving a person once between teams, preferably from IV&V to QA.

**128. Section 1.1.5 Page 2-3 Please clarify the following statement (in bold), "The most significant contribution expected of the QA Consultant will be to supplement State personnel during the Phase II development effort for the purpose of validating assumptions, providing implementation guidance, and assisting Medicaid Agency representatives with the testing effort when needed throughout the development life cycle." There does not appear to be a mechanism for pricing of the testing assistance services mentioned in the above sentence either in the deliverable schedule on page 49 or in the Appendix D pricing sheets. Please provide direction for vendor response to this expectation.**

The State acknowledges that there is no deliverable regarding the assistance in testing effort when needed which is referred to. The State regards this functionality to be inherent in the QA responsibilities of the QA vendor, subject to the direction and priorities of the Project Manager.

The State envisions an RS-R&R Phase II vendor with an iterative design/build life cycle. Within that life cycle, there should be many occasions when the vendor will desire a State representative to indicate their 'acceptance' of what was produced. The State may use QA personnel to help determine whether to accept iterative deliveries, or take advantage of opportunities to test functionality as they present themselves.

The State will consider modifying the RFP to add a new category of services for this function, or modifying the existing 'User Acceptance Testing' category to allow for user acceptance testing in other than the UAT test phase. Until a change is made, vendors should consider this iterative testing to be a part of the *"Formal Review and Validation of all RS-R&R Consultant Use Acceptance Testing Phase deliverables"* item.

**129. 2.1.2 26 What is the e-mail software of choice for the Alabama Medicaid Agency?**

The Agency uses Microsoft Outlook.

**130. 2.1.2 27 Where is the referenced Appendix F – Sample Medicaid laptops Check List and Certification Form located?**

The Checklist is related to computer security and was not attached. It will be made available to the winning vendor.

**131. 2.1.2 27 Which Microsoft Windows operating system is preferred by the Alabama Medicaid Agency or used predominantly in the Medicaid office, XP Professional or Windows 7?**

Windows XP and MS Office Professional is widely deployed in the Agency. New desktops and Windows 7 are being deployed now in the Agency. MS Office 2010 has not been deployed. The State expects products to be delivered in MS Office 2007 compatible formats.

**132. Section 2.2.1 29 In the event of a delay in the project caused in whole or in part by the RS-R vendor, is the IVV/QA contractor expected to absorb the cost of staff remaining idle and committed to the project or are there any remedies to provide any kind of payment to the QA/IVV vendor?**

The State does not wish to harm the IV&V / QA vendor for events outside its control and recognizes that this is a fixed price contract. Should an unexpected delay occur, the Project Manager will determine in good faith if an adjustment of work scope or performance is capable of addressing the delay. If it is not, the State will consider contract modification or adjustment.

**133. 2.3.1 29 Please define “issues of substance that adversely impact the progress of the new Recipient Subsystem Project” as used in this section.**

**The consultant must actively facilitate and participate in project meetings as required or directed by the Agency’s Project Manager. The consultant will monitor and track the Project Work Plan, schedule, processes, products, and deliverables of the RS-R&R consultant, focusing on issues of substance that adversely impact the progress of the new Recipient Subsystem Project, and jeopardize or risk in any way a successful and timely implementation.**

The State believes that an experienced IV&V vendor will have insight to software engineering, project management and quality fundamentals and draw conclusions from RS-R&R activity that others may not. An ‘issue of substance’ is a potential risk to the project that is the result of a conclusion drawn from these observations.

**134. 2.3.1 29 Please define “a successful ...implementation” as used in this section.**

**The consultant must actively facilitate and participate in project meetings as required or directed by the Agency’s Project Manager. The consultant will monitor and track the Project Work Plan, schedule, processes, products, and deliverables of the RS-R&R consultant, focusing on issues of substance that adversely impact the progress of the new Recipient Subsystem Project, and jeopardize or risk in any way a successful and timely implementation.**

The State regards a successful implementation as one in which the system is delivered on plan, and within time, budget and quality standards; and one which is a fit to the State's expectations.

- 135. 2.3.1 30 The RFP identifies IEEE Standard 1012-1998 for Software Verification. This standard has been replaced by IEEE 1012-2004. Will the state require the use of the latest standard in effect at the time of the Project?**

The State recognizes that all standards evolve over time, and wishes to benefit from the most current industry best practices that they represent.

- 136. Section 2.3.2.9 a & b 34-35 Can you provide further clarification on the expectations of the IVV contractor for Training (who) prior to UAT vs. the update training mentioned in item b? Is the State asking the IVV contractor to train state staff how to perform UAT or is this something else?**

The State reference deals with the need for the IV&V vendor to determine the IV&V approach to UAT. The training reference on the next page is similar, and deals with the IV&V approach to Training. These references do not require the IV&V vendor to perform the function, but deal with the need to determine the appropriate IV&V approach to the tasks of the project.

The State would expect the vendor staff, as senior industry professionals interpreting and applying standards and best practice, to be able to explain those standards and practices to State and RS-R&R staff when required to facilitate understanding and improvement to the overall project. This is not envisioned as 'training', but a normal aspect of the performance of IV&V and QA tasks.

- 137. Section 2.3.3 36 Please clarify that the "Project Work Plan" is the Project Plan, Project Schedule or both.**

The State regards the 'Project Work Plan' to be the project plan and project schedule – and may include other artifacts such as risk and issue lists. These may be separate documents, but are parts of the Project Work Plan and, taken together, represent the plan the vendor intends to accomplish.

- 138. Section 2.3.3 38 Please explain what is expected for the MITA Final Assessment. This is not described in section 2.3.2.9 related to IVV activities during UAT. Is this something the MITA/BPR contractor is doing and the IVV contractor is assessing?**

It is not something the MITA/BPR contractor is doing. It is the State's intention that the future Recipient Subsystem is compliant with the CMS MITA Architecture. The project's MITA/BPR Contractor produced a MITA Architecture State Self-Assessment. That assessment is updated each month by the contractor and by the Agency. The item was intended to include a check of the compliance of the system to the roadmap included in the State Self-Assessment document

- 139. Section 3.2.2.8 64 The State established a 20 page limit for the Approach and Methodology for IV&V Services response. However, a 25 page limit was established for the Approach and Methodology for QA Services. Since the scope for writing of the two sections is very similar, would the State consider allowing a 25 page limit for the Approach and Methodology for IV&V Services also?**

The page count is increased. See question 88.

- 140. Section 3.2.2.13 69 Are the forms, resumes and other required attachments included in any of the page limitations for the business proposal sections?**

No.

- 141. 3.2.2.15 69 What alternative financial information will the State accept for small businesses or privately held companies who may not have audited financial reports?**

The State is concerned that businesses not large enough to have audited financial statements might be incapable of fulfilling the requirements of the contract. Should the business not have audited financial reports, the following applies:

The company must submit, in lieu of audited financial statements, copies of executed tax returns and reviewed financial statements, with review opinion and supporting notes to the financial statements, for the prior three reporting years; as well as 2010 interim statements, along with an explanation of why the company is not audited. Lesser financial statements, including compilations and/or in-house prepared statements, are not considered adequate testimony to the company's financial well-being.

- 142. 3.2.3.5 and 3.2.3.6 73-74 Should price schedule I and II be sealed in a separate envelope and placed in the back of the Technical Response section?**

This was not specified in the RFP but the State requests that responding vendors package their Price Schedules in sealed envelopes in this manner and provide them to the State in with the original proposal. Vendor names should be clear on the envelope and the Price Schedules.

- 143. Section 5.3.1 87 The last bullet states, "Upon Agency direction, the Consultant shall change the disposition of pending claims transactions to deny."**

**For clarification, does this mean that the contractor's already submitted claims for payment for work already performed and/or (otherwise approvable) deliverables already submitted but not yet approved will be denied and the contractor will have to absorb that cost as a loss?**

This section has been found not to be valid for this RFP and should be considered deleted.

- 144. Appendix A – Recipient Subsystem Baseline Requirements 101 Is there a separate attachment that has been released to potential vendors that represents Appendix A? Can the State post this Appendix document on the procurement website or release to the potential vendors in email?**

**We note throughout the RFP, the QA vendor is requested to review the RS-R vendor deliverables within the established review timeframes (roughly 10 days) and also review the IVV vendor comments on the same RS-R deliverables. Will the QA vendor have a longer window to review deliverables to accommodate the time needed by the IVV vendor to review documents and provide comments?**

The Requirements Specification was posted with the RFP on the Agency's web site. It is downloadable, and intended to help an IV&V vendor understand the nature of the application being developed – for which IV&V and QA services are being acquired. The State does not feel it necessary to establish a fixed review period. The Project Manager will work with the IV&V and QA teams to ensure the State's needs are met.

**145. Is the total fixed pricing bid equal to Grand total**

There is not enough information to respond to this question.