



**SUBJECT:** Amendment 2 to Request for Proposal 3149  
**RFP TITLE:** Nevada WIC MIS System Transfer and Implementation  
**DATE OF AMENDMENT:** October 9, 2015  
**DATE OF RFP RELEASE:** August 7, 2015  
**OPENING DATE:** November 13, 2015  
**OPENING TIME:** 2:00 PM  
**CONTACT:** Teri Becker, Procurement Staff Member

---

The following shall be a part of RFP **3149**. If a vendor has already returned a proposal and any of the information provided below changes that proposal, please submit the changes along with this amendment. You need not re-submit an entire proposal prior to the opening date and time.

---

1. 1.1 Page 6 - Please identify any State/ITCN standards and policies that deviate from FNS WIC regulations.

*There are no ITCN WIC or Nevada State WIC Program standards or policies that deviate from the FNS WIC regulations. The Awarded Contractor must be willing to plan and implement the new MIS system in accordance with FNS regulations, FNS Western Region guidance and recommendations and Nevada State policies for implementation of an IT system. While we do not have specifics, we can provide assurances that these regulations, policies, recommendations and guidance are typical of any other state IT system implementation in which the contractor may have experience.*

2. 3.1 Page 15 - Please elaborate on the expectations for "providing system operational services for system hosting"

*We are asking Contractors to include in their proposals two options:*

- *Assist any alternate hosting provider in setting up, training and operating the hosting services, and*
- *Provide all necessary hardware, software and system hosting services by the contractor (or subcontractor) themselves.*

*The Nevada WIC Consortium will select the option that best addresses their needs as part of the proposal evaluation process. (Please see question number 21 below for instructions on submitting pricing for both options.)*

3. 3.2.1.1 Page 16 - Are EBT cards issued by Nevada WIC and ITCN WIC considered by the EBT vendor as being issued by the same company or different?

*All EBT cards for Nevada and ITCN WIC Programs for distribution to the WIC households are provided by the EBT Services Contractor as part of the EBT Services Contractors cost per case month. The EBT Services Contractor is responsible for tracking issuance of the cards.*

4. 3.2.1.2, Page 16 - Please provide additional information about the joint EBT services contract. What administrative card transactions are currently initiated on the EBT Vendors system with the expectation that the transaction will be sent and processed by the WIC, SNAP, and/or TANF system?

*Currently SNAP, TANF and WIC have the same EBT Services Contractor. However, WIC has a separate contract from SNAP and TANF.*

*Administrative card transactions for WIC include troubleshooting card problems and issuance and tracking of training cards, compliance buy cards, and cards used for POS certifications.*

5. 3.2.1.2 Page 16 - What EBT card transactions are initiated on the SNAP or TANF system and expected to be received/processed by the WIC MIS system?

*There are no card transactions initiated in the SNAP or TANF system that would be received/processed in the WIC MIS system. WIC uses a separate and distinct card from those used by SNAP or TANF.*

6. 3.2.3 Page 16 - 5.6.2.4 Page 43 Please elaborate on the major differences between the Nevada State requirements/business rules and the ITCN requirements/business rules. Specifically do participants move between Nevada State clinics and ITCN clinics?

*Requirements do not vary between the State and ITCN. ITCN uses their block of cards and tracks issuances and redemptions separate from the State program using unique PANs assigned to ITCN WIC. Participants may transfer between Nevada WIC and ITCN WIC clinics.*

7. 3.2.3 Page 17 - Is the current ITCN WIC MIS system the same system instance as the Nevada WIC MIS or is it operated as a separate instance/copy?

*The current ITCN WIC MIS operates as a separate instance of the same system used by the State WIC Program. ITCN completes the 798 reporting specific to ITCN and receives their reports separate from the State Program. We would like to maintain this separate functionality, if possible, but recognize that changes to business rules may be required to implement MPSC with no modifications.*

*ITCN WIC participants would have to transfer to a State clinic to become a participant of that clinic just as Nevada WIC participants would need to complete a transfer to participate in the ITCN WIC Program. The two programs operate separately but share the same EBT system and the same MIS system with separate applications.*

8. 3.4.2 Page 17 - Will the state procure and install and maintain the digital signature pads, EBT card readers and other devices installed on clinic workstations?

*The Consortium will procure digital signature pads and scanners for all WIC clinic workstations.*

9. 3.6.2 Page 18 Will required training be conducted at the NV or ITCN State office (with local office/clinic staff travelling to the State office) or is it required to be provided at the Local Agency location?

*The Awarded Contractor will be expected to complete training for the Nevada WIC state office staff, the ITCN State office staff and all WIC clinics across the state. Clinic staff training can be grouped for regional training sessions (approximately four (4) clinic staff training sessions). In addition, the Awarded Contractor will facilitate 'train-the-trainers' learning sessions. The Awarded Contractor will be expected to provide all necessary training materials.*

10. 3.7.6 Page 20 - Please provide a copy or a link to the Nevada State security standards that must be assessed.

*The link is <http://it.nv.gov/governance/state-policy-procedures/>*

11. 3.7.9.2 Page 22 - Who will be responsible for the planning and managing execution of the UAT, including scheduling of tester resources, assignment of test scripts, and collection and reporting of test results?

*Those tasks will be the responsibility of the Quality Assurance Contractor.*

12. 4.1.1 Page 23 - Are the Nevada WIC Consortium's requirements/business rules currently documented and will they be available to the awarded contractor?

*The Awarded Contractor will be provided with the current Nevada State WIC and ITCN WIC Programs' Policy and Procedure Manuals.*

13. 5.3.1.1 Page 28 - Please clarify the requirement for one (1) master and four (4) additional hardcopies of each written deliverable. Is this for one or more draft versions of a deliverable or only the final version submitted for approval?

*The requirement to provide one master and four additional hardcopies is in reference to the initial submission of the draft deliverable. We may allow the one (1) master and one (1) additional hardcopy for this submission if it is agreeable to all parties. (See question and answer number 16.) After the Consortium comments have been incorporated into the draft deliverable and a final submission is provided, the final submission will be only one electronic copy and one hard copy. The Consortium staff would be willing to negotiate with the Awarded Contractor regarding the use of an electronic copy for the initial written deliverable submission if that is preferable to all parties.*

14. 5.3.3 Page 29 - Does the Deliverable Review process defined in the subparagraphs apply Summary Documents and Deliverables or only to the full deliverable?

*The Consortium review time period will apply to the initial draft of each written deliverable submission.*

15. 5.3.3.3 Page 30 - Is the 5 day resubmission time in paragraph I after agreements are made during the meetings in paragraph F?

*Yes, however exceptions may be made if all parties agree.*

16. 5.3.3.3 Page 31 - There is an apparent contradiction. 5.3.3.3-O appears to require only one (1) master paper copy and one (1) soft copy of an approved deliverable. 5.3.1.1 states a requirement for one (1) master hard and soft copy plus four (4) additional hardcopies. Please clarify both requirements.

*Reference to the one (1) master and four (4) additional hardcopies applies to the submission of the draft deliverable and reference to one (1) master hard copy and one additional soft copy is in reference to final written deliverable. See also question and answer number 13.*

17. 5.5.2.3 Page 39 - Please clarify Nevada's expectation for system documentation. Is the requirement for the Contractor to deliver the out-of-the-box MPSC documentation with some supplementation or is the requirement to provide a fully customized documentation set addressing all Nevada requirements?

*The Awarded Contractor must deliver the out-of-the-box MPSC documentation (the DFDD, DTSD or other design documents) with some possible supplementation.*

18. 5.5.2.1 Page 40 - RFP states “the contractor will complete a walkthrough of the MPSC DFDD. The walkthrough of the MPSC DFDD will be conducted to validate that the Nevada WIC Consortium’s requirements can be addressed by system parameters, or if necessary, Nevada WIC Program Policy and Procedure revisions.” - Will the contractor be responsible for defining and documenting the Nevada WIC Consortium’s requirements and changes in their business rules? Or will the walkthrough of the DFDD only be to identify configuration changes in the MPSC application.

*The Awarded Contractor will be responsible for working with Consortium staff to define and document the Nevada WIC Consortium’s business rules that will require changes to align with the MPSC functionality. The Consortium staff will be responsible for completing changes in their business rules and updating the Policy and Procedure manual.*

19. 5.7.2. Page 48 - Is there any requirement to include ITCN data conversion in the UAT activities?

*No. The ITCN staff will be involved in UAT. Use of the ITCN data is desirable but not required.*

20. 5.8.2.5 Page 51 - How many Nevada WIC and ITCN locations and staff will be included in the Pilot Test?

*The Pilot test is planned to take place in Reno at some or all of the seven (7) WIC clinics comprising the Community Health Alliance agency. These Reno clinics have approximately 4850 participants and 20 staff. The ITCN WIC clinic sites are not included in the Pilot test.*

21. 5.8.2.8 Page 51 - Worksheet C for project costs only includes line items for hosting support. How should the optional cost for contractor provided hosting be submitted?

*The embedded Attachment K, Revised Cost Schedule shall replace Attachment K, Cost Schedule of the RFP.*

*To open the document, double click on the icon.*

*If you are unable to access the above inserted file once you have doubled clicked on the icon, please contact Nevada State Purchasing at [srvpurch@admin.nv.gov](mailto:srvpurch@admin.nv.gov) for an emailed copy.*

22. 5.8.2.8 Page 51 - For the contractor provided hosting services option, does the state prefer co-location hosting services or virtual/cloud hosting services?

*This will be the choice of the Awarded Contractor.*

23. 8.3 Page 72 - Please confirm that the "dates of service" for each deliverable will be the approval date and not the dates within which the deliverable was actually prepared or service performed. For example, would UAT Support Service provided between June 1 and July 31 be subject to the administrative fee?

*The 'date of service' would be the date the final hardcopy deliverables are approved or the date of completion of a service deliverable such as a meeting. Any billing that is submitted after the first Friday in August will result in a stale claim. Only stale claims are subject to the administrative fee. So, if a contractor submits billing for the example given in the question, after the first Friday in August, then yes, it will be a stale claim and subject to the fee. See Section 8.2.*

24. 14.3.10.2 Page 95 - C references User and operational manuals. D references system and program documentation and source and object code. Please clarify whether these references include MPUG-owned items or only items developed specifically for Nevada.

*These document referenced here may be available through the MPUG. No MPSC system documentation files have been developed by the Nevada WIC Consortium.*

25. Section 1, page 4 – Is there a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Nevada WIC Program and the Inter Tribal Council of Nevada? If yes, can you provide a copy?

*Yes, there is a MOU in place between the Nevada WIC Program and the ITCN WIC Program. We will share that MOU with the Awarded Contractor.*

26. Section 1, page 5 - Please clarify warranty. What is being warranted if there are no system modifications being made by the Implementation vendor?

*We recognize reference to warranty for this project is not the typical IT system warranty where the contractor will be responsible for all software operations. However, in this project the Awarded Contractor will be responsible for all activities completed at part of the contract, not system software warranty. The Awarded Contractor will also be responsible to fully document any error found in the MPSC system code for transfer of the information to the MP Users Group.*

27. Section 1.1.1 – 1.1.6, page 6 – Does the MPSC system currently meet the objectives stated in the RFP?

*Yes, assuming the system is successfully interfaced to the Nevada WIC EBT system and has the means to complete separate financial management and reporting for ITCN, without MPSC system code changes when the system is completed.*

28. Section 1.2, page 6 – The RFP refers to the “WIC EBT system in use” and the “WCI EBT system” in various places. The RFP also mentions that the NV WIC Program has a contract with JP Morgan for EBT Service Provider services. Is the reference to the “WIC EBT system in use” the same as the services provided by JP Morgan? If no, does NV WIC have another EBT related contract in place?

*Yes, JP Morgan is the current WIC EBT System Services Contractor.*

29. Section 1.2.1, page 6 – Which vendor is responsible for modifying the MPSC system to interface with the EBT system? The NV WIC T&I Contractor? Or, the MPSC Users Group Contractor?

*The Nevada EBT Services Contractor will be responsible for the development of the interface with the MPSC system. The Awarded Contractor will work in conjunction with the Consortium staff and the Nevada EBT Services Contractor to determine interface requirements and to assist in the testing of the interface.*

30. Section 3.1, paragraph 4, page 15 – The RFP states that a “contractor provided system Help Desk will be required.” Please confirm that this is referring to a staff Level 1 Help Desk. If not, please clarify.

*The Awarded Contractor will be responsible for providing all necessary Help Desk services for the MPSC system operations. They will not be responsible for Help Desk services regarding EBT system operations, hardware problems or any WIC policy and procedure questions.*

31. Section 3.2.1, paragraph 2, page 16 – The RFP refers to the “Nevada EBT contractor.” Who currently holds this contract? If JP Morgan what are the plans for renewing this contract? Are there plans for transferring the contract to another vendor? If so, who and when?

*The current contract for WIC EBT services with JP Morgan expires June 2018. The new RFP for WIC EBT services that will become effective in July 2018 will be developed and released by the Nevada Department of Administration Purchasing Division. (This RFP will likely be in conjunction with the other Nevada EBT Programs.) The State of Nevada is currently conducting discussions regarding the possibility of an earlier transfer of the EBT contract to another vendor.*

32. Section 3.3, page 17 – Does ITCN currently issue benefits via EBT? If so, do they do so under a separate contract with JP Morgan (or another EBT Service Provider) or under a contract via the NV WIC Program?

*ITCN WIC does issue WIC benefits via EBT under the same contract as Nevada State WIC Program. ITCN WIC receives their own set of PAN and it is through those unique PANs that they are able to track transactions separate from the Nevada State WIC Program.*

33. Section 3.4.2, page 17 – Is the Contractor responsible for the installation and configuration of the signature pads and scanners? If so, approximately how many of each are to be installed? Who is responsible for the purchase of the signature pads and scanners? And, has a specific brand of each been identified? If so, what brand?

*The Nevada WIC Program will procure the scanners and signature pads for all Nevada State and ITCN WIC clinics. The Awarded Contractor will be responsible for the installation of the devices. No specific brands have been identified at this time.*

34. Section 3.7.3, page 19 – Who is the Consortium’s Project Manager? Is he/she fully dedicated to this project?

*That position recently become vacant. The State is currently recruiting a replacement. Approximately 90% of this position’s duties will be focused on this project.*

35. Section 3.7.6.1, page 20 – Does the current MPSC system meet the Nevada Security standards?

*To the WIC Program’s knowledge, the MPSC system meets the Nevada Security standards.*

36. Section 3.7.9, page 21 – Who is the Quality Assurance Contractor?

*This contractor has not yet been brought on board.*

37. Section 4.1, page 23 – The RFP states that Contractors must explain how they will “satisfy the task completions unique to NV WIC Programs, including the unique reporting and financial management for ITCN separate from the State Programs management of the new MIS...”. Where are the tasks “unique to the NV WIC Program” described in the RFP? Where are the “unique reporting and financial management for ITCN” needs described in the RFP?

*The requirements for the Nevada WIC Consortium task completion unique to the Nevada WIC Programs are the listed in the RFP’s Deliverable. Unique reporting and financial management for both Nevada WIC and ITCN WIC Program is highly desired in order to continue separate reporting and tracking of transactions versus intermingling Nevada WIC and ITCN WIC Program statistics. Since code changes cannot be completed in the MPSC system, the contractors’ proposals to define if and how separate financial management and reporting for both programs can be provided is required.*

38. Section 5.0, page 26 – The bullet list at the top of the page indicates that the title for Phase 3 is – “Nevada WIC and WIC EBT Business Processes Modification Activities.” However, the title for Phase 3 listed on the bottom of page 44 is “System Testing Planning and Preparation.” Please clarify the correct name of Phase 3.

*Phase 3 should be titled “System Testing Planning and Preparation”.*

39. Section 5.1.2, page 26 – How many Consortium staff will review and approve the work?

*A deliverable review committee is being formed. It will consist of the Consortium Project Manager, the State WIC Nutrition Coordinator, the ITCN WIC Nutrition Coordinator, two clinic staff and, as appropriate, the State and ITCN WIC Directors, the Vendor Coordinator from both the State and ITCN and select financial management staff.*

40. Section 5.1.5, page 26 – This section of the RFP states that the awarded contractor can “expect assistance from Consortium staff for securing testing and training locations and transport and setup of testing and training equipment.” However, Section 14.3.4.5, page 92 of the RFP states that the “State will provide space for meetings, training, and testing.” Please confirm that the State will provide (i.e. secure and pay for) space for meetings, training, and testing.  
*Yes, the State and ITCN WIC Program staff will provide meeting, training, and testing space.*

41. Section 5.5.2.1, page 37 – Are the System Functionality Presentations 15 sessions over a 3-week period or spread out over a 1-2 month period? Please clarify.

*These sessions should be scheduled for approximately 12 to 15 days over a 3 week period.*

42. Section 5.5.2.1, items L. and M., page 38 – The versions of the DFDD and the DTSD for the MPSC WIC System available through the WIC Technology Partners website for previous MPSC WIC system transfer projects are very outdated and incomplete. Will the DFDD and DTSD be updated to reflect all changes made to-date to the version of the MPSC being transferred to NV WIC? And if so, please validate that the updates will be made by the Contractor holding the contract for the version of the MPSC WIC system being transferred to NV WIC. Or, is the expectation that the Contractor for the NV WIC MPSC transfer project will update/modify the DFDD and DTSD for all changes made to the system since the DFDD and DTSD were originally created?

*The DFDD and the DTSD for MPSC are the property of the MP Users Group. Nevada Consortium staff have no authority to make changes to those documents. Details specific to Nevada will be provided in the User Manuals the Awarded Contractor is expected to provide.*

43. Section 5.5.2.4, items A. and B., page 40 – Does a Hardware, Software, and System Capacity Plan exist today for the current MPSC states? If so, will this document or documents be made available to the Contractor?

*Such plans have not been provided to Nevada at this time. The Consortium staff will, however, forward any Hardware, Software and System Capacity Plans to the Awarded Contractor that is made available by the MP Users Group or the other MPSC system user states.*

44. Section 5.5.2.8, page 43 – What is the timeframe for the telecommunication network review?

*If this questions is in reference to the State review process, the review period is 10 days. If the question is “When is the Telecommunication Plan due?” the plan will be due in accordance with the timeline provided for completion of other plans in Phase 2.*

45. Section 5.5.2.10, page 43 – Please clarify what “assistance” the Contractor will provide concerning Security Audits.

*Any required State or FNS security audits for the Nevada WIC MIS would require the Awarded Contractor to share their proposed Security Plan and actions specified in the Security Plan. This Plan will be used to complete to assurances the system’s hardware, software and data transmission and storage are secure. The Awarded Contractor may be asked to demonstrate the system security.*

46. Section 5.6.2.1, page 45 – How long do you expect the approval process for the System Test Plan to take? Is the review/approval process with the 3 entities mentioned (the Consortium, the QA Contractor, and USDA/FNS) linear or simultaneous?

*The review process with each entity will be simultaneous. The FNS review, along with others, will be completed in approximately 30 calendar days.*

47. Section 5.6.2.1, page 45 – The RFP states that the “system will be ready for UAT only after the Contractor has performed a thorough system qualification test of all system functionality, and that test has recorded no errors.” Is this exclusive of already Known Errors in the MPSC system? Will a list of Known Errors be provided to NV WIC by the MPSC User Group and/or the MPSC User Group’s O&M contractor prior to the start of UAT.

*Known errors in the MPSC system will be excluded from the system readiness for the Nevada WIC Consortium UAT. Consortium staff will obtain the list of the current MPSC errors from the MP Users Group throughout the Nevada MPSC System Phase 1 and 2.*

48. Section 5.6.2.3, page 45 – Who is responsible for making the system modifications to the MPSC WIC System for EBT?

*Any changes to the MPSC code must be completed by the MPSC Maintenance and Enhancement Contractor under the direction of the MP Users Group.*

49. Section 5.6.2.5, page 46 – the RFP states that “if there are any errors (other than minor cosmetic errors) during the demonstration, the UAT will not proceed and a plan for error correction must be completed.” Please clarify. What if the error is already on the Known Error list? Is there an agreement in place with the MPSC User Group’s O&M contractor prior to the start of UAT to ensure that errors discovered pre- and post-UAT that exist in the transferred system receive the highest priority for resolution by the MPSC User Group’s O&M contractor?

*Known errors in the MPSC system will be excluded from the system readiness for the Nevada WIC Programs. Consortium staff will obtain the list of the current MPSC errors from the MP Users Group throughout the Nevada MPSC System Phase 1 and 2.*

50. Section 5.6.2.6, page 46 – the first sentence reads, “Provide comprehensive Training Materials for use by their training staff for initial system training of all system end users prior to the new system implementation.” Please clarify who “their” is referring to.

*The Awarded Contractor will be expected to compete all initial training with all WIC staff and will be expected to provide all necessary training materials for those training sessions.*

51. Section 5.6.2.6, page 46 – This section states that the Contractor must provide comprehensive training materials and that the Contractor will have available for use the training materials used previously in MPSC system training, and all previously prepared MPSC system user and operations manuals. There are no training materials or operations manuals currently posted on the WIC Technology Partners website. The versions of the training materials for the MPSC WIC System available through the WIC Technology Partners website for previous MPSC WIC system transfer projects are very outdated and incomplete. Will the training materials and operations manual be updated to reflect all changes made to-date to the version of the MPSC being transferred to NV WIC? And if so, please validate that the updates will be made by the Contractor holding the contract for the version of the MPSC WIC system being transferred to

NV WIC. Or, is the expectation that the Contractor for the NV WIC MPSC transfer project will update/modify the training materials and operations manual for all changes made to the system since these documents were originally created? Do these materials currently reflect items A. through M. listed on page 47?

*The Awarded Contractor will be required to prepare comprehensive training materials needed to train all Nevada WIC Consortium system users. The Consortium will assist the Awarded Contractor to obtain MPSC training materials used by the other MPSC system user states. These materials may be used as guides; however, the final training materials for Nevada Consortium staff use will be the responsibility of the Awarded Contractor.*

52. Section 5.7.2.3, page 49 – Is it correct to assume that UAT will be conducted in Carson City?

*Yes.*

53. Section 5.7.2.4, page 50 – This section states that the T&I Contractor is responsible for “completing fixes for UAT errors (if possible) or document the errors and arrange for fixes through the MPSC Maintenance Contractor for the UAT recorded errors.” What provisions and/or agreements has NV WIC made with the MPSC User Group and/or the MPSC User Group contractor that NV WIC’s UAT findings will be prioritized for immediate fixes so that the NV WIC project is not delayed?

*As part of the MP Users Group, Nevada has the responsibility to record any errors found in the MPSC system. The MP Users Group may, however, choose to not authorize the MPSC System Maintenance and Enhancement Contractor to act on those errors unless the reported errors result in system non-performance issues.*

54. Section 5.8.2.5, page 51 – This section states that the Contractor will assist the Consortium staff with installation of “other (non-MPSC system) software.” What software other than the MPSC WIC system is anticipated being installed? What level of “assistance” is needed?

*Example of non-MPSC system software are the EBT system software; COTs software to drive the scanners and the digital signature pads; telecommunication software necessary to transfer MIS data to the EBT Services Contractor and the reserve. Assistance in this area is expected to be minimal because the EBT Services Contractor is responsible for EBT software installation. However, the Awarded Contractor’s staff will be responsible for hardware and software installation of the clinic computers and peripheral devices. An example of other requested assistance in this area may be a request from the Pilot staff to the Awarded Contractor to troubleshoot the digital signature pad when the Awarded Contractor is on-site installing and testing the MPSC system software at the Pilot clinic location.*

55. Section 5.8.2.10, page 52 – This section describes a “post-pilot implementation meeting to evaluate the system pilot” and lists the questions that will be asked during this evaluation. Items A, C, D, E, H, J, and L are not within the scope of the T&I project. What is the plan if answers to these questions are adverse?

*The purpose of the post pilot meeting is to assess if the system is ready to be implemented in the remainder of the state. We will review system functionality along with training, data conversion and pilot operations in general. If errors in the pilot operations are identified and can be corrected by the Awarded Contractor, the Awarded Contractor will be expected to correct those errors. (Examples may be inadequate training on system operations or poor help*

*desk response.) Errors in the MPSC system that are beyond the control of the Awarded Contractor will not be the responsibility of the Awarded Contractor. If there are no errors in the MPSC system that will interfere with the operations of the system in Nevada WIC state offices and local clinics, the planning necessary to move beyond the pilot will continue.*

56. Section 5.10.2.1, page 54 – This section states that a hard copy of training materials is required for clinic staff training. How many copies are needed?

*There are a total of 18 Nevada WIC State office staff and six (6) ITCN State and Clinic staff to be trained, specific to their functional area (vendor management, financial management, caseload management and nutrition management) and there are 580 Nevada WIC Local agency/clinic staff.*

57. Section 5.10.2.2, page 54-55 – The third paragraph mentions “quick reference handouts.” Do these materials exist today? Are they current with the version of the MPSC WIC system being transferred to NV WIC?

*We do not believe the quick reference handout has been developed and is in use by the other MPSC states. The Consortium staff will work with the Awarded Contractor to determine if such a document exists and will also work with the Awarded Contractor to write, or if available from the other MPSC system using states, to update the quick reference handout.*

58. Section 5.10.2.2, page 54-55 – The first paragraph of this section states that the “training session will be scheduled for approximately four (4) full days.” At the end of the paragraph it also states, “it is expected that each session will last approximately three (3) days and include ample opportunity for staff to practice.” Please clarify how many classroom training days NV WIC expects.

*This should read approximately 4 days in both places.*

59. Section 5.12.2.1, page 58 – This section states that “the awarded contractor must provide the contracted system Hosting Support Operations Services for a minimum of one (1) year following the completion of statewide rollout.” Please clarify that NV WIC is open to the Contractor providing hosting services for more than just one year.

*Yes, the Nevada Consortium may consider adding years for Hosting Operations during contract negotiations. If the decision is made to increase contractor hosting services after the original contract is awarded, an amendment to the existing contract could be negotiated to add any additional years.*

60. Section 6.1.4, page 61 – This section states that “Contractors are cautioned that some services may contain licensing requirement(s). Contractors shall be proactive in verification of these requirements prior to proposal submission.” Please clarify what licenses, if any, other than the State of Nevada business license listed in Section 6.1.3 is required for submission of this RFP.

*It is the proposing contractor’s responsibility to research and comply with any license requirements that are required of a contractor to provide the services/equipment contemplated within RFP 3149.*

61. Section 6.1.7, page 62 – This section states that the Contractor shall disclose “any significant prior or ongoing contract failures, contract breaches, civil or criminal litigation in which the contractor has been alleged to be liable or held liable in a matter involving a contract with the

State of Nevada or any other governmental entity.” Section 13.3, page 86 states that each Contractor “must include in its proposal a complete disclosure of any alleged significant prior or ongoing contract failures, contract breaches, any civil or criminal litigation or investigations pending which involves the vendor or in which the vendor has been judged guilty or liable.” Please define “Significant.” Is this requirement limited to only a company’s WIC business practice or for any litigation in which the company as a whole is or was involved? Is this requirement limited to only the State of Nevada, or for any State in the U.S.? Where does this information get placed in the response?

*The two sections relating to disclosures include all the contractor’s work (not just contracts with the State of Nevada), and all business done by the Contractor.*

*Significance should be what a reasonable person would consider to have significant impact either on the contractor, or on the contractee.*

62. Section 11.2, page 74 – This section lists documents contained in the reference library available through the WIC Technology Partners website. The only documentation listed on the WIC Technology Partners website for the MPSC WIC System are the DFDD, DTSD, Data Dictionary, and reports. There are no testing materials, training materials, or operations manuals. Also, many of the documents have a “last revised” date as early as 2012. Will the training materials, operations manuals, and testing materials be made available to Contractors responding to this RFP? Will the MPSC WIC system documentation (all documents) be updated to reflect all changes made to-date to the version of the MPSC being transferred to NV WIC? And if so, please validate that the updates will be made by the Contractor holding the contract for the version of the MPSC WIC system being transferred to NV WIC. Or, is the expectation that the Contractor for the NV WIC MPSC transfer project will update/modify the existing documentation for all changes made to the system since these documents were originally created?

*The Nevada Consortium has no control over the MPSC reference documents posted on the WIC Technology Partners website. We will, however, make every effort to obtain and pass on to the Awarded Contractor any testing materials, training materials, operations manuals, etc. provided by the other MPSC system user states. The Awarded Contractor will be responsible to update, revise or develop training materials and manuals to address the needs of Nevada WIC Programs.*

63. Section 6.2.1.8, page 64 – This section states that the Contractor “shall not allow any subcontractor to commence work until all insurance required of the subcontractor is provided to the Contractor.” Are subcontractors required to hold the same insurance coverage as described in the RFP as the prime Contractor?

*Yes.*

64. Section 12.1.5, page 64-65 – This section states that “written responses must be in bold/italics.” Just to clarify, does this requirement mean that all content provided by the Contractor in their written proposal must be in bold/italics? Or, is bold/italics only required for those sections of the response where the RFP explicitly states the response should be in bold/italics (i.e. Tab VI – System Requirements and Tab V – Scope of Work)? Is a specific font and/or font size required?

*The purpose of this requirement is for the evaluators to be able to easily identify the contractor's response from the RFP requirement. There is no specific font/font size required.*

65. Section 12.2.3.9, page 79 – This section indicates that Tab IX should include Proposed Staff Resumes. Please clarify if the response to the following RFP sections also is included in Tab IX. If not where in the response should they be placed? • 6.6 – Preliminary Project Management Plan • 6.7 – Project Management • 6.8 – Quality Assurance • 6.9 – Metrics Management • 6.10 – Configuration Management

*The RFP states that Tab X is the Preliminary Project Management Plan and Schedule (6.6). Additionally, sections 6.6, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9 and 6.10 should be placed in Tab X*

66. Section 12.2.3.11, page 79 – This section indicates that Tab XII is “Other Informational Material.” Section 12.2.3.10 indicates that Tab X is “Preliminary Project Management Plan and Schedule.” There is no Tab XI. Please clarify.

*Tab XI was inadvertently omitted. Please skip XI and use XII in its place.*

67. Section 13 of the RFP describes the Evaluation and Award Process. It does not include the breakdown by percentages of each evaluation criteria. Please provide the breakdown.

*Pursuant to NRS 333.335, the weights of the evaluation criteria may not be disclosed before the date proposals are required to be submitted.*

68. Section 14.2.1, page 88 – This section states that “all contractor personnel assigned to the contract must have a background check” from the FBI. Please clarify. Does this requirement include everyone assigned to the project or just key staff? And, when must the background check be conducted? After contract award? Before the Kick-Off Meeting?

*The State will determine at the time of contract negotiations if the requirement will be acted upon.*

69. Section 14.3.11 Escrow Account, page 96 – This section states that the State may require the Contractor to establish an escrow account. It seems that the escrow account is intended to store project documents. Is a secured SharePoint site, or an equivalent, acceptable?

*If it is determined that an escrow account is needed, a secured SharePoint site for storage of the project documents will be acceptable.*

70. Section 14.3.19 System Compliance Warranty, page 100 – Is the MPSC system currently certified as Date Compliant as described in Section 14.3.19?

*Yes.*

71. Attachment D, Paragraph 16 Insurance Schedule, page 5 references “Attachment BB.” Please clarify what Attachment BB is.

*The Insurance Schedule in Attachment E of RFP 3149 will become Attachment BB to the contract, once a contract is executed.*

72. Attachment I – Proposed Staff Resume, page 110 – can resumes be listed as “confidential information?” Also, is it a requirement to use the resume format in Attachment I or may responders use their company format as long as all of the information on Attachment I is included?

*Confidential Information is defined in Section 2, Acronyms and Definitions as: “Any information relating to the amount or source of any income, profits, losses or expenditures of a person, including data relating to cost or price submitted in support of a bid or proposal. The term does not include the amount of a bid or proposal. Refer NRS 333.020(5) (b).” See also Section 12.6.*

**ALL ELSE REMAINS THE SAME FOR RFP 3149.**

***Vendor must sign and return this amendment with proposal submitted.***

Vendor Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Authorized Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

This document must be submitted in the “State Documents” section/tab of vendors’ technical proposal.