State of Nevada
Department Administration
Purchasing Division
515 E. Musser Street, Suite 300
Carson City, NV 89701

Brian Sandoval
Governor

Jeffrey Haag
Administrator

SUBJECT:	Amendment 2 to Request for Proposal 3475
RFP TITLE:	**Independent Verification & Validation (IV&V) for Child Support Enforcement (CSE) System Replacement**
DATE OF AMENDMENT:	September 29, 2017
DATE OF RFP RELEASE:	August 21, 2017
OPENING DATE:	October 19, 2017
OPENING TIME:	2:00 PM
CONTACT:	Ronda Miller, Procurement Staff Member

The following shall be a part of RFP 3475**.** 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. A clarification question related to the Q&A that came out with the last amendment for RFP #3475 CSE IV&V Services. It appears that in the Q&A that the requirement is for all key staff to have all of the skills required for each position. Can you please confirm our understanding? It would be unusual for all staff to possess all of the experience for each position. Typically the requirement is for staff to have the amount of experience required for their particular specialty.

   The State revises its response to Amendment 1, Question 14 as follows:

   Each IV&V team member must have all of the qualifications listed in sections 4.4.2.1, 4.4.2.2, 4.4.2.3 and 4.4.2.4. The combined qualifications of all team members can be used to fulfill the qualifications listed in sections 4.4.2.5 through 4.4.2.14. However, the experience of different individuals cannot be combined to meet a particular qualification.

   NOTE: The qualifications under sub-sections 4.4.2.15 and 4.4.2.16 are duplicates of the qualifications under sub-sections 4.4.2.10 and 4.4.2.11. Consequently, sub-sections 4.4.2.15 and 4.4.2.16 are hereby <u>deleted</u>.

2. Would the State consider giving a two week extension of the proposal due date, to allow for ample time to incorporate all questions and answers into responses?

   No. Due to time constraints, the State must adhere to the timeline provided in the RFP.

3. Amendment 1 – Questions #14 and #24
   Can you please confirm our understanding of the responses to these two questions? Do all key staff have to have all of these skills required for each position? It would be unusual for all staff

to possess all of the experience for each position. Typically, the requirement is for staff to have the amount of experience required for their particular specialty.

Refer to the State's response to Question #1.

4. In the State's response to Question 14 in Amendment 1, clarification was made that "Each IV&V team member must have all of the qualifications listed in Section 4.4.2 Individual Verification Services Team Member Qualifications." We respectfully request the State reconsider their response. As an experienced provider of IV&V services with the knowledge of the skills sets required to meet and exceed OCSE IV&V standards we understand the need for expertise and experience in several disciplines, including:
   - IV&V of Child Support Systems
   - Technical Expertise including Technical Architectures
   - Child Support Business Functions
   - OCSE Certification

Refer to the State's response to Question #1.

5. Meeting your requirements requires a well-balanced team that collectively can address all the focus areas of a CSE implementation and certification. In our experience it is unlikely that every member of an effective IV&V team would have both technical and business expertise. For example requiring all IV&V team members to have experience in assessing "*training plans involving the development of course outlines and materials and organizing and conducting classes to support the implementation of new business processes and systems*" would, in our experience, be a very rare skill set in persons who are experienced in "*the implementation of secure Internet applications*."

Refer to the State's response to Question #1.

6. The requirement that all team members have all of the qualifications listed in Section 4.4.2 Individual Verification Services Team Member Qualifications versus the collective team, will have the unintended consequences of limiting competition, needlessly increasing costs and restricts the ability for the State to receive the best value for the services requested in the RFP.

Refer to the State's response to Question #1.

7. Section 4.4.2 uses the phrase "Completed at least one (1) project within the past three (3) years" on five of the Team Member Qualifications. We interpreted the term "completed" in this phrase as the Team Member completed their duties on such a project within the three year period, rather than the project was completed, i.e. system is in production and the IV&V contract is expired. As Nevada knows, there have been very few CSE statewide system projects in the last 3 years. Requiring that for these five requirements, especially requirement "*4.4.2.4 Completed at least one (1) project within the past three (3) years that involved the receipt, installation, operation and maintenance of computer equipment and software for a Child Support Enforcement or similar large systems",* would be extremely difficult for any IV&V vendor or IV&V practitioner to meet. We respectively ask the State to clarify their requirements in relation to this term.

Refer to the State's response to Question #1.

8. SECTION IV
Section 10.2.2.4 requests vendors attach "copies of any vendor licensing agreements and/or hardware and software maintenance agreements" and "Copies of applicable certifications and/or licenses" in Section IV – State Documents. Is Nevada aware of any additional documents that are required (which are not already listed in the instructions and/or included as Attachments)?

No.

9. SECTION V
Please confirm vendors should remove Section V "System Requirements" from their proposals (e.g. it has been removed from the Submission Check List (Section 13) and Section 10.2.2.5 has been removed)?

If Section V "System Requirements" has been removed, how should vendors number the subsequent sections?

Refer to attached updated submission checklist.

SUBMISSION CHECKLIST.docx

10. SECTION VI
Section 3.6.2.6 outlines that Deliverables Observation Reports (DORs) will be developed "as needed". Is it the State's expectation that these will be produced as needed to produce the IV&V reports or that they are produced for each deliverable other vendors provide?

Per the attached updated submission checklist in question 9 of this amendment, Section VI – Scope of Work is now Section V.

The State revises the response to Amendment 1, Question 42 as follows:

The State requires a minimum of two (2) Deliverables Observation Reports (DORs). If the proposer deems it would be beneficial to the Project, they can propose additional DORS as an optional service. The costs for the two (2) required DORs should be listed on Tab 5.1.1 of the Cost Schedule under deliverable number 3.6.4.6.

11. Vendor costs will vary significantly based on the number of DORs the State requires. Can the State provide some guidance regarding the number of DORs they will require (e.g. one per deliverable produced by the DDI vendor or as requested, with the expectation to be ~10% of all deliverables produced?)

Refer to the State's response to Question #10.

12. Section VI Scope of Work - Please confirm vendors do not need to respond directly to Sections 3.1 – 3.3

Per the attached updated submission checklist in question 9 of this amendment, Section VI – Scope of Work is now Section V.

The proposer must respond to sections 3.1 through 3.3 by specifying whether they can comply with the terms of those sections.

13. Section VI Scope of Work - What level of the RFP does the State expect the vendors to respond to In Sections 3.4 through Section 3.6? For example, should vendors provide a response to Section 3.4, "Project Kick-Off Meeting" or should vendors provide responses to each sub section such as Section 3.4.3, "Determining format for the project status report"

    Per the attached updated submission checklist in question 9 of this amendment, Section VI – Scope of Work is now Section V.

    Vendors shall place their written response(s) to Section 3, Scope of Work in bold/italics immediately following the applicable RFP question, statement, section, and/or sub section.

14. Many of the sections/sub-sections within section 3.4 through 3.6 are requirements (the vendor must) rather than questions. Can you please confirm whether vendors should respond to each section within Section 3.4 through 3.6?

    Yes, the proposer must respond to sections 3.4 through 3.6 and specify whether they can comply with the terms.

15. Section 3.2.3 state "Vendor's response must be limited to no more than five (5) pages per task not including appendices, samples and/or exhibits." This was clarified in the first round of questions and answers to mean "***The five (5) page limit applies to each task, sub-task, service, or activity in the RFP, including those associated with deliverables. If additional pages are needed for a particular task, the five (5) page limit can be applied to all tasks in the RFP as an overall average.*** However, Section 10.1.10 states "written responses shall be in bold/italics and placed immediately following the applicable RFP question, statement and/or section." Does this mean 5 pages per task, sub-task, service or activity per RFP question? Please clarify.

    Yes, this means 5 pages per task, sub-task, service or activity.

16. The instructions seem to request vendors provide Project Plan information in Section VI of our response (in responding to Section 3.5) and requests information related to the project plan in Section IX of our response (in responding to Section 4.6). Please clarify where these should be provided.

    Is Section VI supposed to provide an overview of the approach and Section IX provide the plan for managing the engagement?

    Section 4.6 requires a Preliminary Project Plan to be included in the vendor's proposal whereas section 3.5 requires a Detailed Project Plan as a Planning and Administration activity to be delivered by the selected IV&V vendor.

    Vendors should refer to the attached updated submission checklist in questions 9 of this amendment to ensure responses are submitted in the correct sections.

17. SECTION VII
    Section 10.2.2.7 requests "written response(s) to ***Section 5, Company Background and References in bold/italics".*** Please confirm this is referring to Section 4 and should only

include responses to questions in Section 4.1-4.3 (As sections 4.4 and above are included in other sections). If not, please provide clarifications.

Per the attached updated submission checklist in question 9 of this amendment, Section V II –Company Background and References is now Section VI.

Responses to sections 4.1 through 4.5 should be included under Section VI, Company Background and References. Refer to Amendment 1, Question 63.

18. Section 10.2.2.7 requests "This section shall also include the requested information ***in Section 5.2, Subcontractor Information***, if applicable." Please confirm this is referring to Section 4.2 and should only include responses to questions in Section 4.2. If not, please provide clarifications.

Yes. Refer to Amendment 1, question 63.

Vendors should refer to the attached updated submission checklist in questions 9 of this amendment to ensure responses are submitted in the correct sections.

19. Section 10.2.2.7 requests "This section shall also include the requested information ***in Section 5.2, Subcontractor Information***, if applicable." Do the questions (e.g. the text from Section 4.2 and the subsections need to be included in the proposal if the vendor is not including subcontractors in their proposals?

Refer to the State's response to Question #18.

20. Section 10.2.2.7 requests "Vendors shall place their written response(s) to ***Section 5, Company Background and References*** in ***bold/italics*** immediately following the applicable RFP question, statement and/or section. Assuming this includes Section 4.3 of the RFP, is the State requesting we provide a response to every section/bullet in this section (e.g. Sections 4.3.1, 4.3.2.1 – 4.3.2.16, through 4.3.5) or can we simply provide the names of the references provided? If Nevada requires a response to each section/bullet, what is Nevada's expectations for these responses?

Vendor should list who they sent their reference questionnaires to for completion.

21. SECTION VIII
Section 10.2.2.8, A requests "A. Vendors shall include all proposed staff resumes per ***Section 5.5, Vendor Staff Resumes*** in this section. Please confirm this is referring to Section 4.5.

Per the attached updated submission checklist in question 9 of this amendment, Section VIII – Attachment H – Proposed Staff Resume(s) is now Section VII.

Section 10.2.2.8 is revised as follows:

Section VII – Attachment H – Proposed Staff Resume

A. Vendors shall include all proposed staff resumes per Section 4.5, Vendor Staff Resumes in this section.

B. This section shall also include any subcontractor proposed staff resumes, if applicable.

22. Section 10.1.10 requires "written responses shall be in bold/italics placed immediately following the applicable RFP question, statement and section". Does Section VIII require responses to both Section 4.4 and 4.5 or only 4.5 (e.g. no response is required to Section 4.4, simply the references must align with these qualifications)?

    Per the attached updated submission checklist in question 9 of this amendment, Section VIII – Attachment H – Proposed Staff Resume(s) is now Section VII.

    Section VII requires responses to both Section 4.4 and 4.5.

23. Section 4.5 refers to Section 13.3.19, Key Personnel in relation to the identification of key personnel. Section 13.3.19 does not exist. Please provide guidance as to who are considered key personnel.

    Section 4.5 is revised as follows:

    VENDOR STAFF RESUMES

    A resume shall be completed for each proposed individual on the State format provided in Attachment H, Proposed Staff Resume, including identification of key personnel per Section 12.3.18, Key Personnel.

24. If Section VIII requires responses to each section and sub-section, at what level should the responses be provided? For example, should vendors respond to Section 4.4.1 or provide a response to 4.4.1.1 through 4.4.1.6?

    The proposer should respond to each section or sub-section as they deem appropriate. Refer to the State's response to Question #25 for an example.

25. SECTION IX
    Section 10.1.10 requires "written responses shall be in bold/italics placed immediately following the applicable RFP question, statement and section". Does this apply to Section IX of the response or does the State simply require a preliminary project plan, which addresses the requirements captured in the RFP, be provided? In other words, do vendors need to respond to every sub-section in Section 4.6, Preliminary Project Plan, 4.7 Project Management, 4.8 Quality Assurance and 4.9 Quality Metrics?

    Per the attached updated submission checklist in question 9 of this amendment, Section IX – Preliminary Project Plan is now Section VIII.

    The proposer should respond to each section or sub-section as they deem appropriate. For example, the proposer should include all of the requirements of sub-sections 4.6.1 through 4.6.6 in their proposed Preliminary Project Plan as provided under section 4.6.

26. Please confirm responses to Sections within 4.10, 4.11, 4.12 and 4.13 are not required, though the response must address assessing these areas. If not, please provide detailed expectations of the response in these areas.

Sections 4.10, 4.11, 4.12 and 4.13 are not applicable to this solicitation per the State's response to Amendment 1, Question 7. However, the proposer should address how they will assess each of these areas in their response to these sections.

27. If Section IX requires responses to each Section and sub-section, at what level of the outline (sections or sub-sections) should the vendors respond to? In other words, do vendors need to provide a response to 4.6 or include a response to 4.6.1 through 4.6.6?

    Refer to the State's response to Question #25.

28. COSTWORKBOOK
    The cost workbook only includes costs for the Planning and Administration activities (Section 3.5) and IV&V Activities (Section 3.6) but does not include any cost regarding the project Kick Off (Section 3.4).

    If the vendor deems it necessary, a separate cost for the kick off meeting can be included on Tab 5.1.2, Other Associated Costs.

29. The cost workbook includes a single price for the deliverable, even though many of the deliverables will be produced multiple times. Should vendors provide the extended price (cost to create one deliverable multiplied by the number of times that the deliverable needs to be produced) or the single price?

    Refer to section 5.1 of the Cost Schedule.

30. If Nevada is requesting the extended price be included in the cost workbook, how many IV&V reports should vendors assume need to be produced?

    Refer to the RFP, section 3.1.5 which states, "The frequency of IV&V oversight services under this procurement, resulting in a report of findings and recommendations has been determined to be Semi-Annual."

31. Could you provide an updated cost workbook which captures both the individual and extended price and captures the costs for kick-of activities, so it is aligned with the SOW?

    Refer to the State's response to Question #28.

32. In the previous answers you answered the question "*Section 1.3 of the RFP outlines the IV&V vendor cannot bid on subsequent contracts related to the Child Support Enforcement System Replacement Project. Is the incumbent vendor(s) that has supported the planning, requirements, IAPD, RFP and procurement effort for the CSE system allowed to bid on this RFP?"* by stating "***Yes, the vendor that supported the planning, requirements, IAPD and RFP effort is precluded from award of the IV&V Services contract."*** This seems to be contradictory (yes, in response to the question whether they are allowed to bid and stating they are precluded from award…). Please confirm whether the incumbent vendor can bid or not.

    The vendor that supported the planning, requirements, IAPD and RFP effort is precluded from award of the IV&V Services contract.

33. Given the number of changes and questions regarding the proposal format, could Nevada provide an enhanced version of Section 10.2.2 which clearly captures the expectations for the

format of the Technical Proposal including the specific questions vendors should respond to? This will likely ease the evaluation process as vendors will submit similar information, decrease the likelihood of a protest.

Refer to attached updated Proposal Submission Checklist.

PROPOSAL
SUBMISSION REQUIRE

34. Given the number of questions and the delay in responding to the first set of questions will the State extend the deadline?

Refer to the State's response to Question #2.

35. Staff qualification 4.4.2.13 asks for five years of conversion experience in a 'lead' role. In general, IV&V practitioners do not 'lead' data conversion. Would the State consider removing the 'lead' role condition from this requirement and/or reducing the years of experience to 3 years instead of 5 years?

Section 4.4.2.13 is revised as follows:

A minimum of five (5) years of experience leading or providing oversight of data cleansing and conversion for a similar-sized project;

36. Staff qualification 4.4.2.14 ask for four years of experience conducting system and user acceptance tests for a similar sized project. Would the State consider removing the 'conducting' condition from this requirement to accommodate IV&V staff who have done direct oversight of testing activities on similar projects.

Section 4.4.2.14 is revised as follows:

A minimum of four (4) years of experience conducting or providing oversight of systems or user acceptance tests for a similar-sized project;

37. Can the State please confirm that team member qualifications detailed in 4.4.2.15 and 4.4.2.16 re duplicates of 4.4.2.10 and 4.4.2.11?

Refer to the State's response to Question #1.

38. RFP Section 3.6.2.6 states, "Create Deliverable Observation Reports (DOR) as necessary. If desired and requested by the Replacement Project team, CSEP, and DWSS, the IV&V Service Provider will prepare and deliver a one-time, focused, specific Deliverable Observation Report to the IV&V Contract Officer (for delivery to the State Replacement Project, etc.,) and OCSE, at the same time, presenting an analysis of a prescribed deliverable or other task not specifically referenced by this scope of work. Examples of such focused Deliverables Observation Reports include: a network capacity, bandwidth, and throughput analysis; independent analysis of compliance of a project deliverable with contract specifications, etc. The Replacement Project team, CSEP, and DWSS may receive a debriefing on the results of such a DOR from the IV&V Service Provider only with the concurrence and attendance of OCSE."

First set of questions included, "Please clarify if the Deliverable Observation Reports (DOR) are only upon request and thus will be scoped and priced separately if/when the State were to make this request of IV&V." Amendment 1 to Request for Proposal 3475 (in response to the first set of questions) communicates that "The Deliverable Observation Reports (DOR) are included in the project budget and should not be priced separately." Amendment 1 also communicates that "The State is adhering to federal requirements as per the IV&V Statement of Work Template located at https://www.acf.hhs.gov/css/resource/ivv-statement-of-work-template." The IV&V Statement of Work template, Task 8.1.10 Deliverable Observation Report (DOR), shows the following requirement/description for this deliverable: "Performed reviews of project artifacts, processes or deliverables not otherwise defined herein this scope of work, as-needed in a special scope of work between State and IV&V Service Provider." The state's response in Amendment 1 that DOR are "included in the project budget and should not be priced separately" appears to conflict with the Federal guideline that state DOR are "in a special scope of work" as-needed.

Refer to the State's response to Question #10.

40. Will the State please clarify the state's interpretation of the Federal guideline for Task 8.1.10 Deliverable Observation Report (DOR) as found in the IV&V Statement of Work template whether it should be included in the budget, or priced separately as needed?

Refer to the State's response to Question #10.

ALL ELSE REMAINS THE SAME FOR RFP 3475.

Vendor must sign and return this amendment with proposal submitted.

Vendor Name: Computer Consultants International, INC.

Authorized Signature:

Title: President & CEO Date: October 19, 2017

This document must be submitted in the "State Documents" section of vendors' technical proposal.