

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
1	Page 6, Section 1.1 Page 57, Section 3.4.1	Page 7, Section 1.1 The new contract will encompass the following areas: 1. Application Maintenance and Operations (M&O) for the 300-350 legacy applications Page 58, Section 3.4.1 As discussed in Section 3.2.2, DHS currently has approximately 200 applications for which the Vendor will perform M&O services.	As per Section 3.4.1(Application M&O Scope), it is mentioned that DHS currently has approximately 200 applications for which the Vendor will perform M&O services. However, in Section 1.1, the RFP mentions that there are 300-350 applications for which M&O is required. Request the State to clarify how many applications are required to be supported for this RFP "200" or "300-350"?	The number of applications required to support within the scope of the RFP are approximately 200 applications. This update has been reflected in the RFP text in Section 1.1 and 3.1.1.
2	Page 8, Table 1. Milestones and Due Dates, Section 1.4 Procurement Schedule	The RFP states that the Contract Start Date is anticipated to be June 15, 2017.	A June 15, 2017 contract start date would only allow for a 2-week transition to a new vendor. Projects of similar size and complexity typically require at least a 6 month transition period. As such, we respectfully request a 6 month transition period be incorporated into the final RFP schedule. Currently, only the incumbent would be capable of transitioning to a new program within two weeks.	Existing contractor is obligated in every possible way to insure no interruption or reduction in data processing functions of DHS business or operations that are the subject of this contract and transition to DHS of the DHS properties will cause no harm to the business of DHS. DHS will negotiate any needed contract extension to meet the needed transition period upon awarding the contract. An update has been made to the RFP text in Table 14.
3	Page 11, Section 1.5.1.1.	In State fiscal year 2014, OST employed 37 State employees to directly manage the major outsourcing ISS contract, supporting various areas including development, support, and maintenance as well as project and vendor management.	Please provide a copy of the current Northrup Grumman ISS contract including amendments to the contract.	This information is not necessary for Vendors to submit a proposal. All relevant information regarding the scope are part of the RFP and procurement library

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
4	Page 15, Section 2.1.2	Vendors who do not attend the Pre-Proposal Conference will be disqualified from submitting a Proposal	Please provide a list of all companies that attended the pre-proposal conference.	Please find this information in the updated Procurement Library.
5	Page 17, Section 2.3.2	The sub-contractor form is further described in Template T-9. A fillable PDF is located in the procurement library and on the OSP website.	Fillable PDF is not available in Template T-9 and/or procurement library. Could the State please recheck and provide the requisite sub-contractor form?	An update has been made in the RFP text in Section 2.3.2 and Section 4.1 of T-9. The information is available in the Procurement Library.
6	Page 17, Section 2.3.2.1	If the Vendor's Key Personnel includes the use of subcontractors, it is strongly preferred that the Prime Vendor complete a minimum of 60% of the work, as defined in this procurement.	In the best interest of DHS, we believe that more than one sub-contractors could be added to the engagement to utilize their expertise; however, that might lead to the situation that the prime vendor performs less than 60% of the total work. Will DHS be comfortable in having a prime vendor owning less than 60% of the work? Please confirm Yes or No.	This is a Preferred requirement and not a mandatory requirement. However, the vendor should provide compelling justification for doing so. Vendors should utilize T-4 for this justification.
7	Page 20, Section 2.4.2.1	The Vendor's Technical Proposal must include at least three (3) references from projects performed within the last five (5) years that demonstrate the Vendor's ability to perform the functions described in the SOW of this RFP. Refer to section 1.2.1 for minimum mandatory qualifications. If the Proposal includes the use of subcontractor(s), the Vendor must provide three (3) references for each. DHS has a strong preference for references that demonstrate where the Prime and subcontractor(s) have worked together in the past.	In addition to three(3) references from the vendor(including prime and sub-contractor), does the State require three(3) additional references for each subcontractor as well? Please confirm(Yes/No). For example, if we employ 2 sub-contractors, then does the State require total of 9 references a) 3 references from vendor(Prime + Sub-contractors) b) 3 references from Sub-contractor 1 c) 3 references from Sub-contractor 2	Yes, an update has been made to the RFP text in Section 2.4.2.1 and T-3: Section 1.0 and 1.1.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
8	Page 25, Section 2.5.12	ACCORDINGLY, THE VENDOR EXPRESSLY REPRESENTS AND WARRANTS to the State of Arkansas through the procurement process by submission of a Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) for 36 C.F.R. § 1194.21	This RFP is for M&O, other application enhancements and does not necessarily require creation of products. As such, we feel that VPAT may not be relevant for the kind of services sought as part of this RFP. Could the State please re-confirm if VPAT is mandatory or not(Yes/No)?	The VPAT is required as specified in Section 2.5.12 and T-9: Section 4.1
9	Page 27, Section 2.5.17	Disclosure under Arkansas Law OSP is required to have a copy of EO-98-04 disclosure form on file for the selected Vendor. Vendor must submit the disclosure form with its proposal. A fillable PDF is published on the OSP website at http://www.dfa.arkansas.gov/offices/procurement/Pages/default.aspx and is also located in the procurement library.	Procurement Library has the following forms: a) Lobbying Activities disclosure form b) Business Associates agreement However, the link (http://www.dfa.arkansas.gov/offices/procurement/Pages/default.aspx) provided contains multiple forms and EO-98-04 form does not seem to be located here. Request the State to provide the exact link via which the EO-98-04 form can be downloaded.	An update has been made to the RFP text in Section 2.5.17. The document is available in the Procurement Library.
10	Page 26, Section 2.5.14	Visa Fees	Would DHS please confirm the Contractor will not incur any additional fees as a result of accepting payment through the State's VISA Procurement Card?	See Section 2.5.14, “VISA is not the exclusive method of payment”. If payment is processed using DHS VISA procurement card, normal processing fees would be the vendor's responsibly.
11	Page 26, Section 2.5.14	Visa Fees	If Vendors will incur fees as a result of accepting the State's VISA Procurement Card, will DHS please specify the amount of such fee?	See Section 2.5.14, “VISA is not the exclusive method of payment”. If payment is processed using DHS VISA procurement card, normal processing fees would be the vendor's responsibly.
12	Page 26, Section 2.5.14	Visa Procurement Card	Would DHS consider utilizing Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) rather than a Visa Procurement Card payment for purposes of this work?	See Section 2.5.14, “VISA is not the exclusive method of payment” Yes, Electronic Funds Transfer would be an acceptable payment method.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
13	Page 29, Above The Baseline Bullet 1, Section 3.2.1	The Draft RFP states that there were "24 Task Orders"	We request DHS to provide more details on these Task Orders including Level of Effort, Duration, and Cost for each of these Task Orders.	This information is provided only as background information of the existing contract. Additional details are not required to respond to the scope of this RFP.
14	Page 29, Above The Baseline Bullet 2, Section 3.2.1	A significant amount (approximately \$10M) of this work is M&O work and this will be shifted to the baseline/Applications M&O Scope	Considering the DHS intent to shift a significant amount of work from ABL to BL category and scope of work defined in Section 3.4, is it expected to increase the staffing of BL category (currently 38 staff) to accommodate the increase in scope?	It is the State's expectation that the Vendor will propose staffing levels for ABL and BL.
15	Page 30, Figure 5	Current Northrop Grumman Team Structure	Please provide the list of subcontracting companies.	This information is not required to respond to the scope of this RFP.
16	Page 30, Section 3.2.1	The MMIS function will be outside the scope of this procurement, although the ISS Contractor must coordinate, cooperate and interface with the MMIS vendor or other vendors as required.	Can the State elaborate on the typical set of activities that the vendor is expected perform as part of coordinating, cooperating and interfacing with the MMIS vendor?	The typical set of activities is outlined in the Monthly Status Reports found in the Procurement Library.
17	Page 30, Section 3.2.1	The ISS contractor must coordinate, cooperate and interface with the EBPS vendor.	Can the State elaborate on the typical set of activities that the vendor is expected perform as part of coordinating, cooperating and interfacing with the EBPS vendor?	The typical set of activities is outlined in the Monthly Status Reports found in the Procurement Library.
18	Page 36, Section 3.2.2.1.3	The business intelligence reports range from dashboards, geospatial coded maps, and custom reports.	What type of tool/tools are currently used to create the geospatial coded maps?	The EDW team has standardized on the Microsoft BI toolset utilizing tools such as MS SQL Server, SQL Server Reporting Services (SSRS), SWL Server Analysis Services (SSAS), as well as SAS for specialized analytics and some Oracle Relational Database Management System.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
19	Page 49, Paragraph 2, Section 3.2.2.2.3 Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW) and Business Intelligence	The RFP states "The incumbent currently provides a team of 15 FTEs to meet the reporting and analytics...". However, on Page 88, Paragraph 2, Section 3.6.2.5, Task 5: Support DHS' Business Intelligence, Analytics, and Reporting Needs, the RFP states "There are currently 12 contractor staff supporting these activities".	Please state whether there are currently 12 FTEs or 15 FTEs supporting this effort.	There are currently 15 FTEs currently providing M&O support for EDW/BI tools and BI reporting support. 3 of these are performing M&O support for EDW/BI tools and 12 are performing enhancements. The scope defined in Section 3.4.3 are focused on performing enhancements.
20	Page 55, Paragraph 1, Section 3.2.5.1 Integrated Eligibility and Benefit Management (IE-BM)	The RFP states "The strategic goal of the organization is to migrate all core eligibility solutions applications to the IE-BM enterprise platform over a period of time".	It is respectfully requested that a timeline with distinct activities be provided in order to appropriately estimate migration. Currently there is not enough information for Vendors to adequately price this aspect.	A summary level timeline (forecasted) of the IE-BM activities have been included in Section 3.2.5.1.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
21	Page 56, Paragraph 1, Section 3.2.5.4 DIS' Enterprise Systems Operations Effort	<p>The RFP states "There is also a Statewide initiative to centralize applications operations activities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Help Desk Services (e.g. Service Desk)- IT Operations process support (e.g. incident management, change/release/configuration management)- Applications Operations Services (e.g. job scheduling) <p>The Vendor will be responsible for coordinating with DIS and assisting with the transition. Once this transition is completed, there will be no need for the Vendor to provide IT Operations Support Services (Optional deliverable, see Section 3.4.5)</p>	It is respectfully requested that a timeline with distinct activities be provided in order to appropriately estimate centralization. Currently there is not enough information for Vendors to adequately price this aspect.	DIS cannot definitively answer the timeline questions at this point in time. There are still procurements that need to be done and details to work out before the first test migration can be completed.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
22	Page 56, Paragraph 1, Section 3.2.5.4 DIS' Enterprise Systems Operations Effort	<p>The RFP states "There is also a Statewide initiative to centralize applications operations activities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Help Desk Services (e.g. Service Desk)- IT Operations process support (e.g. incident management, change/release/configuration management)- Applications Operations Services (e.g. job scheduling) <p>The Vendor will be responsible for coordinating with DIS and assisting with the transition. Once this transition is completed, there will be no need for the Vendor to provide IT Operations Support Services (Optional deliverable, see Section 3.4.5)</p>	Would DHS please provide periods of performances for each of the optional services so Vendor's can price them accordingly?	DIS cannot definitively answer the timeline questions at this point in time. There are still procurements that need to be done and details to work out before the first test migration can be completed.
23	Page 60, Section 3.4.1.6	<p>The Vendor will be responsible for providing access and authorization to systems. Examples Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Application specific access<input type="checkbox"/> Removing old IDs<input type="checkbox"/> Shutting off system authorizations <p>This does not include: Installation efforts that require code changes. These are handled as part of the development process.</p>	We assume that all the relevant tools are provided by the State for providing access and authorization services to systems. Please confirm.	Yes, please see 3.2.4.3.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
24	Page 61, Section 3.4.1.13 - Training (Customer)	The Vendor will be responsible for assistance in proper use of the application and formal system training	In order for us to estimate the effort required to perform this task, we are requesting more details on frequency, mode and scope of these trainings. Historical data on these trainings will also help us in estimating the effort.	There is no detailed reporting for this function. No dedicated NG staff is assigned to customer training. Typically customer training is provided as part of the M&O process by NG staff when system changes are delivered. Training for system enhancements not covered by M & O would be provided by NG staff and should be included as part of the enhancement scope/cost. It is not intended for the vendor to establish a training department, but that lead developer or business analyst should include training as part of the job duties. An update has been made to the RFP text in Section 3.4.1.13.
25	Page 61, Section 3.4.1.13 - Training (Customer)	The Vendor will be responsible for assistance in proper use of the application and formal system training	Who from the Northrup Grumman organization is responsible for the training? The team structure in Figure 5 does not have any training staff.	There is no detailed reporting for this function. No dedicated NG staff is assigned to customer training. Typically customer training is provided as part of the M&O process by NG staff when system changes are delivered. Training for system enhancements not covered by M & O would be provided by NG staff and should be included as part of the ABL cost. It is not intended for the vendor to establish a training department, but that lead developer or business analyst should include training as part of the job duties. An update has been made to the RFP text in Section 3.4.1.13.
26	Page 61, Paragraph 1, Section 3.4.1.13 Training (Customer)	The RFP indicates that Formal onsite training will be required.	In order to price appropriately, will DHS please provide the number of onsite training sessions anticipated, the length of each session, and the number of attendees anticipated?	There is no detailed reporting for this function. No dedicated NG staff is assigned to customer training. Typically customer training is provided as part of the M&O process by NG staff when system changes are delivered. Training for system enhancements not covered by M & O would be provided by NG staff and should be included as part of the ABL cost. It is not intended for the vendor to establish a training department, but that lead developer or business analyst should include training as part of the job duties. An update has been made to the RFP text in Section 3.4.1.13.
27	Page 62, Section 3.4.1.14 - Data Discrepancies	The Vendor will be responsible for assisting resolution of data issues where the data is the problem, not the associated code.	We request historical data on average number of data discrepancies reported and records updated every week.	There were 19 Change Management requests for data fixes in the last 12 months.(11/30/2015 to 11/30/2016) There is no data available on the actual numbers of records updated.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
28	Page 64, Section 3.4.1.17	License management/provisioning Preliminary Vendor Responsibilities - Certificate management	We believe vendor is not expected to propose any products and their licensing costs are already in place by the State. Please confirm.	Yes. Please see 3.2.4.3.
29	Page 69, Section 3.4.4	DHS, in certain circumstances, especially when DHS is looking at newer technologies, may request the Vendor to conduct a market survey and obtain bids from outside vendors. The Vendor must establish a process for this activity that is transparent and encourages competition and acquisition of the outside vendors with the right skill set. The Vendor shall manage any sub-contractor and implementation of selected outside vendor.	Is the ISS vendor not allowed to bid for projects requiring newer technologies? Please confirm.	At State's own discretion, if the State decides to go to market to procure additional services, the ISS Vendor will not be allowed to bid and will support the State going to market.
30	Page 69, Section 3.4.4.2 As-Needed Services Requirements at Engagement Initiation	The RFP does not discuss as needed security services related to encryption of data at rest.	Would DHS please confirm that encryption of data at rest is not required?	DHS DOES require data at rest encryption for Personal Health Information(PHI)/Personally Identifiable Information(PII) and protected data. This encryption is currently being handled at the storage level and not part of the current vendor responsibilities anticipated under this procurement.
31	Page 77, Table 12, Section 3.5.5.1 Vendor Key Personnel	The RFP has "Project Team" listed as the last group of Key Personnel.	Please confirm that all Project Team members are not considered to be key personnel.	Yes. Key personnel are only those staff who are identified as such for specific roles.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
32	Page 77, Paragraph 1, Section 3.5.6.2 (Facilities and Equipment/Location of Contracted Personnel)	The RFP indicates that services can be performed outside of Little Rock only once approved by DHS.	Would DHS please confirm that vendor's are not required to seek approval to perform outside of Little Rock for the utilization of "shared service" (overhead) staff support, which can include finance, billing, contracts...etc.	DHS will allow central office staff or “shared services” to be located outside of Little Rock. An update has been made to the RFP text in Section 3.5.6.2.
33	Page 80, Section 3.6.1	Task 4 – Implement Enhancements (Application Development) ISS.4.1 - Enhancement Requirements and Cost Estimates - Once per task order ISS.4.2 - Completed Enhancement Check-List - Once per release	On page 81 of the RFP document, under Task 4, there are two subtasks ISS 4.1 and ISS 4.2 mentioned as part of Enhancements but in Cost workbook, ISS 4.1 is not mentioned in "Implement Enhancements" worksheet. Could the State please confirm if ISS 4.1 is a deliverable or not?	ISS.4.1 and ISS.4.2 are not sub-tasks. They are deliverables that will be produced with the task. ISS.4.1 (Enhancement Requirements and Cost Estimates) is a required deliverable for each enhancement request so DHS can decide whether to invest ABL funds in the enhancement (see section 3.6.2.4 and 3.5.2.3 for more details). The Cost Workbook simply assumes a certain number of hours for enhancements. All costs for enhancements are associated with the development of the enhancements. Deliverable ISS.4.1 will be required for each enhancement. An update has been made to the RFP text in Table 13.
34	Page 81, Paragraph 1, Section 3.6.2.1	Transition planning activities are anticipated to start approximately 6-9 months before the end of the incumbent vendor’s contract.	Is DHS open to shorter time for Transition planning?	Yes

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
35	Page 81, Section 3.6.2.1	Transition planning activities are anticipated to start approximately 6-9 months before the end of the incumbent vendor’s contract.	What is the duration of transition out/turnover services defined in the current Northrup Grumman contract? What is their contractual obligation for providing resources during this period? What are the cost of these services?	Existing contractor is obligated in every possible way to insure no interruption or reduction in data processing functions of DHS business or operations that are the subject of this contract and transition to DHS of the DHS properties will cause no harm to the business of DHS. DHS will negotiate any needed contract extension to meet the needed transition per upon awarding the contract.
36	Page 85 Deliverable ISS.3.1	Monthly Status Report and Service Level Agreement Reporting (15 Core Applications)	We request incumbent's SLA compliance reports for the past twelve months.	Previous contract did not have SLAs for 15 core systems. Monthly status reports are included in the procurement library.
37	RFP: Page 93, 3.7; Page 8, 1.4	Proposed Contract Start Date	RFP Section 1.4 states that the contract start date is expected to be June 15, 2017. However, RFP Section 3.7 states that contract start date is expected to be July 1, 2017. Can the State clarify the anticipated contract start date?	The RFP has been updated to reflect the current anticipated start date of July 1, 2017. An update has been made to the RFP text in Section 1.4 and Table 14.
38	RFP: Page 93, 3.7; Page 8, 1.4	Transition Period	RFP Section 3.7 states that the Transition Planning period is expected to begin January 1, 2017, followed by the actual transition period of February 1 - June 30, 2017. These dates overlap with the procurement dates set forth in Section 1.4. Can the State clarify DHS' expectations regarding the expected Transition Start/End dates?	Existing contractor is obligated in every possible way to insure no interruption or reduction in data processing functions of DHS business or operations that are the subject of this contract and transition to DHS of the DHS properties will cause no harm to the business of DHS. DHS will negotiate any needed contract extension to meet the needed transition period upon awarding the contract. An update has been made to the RFP text in Table 14.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
39	Page 93, Section 3.8 Performance Standards and Associated Penalties	The RFP does not define a maximum amount of penalties a vendor may incur for the duration of the contract.	Would DHS be willing to include a cap on the SLA penalties in the final RFP? In the event a cap is not provided, perspective Offerors may inflate pricing in order to account for associated risk, which would increase costs to the state. Conversely, has DHS considered introducing financial incentives versus damages in order to motivate positive performance?	The RFP has been updated with contractual terms around liquidated damages and incentives for earn back. See updated Section 3.8, 3.8.1 and 3.8.2.
40	Page 95, Section 4.1 Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation of Optional Services is not clear.	Could DHS please elaborate how optional services will be evaluated from a technical and pricing perspective?	Optional services are not included in the proposal evaluation process.
41	Page 96, Section 4.4, Table 16	Cost of proposed products and/or services	The current evaluation cost scoring model does not support a fair competition given that the State has a current incumbent contractor. We recommend that the State consider other State best practices associated with transition costs with an incumbent contractor. Nationally, States have allowed a certain percentage of total bid costs to not be included within the cost evaluation scoring model with non-incumbent Vendors.	Transition costs will be excluded as part of the cost evaluation and scoring framework. However, a transition plan should be provided for the State to gain an understanding of the overall magnitude of effort. The RFP text has been updated in 2.4.2.2, T-7, and the cost workbook.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
42	RFP: Page 58, Table 9	<p>Legacy Rationalization Requirements - Collaborating with the Modernization Vendor (i.e. IE-BM) to help identify detailed functional specifications</p> <p>Legacy Rationalization Execution - Building enhancements and testing to support the deployment of replacement solution, assist with data conversion, perform all tasks related to enabling the retirement of legacy system, including building of new tactical solutions on alternate platforms, and ensure the new solution can function as specified intended</p> <p>Legacy Rationalization Execution - Responsible for making any modifications required to retire any legacy applications according to the agreed to ABL SOW</p>	Please confirm that the Legacy Rationalization Requirements described in Table 9, Application Retirement Roles and Responsibilities will either be handled under the Application Development task area rather than the Application M&O task area or will be handled as a modification to the Application M&O scope of work, as they involve potential new scope that cannot adequately be defined at this time.	Yes.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
43	RFP: Page 60, 3.4.1.6, 3.4.1.17	<p>3.4.1.6 Security The Vendor will be responsible for providing access and authorization to systems. Examples Include: <input type="checkbox"/> Application specific access <input type="checkbox"/> Removing old IDs <input type="checkbox"/> Shutting off system authorizations This does not include: Installation efforts that require code changes. These are handled as part of the development process.</p> <p>3.4.1.7 Maintain Test Environment The Vendor will be responsible for maintaining a test environment Examples Include: <input type="checkbox"/> Copying data from production to test <input type="checkbox"/> Refreshing test environments <input type="checkbox"/> Defining backups and restores Does not include: Setting up test data to test a new system enhancement. This is part of the development project.</p>	NIST 800-100 Section 8.2.3 indicates that the Information Owner is the one who authorizes access to the information system and determines types of privileges or access rights. With respect to sections 3.4.1.6 Security and 3.4.1.17 Vendor and State Roles/Responsibilities, we assume DHS's intent is to retain the business function of data/application access. Is this correct?	The business owner will identify who has access to the information and the M&O Vendor will be responsible for executing required security changes.
44	RFP page 69, 3.4.4.2, As-Needed Service Requirements at Engagement Initiation	As part of the response to this RFP, the Vendor must propose an appropriate number of Senior Information Security Analysts / Subject Matter Experts with appropriate qualifications to assist DHS with its security related initiatives.	Can the State clarify how DHS expects vendors to respond to this requirement within the Technical Volume and the Cost Volume, as none of the provided Technical Volume Templates or the Cost Workbook provide a location or mechanism to propose and price these services?	The requirement is intended to gauge the strength of security practice. Any cost for these service are above baseline. An update has been made to the RFP text in Section 3.4.4.2, Section 5.0 of T-7, and the Cost Workbook.
45	General	The RFP does not cite a changes provision in a resulting contract.	In light of the anticipated changes in Government that are likely to impact health related efforts, the parties would benefit from the inclusion of a Changes provision in a resulting contract award. The changes provision would be utilized in the event a change to federal or state legislation, policies, statutes, ordinances, rules and regulations results in a scope/cost impact to the program. Consequently, inclusion of such a provision should be incorporated for the effort.	The State does not execute contracts with clauses providing for pre-approved amendments. If business requirements change the agreed scope significantly, a contract amendment may need to be negotiated at that time.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
46	RFP No. SP-17-0006 Vendor Questions.	Failure by DHS to complete activities within the timeframes noted does NOT constitute acceptance, approval or completion unless otherwise agreed upon by DHS and the Vendor.	Would DHS please confirm that deliverables can be considered accepted after the lapse of 30 calendar days from deliverable submission? As payment is tied to deliverable acceptance, it is important for Vendors to be able to quantify payment timelines.	Acceptance of deliverables must be positively confirmed with a State sign-off before considered complete. DHS will not unduly withhold payment or sign-off.
47	Template 2, 3.4, Corporate Guarantee	<p>If the Vendor is substantially owned or controlled, in whole or in part, by one or more other legal entities, the Vendor should submit the information required under the “Financial Capacity” section above for each such entity, including the most recent financial statement for each such entity. The Vendor should also include a statement that the entity or entities will unconditionally guarantee performance by the Vendor for each and every obligation, warranty, covenant, term and condition of the Contract. If DHS determines that an entity does not have sufficient financial resources to guarantee the Vendor’s performance, DHS may require the Vendor to obtain another acceptable financial instrument or resource from such entity, or to obtain an acceptable guarantee from another entity with sufficient financial resources to guarantee performance.</p> <p>Instructions: Provide any additional information requested, and the unconditional guarantee by the owning/controlling entities.</p>	Would the State consider deleting the Corporate Guarantee Statement requirement in Template 2, Vendor Experience Section 3.4 and replace with a Performance Bond?	No, if DHS finds the vendors Corporate Guarantee to be insufficient it could require a Performance Bond.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
48	Template 3, Vendor Reference Tables, Project Information	Project Information/Vendor Involvement	What does the State mean by Vendor’s Involvement?	Vendor's involvement in this context means "What is/was the Vendor's scope and role in the project". An update to the RFP text has been made in Table 1 of T-3.
49	Template 4/1.0, para. 3 (Instructions)	Show proposed Vendor personnel hours by phase, by personnel level, and by role for the entire engagement.	We assume the State expects vendors to show staffing levels for the following phases: Transition In, Delivery, and Transition Out (Turn-Over). Is this assumption correct?	Yes, that assumption is correct.
50	Template 6/Tab 3, O3.18 Template 6/Tab 3, O3.20	Update user documentation and training materials Update existing user/training documentation	Can the State clarify the difference between requirements O3.18 and O3.20 in Template 6, Tab 3?.	The duplicate requirement has been removed from T-6 O3.
51	Template 6/Tab 6, O6.25 Template 6/Tab 6, O6.31	Ensure all DHS vendors comply with change/release management policies and procedures and environment configurations remain synchronized Ensure all DHS vendors are using configuration management tools and comply with policies and procedures and environment configurations remain synchronized	Since the ISS vendor will have no contractual connection with or ability to manage other DHS vendors, please confirm that ISS vendor is only responsible for compliance of ISS vendor and subcontractor staff with DHS change/release management policies and procedures and tool usage and for making DHS aware of circumstances where other DHS vendors may be non-compliant.	Yes. The requirement has been updated in T-6 O6 to reflect that the ISS Vendor will be responsible for identifying and escalating, where necessary, any lack of alignment with policies and procedures.
52	Template 6/Tab 7, O7.1	Propose Account Management structure, planning and procedures	We assume account management is the same as engagement management. Is this assumption correct?	Yes.
53	Template 6/Tab 9, O9.10, O9.13	Documentation Updates	Can the State clarify the difference between requirements O9.10 and O9.13 in Template 6, Tab 9?.	The duplicate requirement has been removed from T-6 O9.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
54	Template 6/Tab 9, O9.18, O9.19, O9.20, O9.21	Time durations	We assume the time thresholds cited in each of these requirements apply to normal working hours. Is this correct?	The State will not guarantee any particular schedule of working hours, as the nature of IT tasks vary and the ISS vendor may find it effective to provide a variety of work schedules for their staff.
55	Template 6/Tab 9, O9.05 Template 6/Tab 9, O9.06	99.5% of transactions complete (response time from entering command to receiving result) within 2 seconds and the remaining transactions complete with in a max response time of 5 seconds 99% of transactions complete (response time from entering command to receiving result) within 3 seconds and the remaining transactions complete with in a max response time of 7 seconds	Many applications are not designed to be completed in near real-time. For example, with the ISS portfolio, the EDW reports are not designed to complete within seconds. Could the State please provide a list of the relevant applications where these response times apply?	DHS has updated their approach to availability and performance SLAs. This will be applied to all new applications once in production and all existing application after a year. Section 3.5.2.1 and Template T-6, Tab – O9 SLRs have been updated to reflect this change. For O9.5 "99.5% of transactions complete (response time from entering command to receiving result) within 2 seconds..." has been updated to "99.5% of transactions complete (response time from entering command to receiving result) within 3 seconds..."
56	Template 6/Tab 2, O2.29	“Maintain/update ISS Application security plan based on The State of Arkansas and Federal application security requirements , standards, procedures, policies which includes, but is not limited to , procedures for security monitoring and log management functions, ISS Application vulnerability management.”	Is this requirement in support of IRS Safeguard Activity Reporting and CMS System Security Plan reporting?	Yes and others, as applicable.
57	Template 6/Tab 8, O8.1	Create a detailed Turn-Over Plan and the Disentanglement Plan that covers all activities and the efforts of all involved parties. This part of the plan should express this in time and budget requirements, action ownership and program governance.	How does the State distinguish between the M&O Turn-Over Plan (Deliverable ISS 7.1) and the Disentanglement Plan?	The reference to Disentanglement Plan has been removed from the RFP text in T-6 O8.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
58	Page 1, SP170006T9 Terms & Conditions, Section 2.0	Vendors must strictly adhere to the Mandatory Terms and Conditions of this RFP. Failure to follow any instruction within this RFP may, at the State’s sole discretion, result in the disqualification of the Vendor’s Proposal. Rejection of the Terms and Conditions, in whole or in part may be cause for the State’s rejection of a bidder’s proposal.	As per Section 2.0 of T-9 (Terms and Conditions), it seems that vendor has to agree to all the terms and conditions mentioned in Section 2.0(General Contractual agreements); however, Section 5 of T-9 allows Clarifications/exceptions to terms and conditions. Q1.) Could the State please clarify whether exceptions to Terms and Conditions are allowed or not? Q2.)If Yes, then are exceptions allowed for both General Contractual agreements and Standard Terms and Conditions?	Exceptions to Terms and Conditions are not allowed. Please see RFP Section 2.3.1 and T-9
59	Page 2, SP170006T9 Terms & Conditions, Section 2.2	The vendor shall indemnify and save harmless the agency and all its officers, representatives, agents, and employees against any claim or liability arising from or based upon the violation of any such law, ordinance, regulation, order or decree by an employee, representative, or subcontractor of the vendor.	Our understanding is that the clause listed puts no limit on the amount of liability for Contractor i.e. it signifies unlimited liability. Would State be open to cap the limits of liability of Contractor for this project?	Exceptions to Terms and Conditions are not allowed. Please see RFP Section 2.3.1 and T-9
60	Procurement Library, Monthly Status Report	Service Requests by month	We request a final disposition status of these Service Requests if they required a code change, training write-up, converted to enhancements, duplicate, data-fix etc. Do enhancements for policy changes tracked through a Service request?	Detailed Service Request data is not available for all service requests and changes related to policy changes are not specifically tracked.
61	Procurement Library	AR DHS ISS Application Inventory - Ancillary Application Tab	How many of these systems are actively used in Production? Of the ones that are currently Active in Production, how many have been modified during last 12 months?	All systems listed in the inventory provided have been determined to be currently active. No data is available to identify all applications that have been modified in the last 12 months.

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Response to Vendor
62	Cost Workbook, Tabs 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9		Can the State provide job descriptions and experience requirements for all labor categories used by Cost Workbook Tabs 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9 - as DHS has done on Tab 7, As Needed Services - to ensure that vendors develop rates reflective of the appropriate skills and experience for all labor categories?	Sample responsibilities and expected qualifications have been added to Cost Workbook Tab 2. Labor Rates for every staff position; they have been removed from Tab 7 As Needed Services.
63	Cost Workbook, Tab 2, Labor Rates		Can the State clarify the presence of "BI/Data Warehousing Analysts" and "BI/Data Warehousing Tool Experts" in Table 1 (Application M&O Hourly Rates) and the omission of these labor categories from Table 3 (Business Intelligence, Analytics, and Reporting Services Hourly Rates), as these labor categories seem to only be applicable to Table 3 based on the defined RFP scope of work?	EDW M&O is included in Task 1. As such, it is appropriate to include in Table 1. Table 3 have been updated to better reflect the required labor categories
64	Cost Workbook, Tab 4, Appl M&O	Table 2, Facilities Cost	Is it DHS' expectation that all facility costs (facility transition cost as well as leasing, maintenance, utilities, furniture, etc.)should be included within the direct charge line item in Table 2, Facilities Cost (as opposed to factoring facility costs into individual labor rates)?	Yes
65	Cost Workbook, Tab 4, Appl M&O	Table 2, Facilities Cost	Please verify that it is DHS' expectation that the facility costs for staff supporting all task areas, not just Application M&O, shall be provided in Table 2, Facilities Cost.	Yes, facility costs on Table 2 should be costs for resources supporting all tasks.
66	Cost Workbook, Tab 6, BI and Reporting RFP 3.4.3	DHS envisions an iterative approach will be required to interpret and fully understand the user’s needs. DHS envisions the Vendor will provide 12 full time staff members will be assigned to performing the tasks outlined above.	RFP Section 3.4.3, Business Intelligence and Reporting, indicates that DHS envisions 12 FTEs to perform the required BI and Reporting services and further indicates that DHS expects vendor to propose to distribute the current BI and reporting portfolio into M&O and Enhancement projects. However, Tab 6 of the Cost Workbook simply includes a single plug of 20,000 hours. Can the State clarify how vendors are expected to propose pricing for FTEs envisioned to support BI and reporting, as well as how DHS intends to utilize the plug of 20,000 hours?	Refer to item #19 for the clarification on # of FTEs for M&O vs Enhancements. On the question regarding Tab 6, this is strictly for 12 FTEs working a total of 20,000 hours on enhancements with the expectation that the Vendor inputs the blended hourly rate for the State to determine the total cost for this line item.