



Date of Issuance: 02/24/2015
Requisition No. 8300022142

Solicitation No. 8300001112
Amendment No. 4

Hour and date specified for receipt of offers is changed: No Yes, to: _____ 3:00 PM CST/CDT

Pursuant to OAC 580:16-7-30(d), this document shall serve as official notice of amendment to the Solicitation identified above. Such notice is being provided to all suppliers to which the original solicitation was sent.

Suppliers submitting bids or quotations shall acknowledge receipt of this solicitation amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation as follows:

- (1) Sign and return a copy of this amendment with the solicitation response being submitted; or,
- (2) If the supplier has already submitted a response, this acknowledgement must be signed and returned prior to the solicitation deadline. All amendment acknowledgements submitted separately shall have the solicitation number and bid opening date printed clearly on the front of the envelope.

ISSUED BY and RETURN TO:

U.S. Postal Delivery or Personal or Common Carrier Delivery:

Office of Management and Enterprise Services
ATTN: 8300001112/Allen Cook
3115 N. Lincoln Blvd.
Oklahoma City, OK 73105

Allen Cook
Contracting Officer

allen.cook@omes.ok.gov
E-Mail Address

Description of Amendment:

a. This is to incorporate the following:

Amendment 4 is issued to answer questions asked via the Wiki from 12/15/2014 – 02/23/2015:

1. I just wanted to confirm that RFP#8300001112 is the MOSAIC Enterprise System software RFP? I didn't see the MOSAIC acronym in the solicitation, so just wanted to double check.
a) **This is correct.**
2. Regarding the IT Solicitation Package Version 18, is there an incumbent contract for this project? Thank you.
a) **No, there is not an incumbent contract for this project.**
3. If the software manufacturer were to be the Prime vendor on the RFP response and subcontracts the services requirements within this solicitation to a 3rd party vendor, would the 3rd party vendor be precluded from bidding on the subsequent RFP for implementation and integration services?
a) **It is the intent of the State to conduct a fair and open solicitation throughout the duration of the project as allowed by State of Oklahoma procurement guidelines. The State does not see a scenario at this time that would disqualify a vendor from participation in the second integrator solicitation because of either being selected for this solicitation or involvement in its execution.**
4. Would the state please provide a Word copy of the main PDF document so we may format our answers properly? Thank you!
a) **Yes, please see the following link: <http://www.ok.gov/cio/Procurement/Solicitations/8300001112.html>**
5. C.3.6. – Will the State provide hardware with operating systems to host proposed software for the installation effort?
a) **See section C.3.4. "Provide the necessary hardware or aid the state in identifying the necessary hardware for the implementation of the technical architecture." Bidders are also encouraged to view Appendix D.**
6. H.5.4.8. – Will the State please clarify to what the 25 page limit is referring? Is it the State's intent to limit sample project documents to 25 pages-front and back? Does this 25 page limit apply to each project discussed? Does it apply to the past performance section as a whole?
a) **The 25 page- front and back limit applies to "C" only and per example provided. DHS will review only 3 program/project examples.**
7. H.4.3. – Will the State please confirm whether the information requested pertains to OK or to the references in D.1.1.1?
a) **Experience is not limited to past performance in the State of Oklahoma.**
8. H.6.4.6. – This section makes reference to RFP Section C.6 Oklahoma Benefits System Project Goals and Objectives. Will the State please confirm that the project goals and objects being referenced appear in RFP Section C.5.?
a) **Yes, the project goals and objects are in section C.5.**

Description of Amendment - continuing

9. H.6.7. – This section includes instruction to complete Attachment E but also appears to be requesting narrative which will provide detailed information of modules functionality, screenshots, etc. Will the State please clarify, from a response format perspective, how they prefer to have the narratives presented? A) Will they remain as part of Section H.6.7.? B) How would you prefer the tabs addressing module descriptions numbered? Additionally, it may be more informative to present narratives in terms of solutions vs. modules. This approach will provide the State will a more comprehensive view of the application of each module as it applies to each program area i.e. Child Welfare, Assistance Programs, and Child Support. Will the State please consider narratives using this approach?
- a) **Narratives must remain as the response to H.6.7 along with the information regarding examples of previous work. It is also required that the narratives map and correlate to Attachment E. These may be numbered and tabbed as per the numbering scheme in Attachment E. For traceability purposes, the state is unable to accept solution based narratives.**
10. H.7.10. – Will the State please clarify the response being sought as this appears to be a complete contradiction to the concept of Software only?
- a) **The bidders for this software RFP are being asked to install and configure the software solution into the current OMES-ISD technical environment. They are also being asked to conduct training for knowledge transfer of the product. That is the implementation that is being referred to. The state is referring to the system support of the software and third-party software proposed, such as patch management, updates and system maintenance of software and solutions proposed.**
11. H.6.7.2. & H.7.8.2. – Will the State clarify if they want time required in the same Small, Medium, Large format as the H.6.7.3, H.7.8.3 formats?
- a) **Yes, a Small, Medium, and Large format is acceptable.**
12. H.7.8.2. – H.7.1. instructs to not include cost or price information yet H.7.8.2. requests cost. Will the State please clarify its intent re the inclusion or exclusion of cost information in this section?
- a) **The reference in H.7.1 is asking that the costs associated with this proposal for the State to consider be submitted in the cost section of the RFP. The reference in H.7.8.2 is asking the bidders to give the state an idea of the amount of work need to modify the solution to be compliant. The sizing methodology given in H.7.8.3. Would be sufficient for this answer and not include estimated costs.**
13. H.7.8.3. – H.7.8.4. differs from a similar question for H.6.7.4. in including cost. Did the State not intend to include cost in this section?
- a) **The reference in H.7.8.4 is asking that the costs associated with this proposal for the State to consider be submitted in the cost section of the RFP. The reference in H.7.8.2 is asking the bidders to give the state an idea of the amount of work need to modify the solution to be compliant. The sizing methodology given in H.7.8.3. Would be sufficient for this answer and not include estimated costs.**
14. H.6.7.4. & H.7.8.4. – Both H.6.7.4 and H.7.8.4. request the time required for the third party solution implementation. Third party solutions would likely be part of the implementation phase of the project completed by another party. Would the state consider removing or clarifying the time required request?
- a) **It is the intent of the state to procure all necessary hardware and software and deploy a working solution in a non-production environment. "Implementation" in the context of this RFP refers to the work required to accomplish the above stated goal of an installed solution. It should not be confused with "Implementation" of the solution in the System Integrator phase which will follow after a successful award of this RFP.**
15. H.7.4.1. – The RFP indicates that the scope of this project is limited to the purchase and installation of software. Will the State please clarify the purpose of seeking information concerning full-scale system development?
- a) **As indicated Section H.7.4 the state is asking for bidders to describe full-scale system development if used in the deployed proposed solution out of the box (OOB).**
16. K.7.1.18. – This appears to be an implementation requirement. Can the state clarify that this is in or out of scope?
- a) **The intention of this requirement is to inquire if the solution offered by the bidder is capable of handling 150 interfaces.**
17. K.7.26.34. – Can the state clarify this question? Does this question imply that a system administrator should be able to disable a system generated alert for all users?
- a) **Yes, the system administrator must be able to disable a system generated alert.**
18. Attachment E – Tab F&F includes columns OOB, CONF, MOD, and TPS. Attachment E includes several tabs that do not include the above referenced columns. Will the State please indicate whether or not they wish the vendor to add the above referenced columns to all tabs? If yes, will the State issue an Amended Attachment E? If no, will the State please specify the information that must be reflected on data elements reflected on Data Element Tables?
- a) **With the exception of Tab F&F, the remaining tables are provided for information only.**
19. K.7.1.45. – Is the state referring to filtering of the individual user's case load? Or filtering of other items?
- a) **Since users will have the ability to set filters the State was asking if the system would allow the users to save and retrieve these settings anywhere they are permitted to filter.**
20. Appendix D – The RFP seems to be missing "Appendix D – Infrastructure Technical Specifications". The RFP document does include an Appendix D on page 251 but it is labeled as "Appendix D – As-Is Software Applications". So the question is, where is the correct Appendix D?
- a) **The state apologizes for the oversight. Please see the following link for the correct Appendix D. <http://www.ok.gov/cio/Procurement/Solicitations/8300001112.html>**
21. H.7.3.2. & H.7.3.3. – Sections H.7.3.2. and H.7.3.3. ask to give an overview of the Technical Infrastructure and Technical Environment use, upgrade, and/or replacement. How does the State distinguish "technical infrastructure" and "technical environment"?
- a) **Technical infrastructure refers to the overall technology supporting the enterprise solution. Technical environment refers to those technical components that are within the scope of the enterprise solution.**
22. In section K.101.45., the RFP states that OKDHS will not accept a SAAS/Hosted solution. Section C.1.13. states that OKDHS is open to an externally hosted solution. The sections seem to be opposing preferences. Please clarify whether OKDHS is open to a SAAS/Hosted solution or would a 100% on premise solution be the preference.
- a) **The state apologizes for the oversight. The state is open to a secure SaaS/Hosted solution. K.10.1.45 (Attachment H) should be stricken.**
23. Attachment E, Section K.7.16.40 states: "The vendor will need to propose a per template estimate over the 1000 templates being asked for." This appears to be an implementation requirement. Will the State please clarify that this is in or out of scope?
- a) **This requirement is out of scope and will be stricken from the RFP.**

Description of Amendment - continuing

24. Attachment E, Section K.7.29.2 states: "The solution must provide a per office implementation cost for any offices over the initial 30 offices." This appears to be an implementation requirement. Will the State please clarify that this is in or out of scope?
- a) **This requirement is out of scope and will be stricken from the RFP.**
25. In order to provide for consistency amongst bids, can the State please clarify the anticipated start date of this project?
- a) **The projected date is December 1, 2015, subject to negotiation and circumstances outside the state's control.**
26. Attachment E - Based on the State's answers to previous questions, it is clear that the State is seeking an implementation of a "working solution" in a "non-production environment" that is "configured into the current OMES-ISD technical environment". In order to ensure consistency amongst various bidders' solutions, can the State please confirm the scope of this implementation would include: -- Hardware installation or connection of required hardware to the OEMS-ISD technical environment -- Software installation (including third party software products required to implement an operational instance of the solution) -- Software product configuration to operate in the OEMS-ISD environment -- Loading of demonstration/test data to include rules content, workflow configuration and case data sufficient to demonstrate to the State the configured system is able to perform standard expected business transactions (i.e., receive an application, assign caseworker, determine eligibility, process benefits, refer a case to child support, establish paternity, establish support order, receive child abuse allegation, etc.) -- Perform technical and application training to State staff to assist in supporting and further configuring the system in subsequent phases. For the purpose of clarity, please confirm that the scope of implementation does not include implementation of State specific customizations such as reports, interfaces, forms, extensions, etc.
- a) **Yes, this is an accurate interpretation of what is required. The state has requested this level of functionality in order to conduct a comprehensive GAP analysis between the product and current business processes.**
27. Attachment E - In Attachment E, the items that can be selected for each requirement are OOB, CONF, MOD, and TPS. There are instances where more than one checkbox would be the most accurate response. For example, there are items that we consider OOB and are provided by a Third Party Software. In those instances, can we select both OOB and TPS? An example is: J.3.14.19, "The solution must provide 'inbox' functionality.". Our product provides a Task List out of the box, and it is powered by a third party workflow product.
- a) **Yes, if you check TPS the state would like to know if the requirement is OOB, CONF, or MOD and explain the scope and time required, product name, description, manufacturer/vendor and total number of units.**
28. Attachment E, K.7.29.7 and K.7.16.18 - Is the State requesting bidders to provide a scanning/imaging system or do you have an existing system you would like Bidders to leverage?
- a) **It is an optional requirement. Please refer to Appendix D, Section J.1.15 and J.1.16 for the current environment. The Bidders need to advise the State in its response if this current product used by DHS can be integrated into the solution being offered or if the Bidder's solution has a better proposal for imaging. If the Bidder has a better imaging option for the State the costs associated with acquiring this option should be outlined.**
29. Section H / Section M - Within the Section M checklist, there are multiple items noted as being required as part of the bid but that are not included within the Section H instructions to bidders. Examples include: submittal of a function point analysis and feasibility of proposed solution for the project management, business, and technical solutions. For these items that are within the Section M checklist but not contained within the Section H instructions, can the State please provide direction on where these items should be included within the proposal response or clarify that Section H does contain the full instructions of what must be submitted in the bid.
- a) **It was the intention of the State for the items listed on the check list to be included in the bid responses. Even if not clearly addressed in Section H the bidders need to submit their response in Section H for everything in Section H and on the check list in Section M.**
30. B.25.5.2 and E.3 - The state lists damages for a change in "Program Manager" in RFP section B.25.5.2 but in section E.3 and subsections, the RFP discusses the Supplier "Project Manager" as the primary point of contact, and does not list a Supplier "Program Manager". Are bidders expected to propose a program manager or a project manager or both?
- a) **Section B.25.5.2 is correct and section E.3 inadvertently used the word Program instead of Project.**
31. E.2.16 - Section E.2.16 of the RFP lists DHS key resources and that the DHS Methodologies website provides their role descriptions. In searching the website, a role description for Program Manager could not be found. Is the Program Manager a key resource for DHS? If so, what is the role description that bidders can review?
- a) **Section E.2.16 inadvertently used the word Program instead of Project.**
32. H.5.12.1 - In section H.5.12.1, the state indicates that if bidders propose deliverables in addition to those listed in the RFP, Attachment M, Additional Deliverables Chart should be completed. Please confirm that this should be Attachment K as we have not located an Attachment M?
- a) **Attachment K is correct, attachment M was referenced incorrectly.**
33. H.8.1 - In an effort to provide greatest transparency, it is our intention to provide the State with the most complete list of Third Party Software. This includes software meant explicitly for system management, project management, lifecycle management, system monitoring, etc. Would the State consider refining the requirement for VPATs to explicitly indicate their requirement for software which is expected to be end-user facing only?
- a) **Refer to Section A.30 for description on applicable VPATs.**
34. Software List and Pricing - Can the State please confirm that bidders should include the cost of all Third Party Software products required to implement the Enterprise Human Services system?
- a) **Yes the State confirms that bidders should include the cost of all Third Party Software products required to implement the Enterprise Human Services system.**
35. B.12.1.8 and H.4.4 - In section B.12.1.8, the State indicates that the Supplier should "provide to DHS copies of any applicable license agreement from the licensor of the Third-Party Software to allow DHS to pre-approve such license agreement". In section H.4.4, the State indicates that "Bidder may submit copies of any applicable license agreement from the licensor of the Third-Party Software, including warranty services and coverage period." Does this indicate that for the purposes of the project (after award), the successful bidder would need to provide the State with all of the software license agreements prior to the final purchase of the software? Whereas for the purposes of the RFP, bidders should provide the software license agreements that provide the best illustrative examples and insight for the State to review?
- a) **Bidders should provide the software license agreements that provide the best illustrative examples and insight for the State to review.**
36. E.2.14 and F.1 - Section E.2.14 states that DHS will provide onsite workspace including network, telephone, and furniture as needed for hardware and software implementation throughout the duration of the project. While Section F.1.4 states that Supplier shall provide all equipment, supplies for its own staff, whether on-site or off-site, and communication connectivity beyond what DHS provides for on-site

Description of Amendment - continuing

- staff. Section F.1.5 states that if determined needed by DHS, provide all equipment, supplies and communication connectivity for up to 25 total DHS and OMES-ISD staff at Supplier's local project office. Can the State please clarify the facility expectations and specify if a Supplier facility should be included within Bidders' solution and price?
- a) **When the Suppliers staff is required to be on site at a State facility location for a specified task the State will ensure that Suppliers staff has a work space. It is also the intention of the State for the Supplier, if determined needed by DHS, provide all equipment, supplies and communication connectivity for up to 25 total DHS and OMES-ISD staff at Supplier's local project office. It is the intention of the state to conduct as much business as possible at the Suppliers location.**
37. H.9.4.3 - Section H.9.4.3 of the RFP states "Bidder may submit multiple Attachment 2 options to the software/hardware solution to give DHS alternatives in pricing options." Can the State please clarify its expectations as it relates to a bidder submitting multiple price summaries when only one technical proposal is allowed? In the event that multiple price proposals are provided, what would the State's process be to fairly evaluate the bids?
- a) **All options will be individually evaluated.**
38. Attachment E - What is expected of the vendors in relation to the Data Element Tables that are included for each module in Attachment E? The last requirement of each module lists the name of the module and references the Data Elements Table related to that module. Please describe how you would like the vendors to respond to the Data Element Table requirement in each module using the codes the State provided (OOTB, CONF, MOD, TPS). What would constitute an OOTB response? Is the State requesting that we indicate if we have the necessary pages to capture the type of data necessary using the Data Element Table as an example?
- a) **With the exception of Tab F&F, the remaining tables are provided for information only. If your solution as proposed includes the data element it would be considered OOTB.**
39. In reference to Section's K.11.1.9 and K.11.1.9.1 (Attachment I): Is the intention behind this requirement to provide capabilities that would enable passing the call from the IVR to an agent with relevant screen pops within the Case management system?
- a) **The State currently uses the "Avaya Voice Portal Management Solution v5.1.0.3.0502". The proposed solution should integrate with the above mentioned system.**
40. In reference to Section K.11.3.3 (Attachment I): Is it the intention of the state to be able to import existing IDL libraries into the new solution? Does this requirement still apply to a proposed COTS solution?
- a) **The state intends to reuse IDL libraries when possible.**
41. In reference to Section K.11.4.3 (Attachment I): Is it the intention of the state to ensure that the newly procured solution runs on these older browser versions such as IE7, Firefox v3.6, and Safari v5.0 because they are currently being used by the state, or are the most currently available browser(s) i.e IE 11, Firefox 36, and Safari 7 that support current web standards such as HTML5 acceptable?
- a) **The current version of the browser within the State is IE11 and Firefox 36. The requirements stated in K.11.4.3 regarding multi-browser support and browser independence still apply. HTML 5 support is acceptable but not mandatory.**
42. In reference to Section D.1.3 (Bidder Information Sheet): Please provide the stated Form 076, Bidder Information Sheet.
- a) **Please see the following link: <http://www.ok.gov/cio/Procurement/Solicitations/8300001112.html>**
43. The scope of this solicitation appears to be broad. We are experts in a small portion of the overall solicitation. Are you looking for a single vendor or multiple vendors? In other words can we respond (and be considered) for only parts that are applicable to our solution? If you are looking for a single vendor we would be interested in being a sub to a prime or lead core system. Are you able to let me know who is bidding so we can coordinate efforts?
- a) **Bidders should bid on the RFP as a whole. The requirements in the RFP must be met to the extent possible. As stated within the RFP the Prime Bidder can have sub-contractors but must follow the instructions on producing documentation for sub-contractors. The State will continue to allow Bidders to remain anonymous until the conclusion of the RFP process.**
44. Will the State distribute all Administrative Review questions and answers? How will they be distributed and what is the anticipated date?
- a) **No the State will not distribute all Administrative Review questions and answers. The State will address each Administrative Review individually, via email, with the Bidder requesting the Administrative Review on a first come first serve basis.**
45. Would the State be open to the Supplier dividing the deliverables outlined in Attachment 2 (i.e. Enterprise Architecture) into logical components and submitting those as new and distinct deliverables (i.e. 2 Deliverables for F.4, 3 Deliverables for F.6, etc.)? We believe that having this flexibility will provide the State the opportunity to more easily and effectively review the key work products as they are produced over the duration of the project.
- a) **Attachment 2 must be completed as instructed. Additional, supporting documentation can be included as a separate document in the format of the bidders choosing.**
46. In reference to the requirements listed in Section H.5.4: These specific requirements do not correspond with all of the requirements in Attachment A, should the additional requirements be added to Attachment A or provided in a different table as part of the narrative response?
- a) **Per Section H.5.3, please fill out attachment A. In Section H.5.4 please respond to the items as listed.**
47. Att. E, K.7.8.3 states "The solution must provide an authorization process by state office for placements at a level above foster care." Will the State please clarify what is meant by 'level above foster care'?
- a) **"Level above foster care" refers to the placement of children in states custody who are in need of a placement that provides more intensive services than children in a typical family foster home. These placements are typically approved or authorized by management personnel and are characteristically placements settings such as congregate care, psychiatric settings or therapeutic foster care.**
48. Att. E., K.7.19.7, states: "The solution must provide a method to create an on-call schedule." What are the duties of a person who is 'on call'?
- a) **The specific duties performed by the on-call staff could vary (Child Welfare, Adult Protective Services, etc.) and are not relevant to the requirement. The solution must provide a method that will allow for centrally assigning, displaying, and tracking staff that are designated to be "on call" regardless of what the job duties entail.**
49. The state has requested a total decentralized user population of 5,000, with an additional 10,000 external users. Will the State please break the number down by categories of users as follows: - integrated eligibility state workers, - child welfare state or contract workers, - child support enforcement state workers, - external users such as foster care, adoption services, and other child welfare providers, - external providers of services for integrated eligibility programs, - general population expected to access the state public facing portals
- a) **The Child Support Enforcement count = 976**

Child Welfare workers plus external providers = 3,123

Description of Amendment - continuing

Integrated eligibility workers = 5,488

External users expected to access the system = 5,413

Total client base of DHS is approximately 2,000,000 clients. The number of concurrent users that will access the system is unknown.

50. H.9.2.2 - Section H.9.2.2 requires Bidders to submit certified annual reports, financial statements, their last interim financial statement, and other evidence of financial status. Would it be acceptable to include the annual reports and interim reports on the electronic copy of the proposal only? These reports for the last three years can be voluminous for publicly traded companies.
- a) **The state needs copies both digitally and paper to support the bid documentation requirements.**
51. H.7.2, H.7.6, and M.4 - Section H.7.2 states "Technical Proposal" refers to the Technical Section, General Requirements, Enterprise Architecture, Technical, Quality, and Performance within this Solicitation." However, in checklist item M.4, the EA methodology is listed as part of the business proposal. Please confirm that the State is only expecting responses about enterprise architecture in Part III – Technical Proposal.
- a) **Yes, the State is expecting the responses about enterprise architecture in Part III – Technical Proposal only**
52. H.6.5, H.7.5, M.4 and M.5 - Both Sections H.6.5 and H.7.5 state the same requirement: "Bidder provides its SOA concepts, including plans, activities, tools, controls, and best practices for incorporating SOA in the DHS environment." M.4 Part II - Business Proposal has checklist item of "Provide your SOA concepts" while M.5 Part III - Technical Proposal does not. Should this SOA requirement only be responded to within Part II - Business Proposal?
- a) **The SOA requirement should be responded to in both sections. Section H.6.5 has the M.4 checklist item "Provide your SOA Concepts. Section 7.5 has the checklist item in M.5 "Submit Attachment H, Technical SOA Reference Chart" which is actually Attachment I rather than Attachment H.**
53. M.2 - Function point analysis requirements are not mentioned in the Administration Proposal requirements or anywhere else in the RFP, but the M.2 Administration Proposal checklist does specify a Function Point Analysis being required. Function Point Counts are typically performed during a system implementation project once requirements of interfaces, reports, screens, etc. are defined for the project. Additionally, Function Point Counts take a significant time to complete, and, in a technical industry increasingly becoming more component-based and service-oriented, are less meaningful, especially with true enterprise systems. Would the State please consider removal of the Function Point Count checklist item for this RFP?
- a) **The State agrees to remove the Function Point Count checklist item for the RFP.**
54. Attachment D, K.6.1.2 and other implementation like requirements - The following requirement seems to be intended for the implementation scope and not for the scope of this procurement "K.6.1.2. Re-engineer and demonstrate how common business functions will work in the Enterprise System environment; and re-engineer all OKDHS business functions that are not common to be efficient, standardized, and meet all federal and State of Oklahoma rules and regulations". Please confirm that this requirement is not in scope for the current RFP and would be a requirement for the subsequent Implementation work.
- a) **This requirement is not in the scope of the RFP and will not be considered.**
55. Attachment 2 - Please confirm that the in scope deliverables for this solicitation and the corresponding pricing is limited to the Requirements/Deliverables listed in the relevant sections under F. Solicitation Primary Specifications – F4, F6, F8, F12, F17, F19, F21, and F23.
- a) **Attachment 2 is asking the bidders to break their costs associated with this RFP into 3 categories (A1) Hardware, (A2) Software and (A3) Deliverables total. The bidders should show their total costs by category associated with performing what has been requested in this RFP. All anticipated costs should be covered in these 3 categories. All sections in F that have an associated cost should be reflected in one of the Attachment 2 categories.**
56. Attachment 2, F.2 - Please clarify how the 'Project Management Requirements' (and associated deliverables) listed in Section F.2 should be priced as the Price Summary Chart (A3) does not have a line item for this set of deliverables.
- a) **Attachment 2 has been modified to include "Project Management" deliverables. Please utilize the Revised Attachment 2 for the submission.**
57. Attachment E, H.6.7 - The instructions for Attachment E (in Section H.6.7) asks Bidders to include marketing materials at the module level. Bidders will likely have marketing material at the solution level that would span many, if not all, modules. Would the State consider allowing Bidders to centralize the marketing materials in the General module section OR create a separate section for all marketing materials?
- a) **The State will allow the centralization of marketing materials at the end of the Business Proposal section H.6. However, for consideration, references to the marketing materials must be clearly identified in Attachment E at the module level.**
58. G.5.4.12 - In G.5.4.12, the State has asked Bidders to provide a laptop for a period of 30 days with the Enterprise Software Solution loaded on it. As it is not feasible for a fully functioning Enterprise Human Services System to be reliably loaded onto a single laptop, can the state please confirm that the State will accept a laptop that has been configured to access a secure demo environment of the Enterprise Software Solution. Alternatively, would the State accept a clickable offline demo of the Solution to allow it to be loaded on a single laptop?
- a) **The State will accept access to a secure demo environment that contains a copy of the proposed solution, provided adequate support from the vendor is provided to ensure access to the solution environment. A clickable offline demo will not be acceptable.**
59. D.1.1.1 - Per the State's direction in Section D.1.1.1 of providing references for experience in implementing projects of similar nature and/or size, we assume that the State is seeking callable references that are U.S. based only, given the unique regulatory and legal environments that exist within the U.S. versus international references. For example, U.S. child support Federal regulations (45 CFR) include more robust establishment and IV-A recovery requirements than what non U.S. projects may require. Please confirm we should provide U.S. references to meet this requirement.
- a) **The State will not restrict references to U.S. References only, provided the State can easily access the references and obtain the necessary information to complete the review of this bid. In the event the bidder provides an international reference the contact person must be conversant in the English language.**
60. Based on the state's approach to select an implementation partner in the future as well as the objective and goals outlined in C.5.3.4 (to better leverage partners), the Supplier believes that the State intends to select a software product that has a robust ecosystem of implementation partners. As such, we did not see mandatory or rated criteria for demonstrating the Supplier's ecosystem of partners and would like to inquire about the level of importance that the State is placing on this criteria and if important, where in the response Suppliers would be rated on this criteria.
- a) **As stated in objective C.5.3.4, the goal of this project is to improve access to services. The focus of the RFP is to find the solution that best improves access to services.**

Description of Amendment - continuing

61. As part of the pricing proposal, the State has asked for price quotes each for Hardware, Software and Deliverables. Some of the deliverables identified in Section F of the RFP only comprise of supply of Software (for example: F.25, Technical – Web Portal Deliverables). Is it the state's intention to provide the cost of Software both as part of the deliverable Price quote and the Software price quote?
- a) **The State is confident that all costs associated with this RFP should fall within one of the three categories found in the Revised Attachment 2.**
62. How many total concurrent users (Internal and external) will need access to the OK Benefits system on a yearly basis?
- a) **It is estimated at 12,000.**
63. How many case workers will need access to case management capabilities?
- a) **A total of 5,500 will need access to case management capabilities.**
64. How many internal employees will need access to imaging technology when processing paper forms?
- a) **3,500 staff**
65. In reference to Attachment J that is to be completed, there are two columns "Description" and "Units". Can the State clarify what they would like us to provide within each of these columns? We will have already provided a product module description and an overview on how to address the individual requirements captured in J with section H.6.7. What do you want the Description column to entail/provide in addition to the product descriptions we have already listed in H.6.7? Also, what does the Unit column represent? Unit of measure, number of software/product units? Other?
- a) **Attachment J is the list of all software proposed in the bid. Column A is the reference to the deliverables fulfilled in the RFP by the software. Column B is the name of the software. Column C is whether the software fulfills the deliverable listed out of the box, with configuration, or requires modification (customization). Column D is the Description that describes what the software does in the solution. Column E is the Manufacturer of the software. Column F is the Units or number of licenses/occurrences of the software that are required to meet the deliverable.**
66. Requirements F.22.30 and F.22.34 indicate that a SIEM should be part of the solution. Is there an existing enterprise-wide automated security and audit logging and analysis capability in place to integrate with our solution? If so, could the State please elaborate?
- a) **Since the writing of the RFP the State has deployed the Oklahoma SIEM, Symantec SSIM**
67. In Attachment 2, Tab A3-Deliverables, it appears the formulas in columns J and K which read "10% Holdback" and "Net of Holdback" respectively, are inverted. Under "10% Holdback" the current formula calculates 90% of the Deliverable Price in Column I, and then the "Net of Holdback" is the other 10%. Can the State confirm the formulas or perhaps headings (in J3 and K3) should be reversed?
- a) **The headings in columns J3 and K3 should be reversed and have been corrected in the Revised Attachment 2.**
68. As part of Section M Checklist, it is requested that Bidders provide responses on the feasibility of the proposed project management, business, technical, and financial solutions. Given that there are no specific RFP requirements within Section H and to help ensure consistency in the items addressed amongst the various bids, would the state please provide guidance regarding what should be addressed as part of these feasibility responses?
- a) **The state has completed a feasibility study and it is not necessary for the bidders to respond to this requirement.**
69. Per H.5.4 and M.3, Bidders are asked to provide verifiable evidence of past performance. As part of this evidence, Bidders are asked to provide samples of work for each of the past performance references. In many cases, client confidentiality and client ownership of work products restricts a Bidder's ability to provide these samples. Would the State consider removing requirement H.5.4.8 c as a Bidder's callable references could talk to the quality of work? If the requirement cannot be removed, could the State please advise Bidders on how to handle this situation where it exists?
- a) **This requirement is critical for the State to verify the capability and performance of the bidders to ensure they will be able to deliver what has been proposed in the bid. The State will not remove the requirement.**
70. The RFP references both Attachment L and Attachment N when referencing the Escrow Agreement. The actual Escrow Agreement in the RFP is labeled as Attachment L. Please confirm that the Escrow Agreement in Attachment L is the correct Escrow Agreement and any reference to Attachment N should be Attachment L instead.
- a) **The State confirms that the Escrow Agreement is in Attachment L.**
71. Should clarifications be required only for the responses released after the 2/19/15 Q&A submittal deadline, may Bidders submit clarifying questions within 1-2 business days of the release of the State response? This process will help ensure questions are fully answered and clarified for the vendor community.
- a) **The State will not respond to further questions past the General Questions deadline as outlined in the solicitation. The General Questions period ended as of February 23, 2015 at 3:00PM Central Time. The responses to all questions are final with the issuance of Amendment 4.**
72. Can the State elaborate on its Predictive Dialing/IVR/CTI Requirement (J.2.5.26), and identify the characteristics of its existing predictive dialing solution?
- a) **The State currently uses the "Avaya Voice Portal Management Solution v5.1.0.3.0502". The current product used by the State has many robust functions and features. The State would consider an alternative it meets or exceeds the current system.**
73. Will the Contractor awarded this solicitation also be allow to bid on the follow up Implementation RFP(s)? Regarding Section B.25, are these costs negotiable to the mutual benefit of both parties? The assumption is that these costs are an attempt to keep the project on track, but penalties can also cause added cost contingencies or other concerns, e.g. in Section B.25.5.2. What if Key Staff become ill, die or leave the company. Is the Contractor still to be penalized?
- a) **The intent of the State is to allow open competition for bidding on the next RFP for System Integration services to include any vendor that is part of this software RFP award.**
- Regarding the penalties in B.25 the bidder is correct in assuming that the State wishes to keep the project on track and to achieve a quick success and outcomes. The State believes the bidder selected from the RFP bidding process will work diligently with the State to avoid these situations but the State needs some level of assurances. The penalty for key staffing is there to give the bidders incentive to bid the actual staff that will work on the project and not bid their best resources and then change resources when the project starts. The penalty is also an incentive for the bidder who is selected to keep the staff on the project throughout the project duration. There will be situations that are totally out of the control of the bidder as mentioned in the question and the State has no intentions of penalizing a bidder for those situations.**
74. Based on discrepancies between M Checklist and actual Attachment names, can an updated M Checklist be distributed? The Escrow Agreement and the Additional Deliverables Chart discrepancies were addressed previously in the General Q&A. Please confirm the

Description of Amendment - continuing

following: --Enterprise Architecture Methodology listed in M.4 Part II-Business Proposal=Attachment G. Enterprise Architecture Reference Chart-Methodology Chart -- Attachment E. Business Deliverables and Requirements Chart, M.4. Part II - Business Proposal = Attachment D, Business Deliverables Requirements Chart -- Attachment F. Business Solution Features and Functions Chart, M.4. Part II - Business Proposal = Attachment E, Business Solution Features and Functions Chart -- Attachment H. Technical SOA Reference Chart, M.5. Part III - Technical Proposal = Attachment F, Technical SOA Reference Chart -- Attachment I is not included on Checklist = Attachment I Technical Solution Features and Functions Chart -- Attachment J. Technical Deliverables and Requirements Chart, M.5. Part III - Technical Proposal = Attachment H (all tabs except the first one – General Deliverables) -- Attachment K. Technical Solution Features and Functions Chart, M.5. Part III - Technical Proposal = Attachment I Technical Solution Features and Functions Chart -- Attachment L, Software Proposal Solution Chart, M.5. Part III - Technical Proposal = Attachment J Software Proposal Solution Chart

- a) **No, Section H.7.6.2 references the actual use of this Attachment G. The Checklist references that the Bidder shall supply your Enterprise Architecture Methodology; yes; yes; yes; yes; yes; yes; yes**

Below is an updated list of Attachments referenced in Section M. – Checklist. This is only a list of the attachments, all other details of Section M. – Checklist still apply.

M Checklist – Attachment (only) Update

M.1. Instruction to Supplier

No attachments for reference

M.2. Part A – Administrative Proposal

Attachment N = Attachment L, Escrow Agreement

M.3. Part 1 – Project Management Proposal

Attachment A = Attachment A, Bidder’s References

Attachment B = Attachment B, Project Key Personnel Roster

Attachment C = Attachment C, Project Management Requirements/Deliverables Chart

Attachment M = Attachment K, Additional Deliverable Chart

M.4. Part II – Business Proposal

Attachment E = Attachment D, Business Deliverables/Requirements Chart

Attachment M = Attachment K, Additional Deliverable Chart

Attachment F = Attachment E, Business Solutions Features and Functions Chart

M.5. Part III – Technical Proposal

Attachment H = Attachment F, Technical SOA Reference Chart

Attachment J = Attachment H, Technical Deliverables/Requirements Chart (all tabs minus General)

Attachment M = Attachment K, Additional Deliverable Chart

Attachment K = Attachment I, Technical Solutions Features and Functions Chart

Attachment L = Attachment J, Software Proposal Solution Chart

M.6. Part IV – Accessibility Compliance

Attachment L = Attachment J, Software Proposal Solution Chart

M.7. Part V – Financial Proposal

Attachment 1 = Attachment 1, Resource Hourly Rate Chart

Attachment 2 = Attachment 2, Price Summary Chart

- b. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

Supplier Company Name (**PRINT**) _____
Date

Authorized Representative Name (**PRINT**) _____
Title Authorized Representative Signature