



Questions/Responses #1
TORFP #F50B3400073
Oversight Program Support Services (OPSS)
August 28, 2013

The following questions for the above referenced TORFP were received by e-mail and are answered and posted for all prospective Offerors. The statements and interpretations contained in the following responses to questions are not binding to the State unless the TORFP is expressly amended. Nothing in the State's response to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the State of any statement or interpretation on the part of the Offeror asking the question.

1. Question: Is the Pre-proposal conference mandatory?

Response: No

2. Question: In reference to the following paragraph in TORFP Section 1.5:

The selected TO Contractor and any subcontractor(s) shall not be eligible for award to a contract or task order supporting a Major Information Technology Development Project (MITDP), as defined by DoIT, for the duration of the TO Agreement. Further, the selected TO Contractor and any subcontractor(s) shall not be eligible for award to ANY contract resulting from a solicitation that the TO Contractor personnel reviewed and/or commented on via the DoIT oversight process, as required by this TORFP.

- a. Are Offerors who worked on past (now expired) contracts that supported a current MITDP eligible for this task order award?

Response: No, it would be a conflict of interest. The TO Contractor cannot perform oversight on a project where the TO Contractor was or is an MITDP stakeholder.

- b. Are Offerors with current contracts that support MITDPs eligible for this task order award?

Response: Same response as #2a above.

- c. Are Offerors with past or present contracts related to non-MITDP projects eligible for this task order award?

Response: Yes.

- d. Will DoIT identify which TORFPs, RFPs, and contracts support MITDPs?

Response: Yes. Prospective Offerors may identify to the Procurement Officer any specific State solicitations or contracts involving, or of interest to, the prospective Offeror. DoIT will advise that Offeror whether identified solicitations or contracts support MITDPs.

- e. What happens if, after this task order is awarded, a project where the awardee was a stakeholder becomes designated as an MITDP?

Response: DoIT would assign oversight of that MITDP to resources other than those provided by the TO Contractor.

3. Is there an incumbent currently providing these services?

Response: Yes.

4. If yes, who is the current incumbent?

Response: Details for the current OPSS task order can be found at the web page below, search task order F50B1400001.

<http://doit.maryland.gov/contracts/Pages/CATSITORFPStatus.aspx>

5. Is the incumbent eligible for award of this task order?

Response: Yes.

6. Will there be time allowed for transition from the incumbent to a new awardee?

Response: Yes, award for this task order is estimated to occur two to three months before the current task order expires. The current task order expires May 31, 2014.

7. TORFP Section 3.2.1.B states that “DoIT requires a core team be on-site at the outset of the TO Agreement, consisting of one TO-PRM, plus up to two TO-PMs”. What is the anticipated start date for the resources once the task order is awarded?

Response: The core team will start as soon as possible after task order award.

8. In TORFP Attachment 4, for the TO Program Manager, it requires “Five years’ experience performing government IT quality assurance program management”. It also requires “Two years’ experience supervising multiple project managers engaged primarily in government IT quality Assurance.” However in TORFP Section 2.5, it does not mention “government”. Please clarify.

Response: TORFP Section 2.5 is correct; Attachment #4 is wrong. Candidates for the TO-PRM role need not have government experience. A TORFP Amendment #1, issued on August 21, 2013, corrects this error in Attachment #4.

9. Why is this service being re-bid at this time?

Response: To replace the current task order that will expire on May 31, 2014.

10. The State is requesting both hourly and annual fixed labor rates for each resource / labor category proposed. Are annual rates requested because these are management or executive level positions?

Response: The State instituted the annual rate as a professional salary concept. Resources may have to work some extra hours as needed to meet milestones and deliverable deadlines. Extra hours should not be the norm.

11. Is it accurate that resources may have to work over 160 hours in a given month, but not receive pay for hours exceeding 160? What is the expectation of average hours worked per resource?

Response: See #10 above

12. Why are annual fixed labor rates capped at the hourly labor rate x 1920?

Response: The cap fosters DoIT's expectation that proposed fixed annual labor rates be at a discount compared to the cost annually of hourly labor rates.

13. Would the State consider removing or raising this cap?

Response: No.

14. Why do Attachments 1 and 1A request labor rates only once for the Project Manager (TO-PM) labor category when DoIT is requesting resumes (Attachment 4) and references (TORFP Section 3.2.1 C) for two TO-PMs for the core team?

Response: The same labor rate shall apply to all Project Manager resources.

15. What is the probability and expected time frames that DoIT may request additional resources from the Master Contractor under this award?

Response: The probability is high, in the short term after award, that DoIT will issue work orders for additional resources beyond the core team.

16. Would these additional resources most likely be Project Managers or other positions? If other, which positions are expected to be needed?

Response: Beyond the core team, additional resources are likely to be both Project Managers and other labor categories. Offerors should review TORFP Section 2.3 "Oversight Support Duties and Responsibilities" to determine an appropriate number and variety of other CAT+ labor categories to propose. Within Section 2.3, Sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.6 historically are the most consistently active and ongoing scopes of work.

END DOCUMENT



Questions/Answers Volume 2*
TORFP #F50B3400073
Oversight Program Support Services (OPSS)
September 11, 2013

The following questions for the above referenced TORFP were received in writing and are answered and issued to all CATS+ master contractors in Functional Area (FA) 10. The statements and interpretations contained in the following responses to questions are not binding to the State unless the TORFP is expressly amended. Nothing in the State's response to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the State of any statement or interpretation on the part of the Offeror asking the question.

*** Note - This Q&A Volume 2 supersedes the prior volume for this TORFP; Offerors should review all Q&A herein because some answers have been updated.**

1. Was the pre-proposal conference mandatory?

Response: No, after the conference a summary and attendee list was distributed to FA 10.

2. In reference to the following paragraph in TORFP Section 1.5:

The selected TO Contractor and any subcontractor(s) shall not be eligible for award to a contract or task order supporting a Major Information Technology Development Project (MITDP), as defined by DoIT, for the duration of the TO Agreement. Further, the selected TO Contractor and any subcontractor(s) shall not be eligible for award to ANY contract resulting from a solicitation that the TO Contractor personnel reviewed and/or commented on via the DoIT oversight process, as required by this TORFP.

- a. Are Offerors with past or present contracts supporting an MITDP eligible for this task order award?

Response: Offerors with past or present contracts supporting MITDPs are not precluded from award. However, depending on factors such as the roles and responsibilities of Offeror personnel on such MITDP/s, and MITDP/s expiration dates, an Offeror may not be able to perform MITDP oversight for conflict of interest reasons. The inability to perform oversight on one or more MITDPs may be a weakening factor in the technical evaluation.

- b. Can DoIT provide a list of current MITDPs?

Response: Yes, the list is posted on DoIT's web site at:

<http://doit.maryland.gov/policies/Documents/pmo/mitdpsopen.pdf>.

- c. What if all MITDPs for which an Offeror has or had supporting contracts are scheduled to complete by the current oversight contract expiration? Will the Offeror's MITDP contract history still be a weakening factor in the technical evaluation?

Response: No.

- d. Do past or present contracts supporting non-MITDP projects or other work unrelated to MITDPs affect an Offeror's ability to perform MITDP oversight?

Response: No.

- e. Will DoIT identify which State contracts support MITDPs?

Response: Yes. Upon request, the Procurement Officer will advise whether a specific solicitation or contract supports an MITDP. Requestors must identify the contracting agency and the contract name and number.

- f. What happens if, after this task order is awarded, a project where the awardee has or had a supporting contract becomes designated as an MITDP?

Response: DoIT would assign oversight of that MITDP to resources other than those provided by the TO Contractor.

- 3. Is there a current OPSS contract? If yes, what are the details?

Response: Public information on the current OPSS task order can be found at the web page below, search for task order F50B1400001.

<http://doit.maryland.gov/contracts/Pages/CATSIITORFPStatus.aspx>

- 4. Is the incumbent eligible for award of this task order?

Response: DoIT will not comment on specific CATS+ master contractors.

- 5. Will there be time allowed for transition from the incumbent to a new awardee?

Response: Yes, award for this task order is planned in time to allow for smooth transition ahead of the current task order expiration. The current task order expires May 31, 2014.

- 6. TORFP Section 3.2.1.B states that "DoIT requires a core team be on-site at the outset of the TO Agreement, consisting of one TO-PRM, plus up to two TO-PMs". What is the anticipated start date for the resources once the task order is awarded?

Response: The core team will start as soon as possible after task order award.

7. In TORFP Attachment 4, for the TO Program Manager, it requires “Five years’ experience performing government IT quality assurance program management”. It also requires “Two years’ experience supervising multiple project managers engaged primarily in government IT quality Assurance.” However in TORFP Section 2.5, it does not mention “government”. Please clarify.

Response: TORFP Section 2.5 is correct; Attachment #4 is wrong. Candidates for the TO-PRM role need not have government experience. A TORFP Amendment #1, issued on August 21, 2013, corrects this error in Attachment #4.

8. Why is this service being re-bid at this time?

Response: To replace the current task order that will expire on May 31, 2014.

9. The State is requesting both hourly and annual fixed labor rates for each resource / labor category proposed. Are annual rates requested because these are management or executive level positions?

Response: The State instituted the annual rate as a professional salary concept. Resources may have to work some extra hours as needed to meet milestones and deliverable deadlines. Extra hours should not be the norm.

10. Is it accurate that resources may have to work over 160 hours in a given month, but not receive pay for hours exceeding 160? What is the expectation of average hours worked per resource?

Response: See Q&A #9 above

11. Why are annual fixed labor rates capped at the hourly labor rate x 1,920?

Response: The cap fosters DoIT’s expectation that proposed fixed annual labor rates be at a discount compared to the cost annually of hourly labor rates.

12. Would the State consider removing or raising this cap?

Response: No.

13. Why do Attachments 1 and 1A request labor rates only once for the Project Manager (TO-PM) labor category when DoIT is requesting resumes (Attachment 4) and references (TORFP Section 3.2.1 C) for two TO-PMs for the core team?

Response: The same labor rate shall apply to all TO-PMs.

14. What is the probability and expected time frames that DoIT may request additional resources beyond the core team from the awarded TO Contractor?

Response: DoIT is likely to issue work orders for additional resources beyond the core team in the

short term after the current oversight task order expires.

15. Would these additional resources most likely be Project Managers or other positions? If other, which positions are expected to be needed?

Response: Beyond the core team, additional resources are likely to be both Project Managers and other labor categories. Offerors should review TORFP Section 2.3 “Oversight Support Duties and Responsibilities” to determine an appropriate number and variety of other CAT+ labor categories to propose. Within Section 2.3, Sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.6 historically are the most consistently active and ongoing scopes of work.

16. Would DoIT consider extending the proposal due date for the following reasons?

- a. Allow adequate time for quality candidate recruitment ahead of proposal closing;
- b. Aid retention of proposed candidates between proposal closing and task order award;
- c. Allow adequate time to incorporate the Q&A in proposals.

Response: Yes, an Amendment #2 was issued September 9, 2013 that extends the proposal closing date to Tuesday, October 22, 2013, at 2PM local time.

17. If a proposed candidate withdraws after the proposal due date but before award, can the Offeror propose a substitute candidate?

Response: No.

18. Is it expected that the TO-PRM and/or the TO-PMs work at DoIT or other State facilities or will they be working from the TO Contractor’s office?

Response: The core team of the TO-PRM and up to two TO-PMs shall be based at DoIT in Annapolis. Additional TO-PM resources beyond the core team would also be based primarily in Annapolis. On occasion, resources may work on a temporary basis at other State agency locations. Proposed other resources, see TORFP Section 3.2.1.D, may be expected to work at the TO Contractor’s location.

19. Would DoIT consider multiple awards on this TORFP to address potential organizational conflict of interest on a MITDP identified after award?

Response: No, see Q&A # 2f above.

20. Is there an anticipated percent MBE performance goal for work orders under this task order?

Response: Percent MBE performance goals will be set as appropriate for each individual work order.

21. Is it anticipated that MBE sub-goals will apply for work orders?

Response: MBE sub-goals may apply to work orders.

22. Do any or all of the specified Offeror Company Minimum Qualifications (TORFP Section 2.6) apply to proposed subcontractors?

Response: Proposed subcontractor company experience counts toward the minimum qualifications.

23. Do all TORFP subcontractors need to be identified at the time of proposal submittal or can additional subcontractors be submitted after contract award?

Response: To fulfill future work orders, the TO Contractor will be allowed to propose subcontractors not previously identified in response to the TORFP.

24. How many resources are working on the current contract and what are the associated labor categories other than the core team?

Response: The current task order allows up to 10 resources; the number of actual resources has varied but at present is near the limit. DoIT will not disclose the number and variety of labor categories in the current TO Contractor's accepted technical proposal. See Q&A #15 above for guidance on proposing labor categories beyond the core team.

25. Is the awarded TO Contractor precluded from proposing on any future solicitations issued through CATS+ for the duration of the oversight task order period?

Response: See Q&A #2 above.

26. Would DoIT consider allowing "curtaining off" of the specific resources who review solicitations so that the TO Contractor is eligible for award on those solicitations?

Response: No, the appearance of a conflict of interest would still exist at the company level.

27. Is there a preferred number of references for company and proposed personnel experience?

Response: Per TORFP Sections 2.5 and 2.6, the purpose of references is to verify that proposed personnel and the Offeror's company have the minimum work and contract experience respectively. The number of references provided depends on how many it takes to verify the length and nature of the work / contract experience that meets minimum qualifications. For example, a proposed TO-PM who worked in IT as a PM since 2003 for the same company may only need one reference to verify that experience. A proposed TO-PM who worked at three companies since 2003 may need three verifying references.

28. In Attachment 1 and 1a, companies are requested to provide labor rates for additional proposed labor categories. Will the TO Contractor be bound to these proposed rates or will there be flexibility based on the quality and experience of available resources?

Response: The TO Contractor will be bound by the proposed labor rates.

29. Relative to TORFP Section 2.6, bullet #2, can you provide added clarification and / or specific types of IT quality assurance meant by the phrase "engaged primarily in IT quality assurance"?

Response: Refer to TORFP Section 2.3 "Oversight Support Duties and Responsibilities" for the most relevant types of IT quality assurance.

30. If the TO Contractor is a certified MBE, will that count toward the MBE goal on future work orders?

Response: No, MBE goals can only be satisfied through sub-contracting with other certified MBEs.

31. Would an Offeror's company experience as a subcontractor count toward the minimum qualifications required in TORFP Section 2.6?

Response: See Q&A #22 above.

32. Per TORFP Section 1.3, should we incorporate Attachment 4 and copies of valid PMP certifications within our technical proposal document or provide as separate attachments?

Response: Either way is acceptable.

33. Per TORFP Section 2.1, can an Offeror submit either 1 or 2 TO-PM candidates and be responsive?

Response: No, Offerors must propose one candidate for each of the three core team resources. Resumes (Attachment 4) for one TO-PRM and two TO-PM candidates are required (three resumes total).

34. Will DoIT consider reducing the minimum required company experience (TORFP Section 2.6) from five years to two or three years for the benefit of newer companies?

Response: No, the required minimum qualifications are consistent with the State's risk-related need for a highly experienced TO Contractor to help oversee the State's MITDP portfolio.

35. Regarding TORFP Attachment 1 and 1A, what guidance can you provide on labor rates given that "off-site" rates normally exceed "on-site" rates because of overhead expenses?

Response: In formulating on-site and off-site labor rates, Offerors are only limited by: 1) the maximums proposed at the CATS+ master contract level; 2) the TORFP requirement that on-site rates be equal to or lower than off-site rates; and 3) the TORFP requirement that fixed annual rates not exceed corresponding hourly rates multiplied by 1,920.

END DOCUMENT



Questions/Answers Volume 3*
TORFP #F50B3400073
Oversight Program Support Services (OPSS)
October 11, 2013

The following questions for the above referenced TORFP were received in writing and are answered and issued to all CATS+ master contractors in Functional Area (FA) 10. The statements and interpretations contained in the following responses to questions are not binding to the State unless the TORFP is expressly amended. Nothing in the State's response to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the State of any statement or interpretation on the part of the Offeror asking the question.

*** Note - This Q&A Volume 3 contains all new questions received since issuance of Q&A Volume 2.**

1. Please define the incumbent's type of work performed and how many resources were used.

Response: See Q&A Volume 2, questions #3 and #24.

2. What is the anticipated award date?

Response: See Q&A Volume 2, question #5.

3. Has funding been secured?

Response: This is not relevant to proposal preparation.

4. After award, if a work order is issued for additional personnel, how much time will the contractor have to supply the personnel?

Response: The time frame for fulfilling any given work order will be described in the individual work order. Contractors will be allowed reasonable time to on-board additional on-site TO-PMs. Work orders for off-site services, for example document reviews, typically will have time frames for work start-up, deliverables and milestones.

5. Who determines onsite and offsite pricing?

Response: The Offeror. See Q&A Volume 2, question #35.

6. For contractor past performance, in lieu of a PMI certification, can relevant years of past work experience be used instead?

Response: No, PMI certification is required because DoIT applies PMI standards for oversight.

7. Please clarify what is being requested for the sample work order for the technical response (Page 13).

Response: No further clarification is required.

8. Please clarify on the resource requirement for the program manager. On Attachment 4 it indicates PMP Certification preferred; but on page 11, Section 2.5 of the TORP, minimum qualification PMP certification. Will candidates be rejected if they are not PMP Certified?

Response: Yes, lack of PMI certification as a PMP will cause candidate rejection for failure to meet TORFP minimum qualifications. The “preferred” statement is from the master contract labor category minimum qualifications, the TORFP minimum qualifications are stricter and take precedence.

9. Is the PMP certification acceptable if it was obtained in a foreign country?

Response: Yes.

10. RE: TORFP Section 1.4 Oral Presentations, Page 5. If the Offeror is required to make an oral presentation to State representatives that may require presentation slides what is the subject matter to be discussed and presented in the presentation? How much time will the contractor have to prepare for the oral presentation and produce presentation material?

Response: If the State decides to hold orals, Offerors will provide an overview and highlight their proposed solution to the TORFP scope of work. Proposed TO-PRM and TO-PM candidates may need to attend to describe their experience and qualifications. The State may ask questions of the Offeror and candidates. Notice of orals normally is given at least two weeks in advance.

11. Would an Offeror’s proposal be weakened if the Offeror had another proposal under evaluation by the State to perform MITDP support work?

Response: Having another proposal under evaluation by the State would not weaken a proposal to this TORFP. A proposal to this TORFP would be weakened if the Offeror was awarded an MITDP supporting contract before the award for this TORFP. If an Offeror is awarded an MITDP supporting contract after this TORFP award, the Offeror would not be permitted to perform oversight on that MITDP. An Offeror’s inability to perform oversight work on MITDPs would weaken its proposal. See Q&A Volume 2, question #2a.

END DOCUMENT