



**Question and Answer No. 1
Request for Proposals (RFP)
Central Collections Unit (CCU)
Debt Collection Information System (DCIS)
RFP # F50B2400052**

Ladies/Gentlemen:

This list of questions and responses is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above referenced RFP. The statements and interpretations contained in the following responses to questions by potential Offerors are not binding to the State, unless an addendum expressly amends the RFP. 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 vendor.

1. Although it is stated in the RFP that no extensions will be granted will the State consider a one week extension? We are asking for a one week extension based on when final questions are due July 5th. We believe the state will need 2 to 4 days to read and respond to final questions. This leaves on 3 to 4 days for offerors to review answers and then alter, produce, and deliver their proposal to the State. If the State if not will to extend the due date would you be alternatively willing to change the final question due date to be earlier say Friday June 29th, 3 days after the pre-bid conference?

Response: The State will amend the Proposal Due Date from July 12, 2012, 2:00 PM, Local Time to July 19, 2012, 2:00 PM, Local Time. Please see Amendment #1.

2. Would the State be able to provide estimated dates for the high-level sequence of dates listed in section 1.1.11, specifically for event #s 6, 7, 8, , and 10?

Response: For Event #6, Offeror Demonstrations, the estimated timeframe, as stated in Section 1.14.1 will be approximately one month after proposal receipt. Event #7 cannot be estimated until after receipt of proposals. Events #8-10 will be addressed with the successful Offeror.

3. For demonstration requirement 1.14.2 bullet #4, will the State be providing scripts for each offeror to follow and demonstrate or is it up to each offeror to create their own scenario's and scripts? If it is the latter, what methodology will be used to normalize the evaluations for demonstrations that may not materially equal in content?

Response: The State expects the Offeror to provide a demonstration based on a subset of specific requirements that will be provided to the Offeror by the State when scheduling the demonstration. NOTE: Scheduling and identification of the specific requirements subset will not occur until after the proposal closes.

4. For demonstration requirement 1.14.2 bullet #5, is it the States intent to have the offeror review each requirement in the RFP and RFP Attachment 1, or a material subset that the State

determines are the most important? If the requirement is based on a 3rd party application, is it required for the 3rd party to show its product to demonstrate their portion of the requirements?

Response: As stated in the response to Question #3, the State will provide a material subset of the total requirements provided in Attachment I.1 Functional and Technical Requirements that it will expect the Offeror to demonstrate when scheduling the demonstration. Third party software proposed by the Offeror and demonstrated to the State must also be “out-of-the-box” and included during the demonstration if proposed and priced by the Offeror as part of their total solution.

5. Does the MD CCU intend to continue to use the current IVR and predictive dialer or for the offeror to propose an integrated IVR and dialer?
 - a. If the CCU intends to have the offeror provide the IVR and dialer, is that functionality part of the evaluation phase or the implementation/production phase of this project? With costs being accounted for in the appropriate worksheet.

Response: The IVR and predictive dialer are not requirements of this RFP. Any integration with existing hardware or software or any separately procured product (see Section 1.1.6) will be addressed by the State under future solicitations.

6. Is it the intent of the State to integrate HotDocs to the COTS product to generate legal forms?

Response: The generation of legal forms is not a requirement of this solicitation.

7. Section 2.8.1 COTS fit-Gap Analysis indicates the offeror will work with the State to perform the analysis. For pricing purposes can the State quantify the involvement in time and duration of the offeror, as well as indicated where that cost would be accounted for in the pricing template? Or, will the Fit-Gap Analysis be handled as a separate task order with a separate NTP?

Response: Support for the COTS Fit-Gap Analysis (timing and requested hours) will be provided by the State through a Notice to Proceed (NTP) as stated under Deliverable 2.14.12. Pricing will be based on labor rates proposed by the Offeror in Table K of Attachment E.

8. It is assumed the State will be providing a test database as described in 2.14.14 as an extract from the current system? Is this a correct assumption? Is yes, what format(s) can the state provide the test database file in? If no, please indicate how the offeror would provide a test database file?

Response: The Offeror will be responsible for delivering and installing a test database, loaded by the Offeror, with sufficient test data as described in Section 2.5.3 of the RFP. The State expects the Offeror to include as part of their proposal, how the test database will be loaded and all formats required.

9. Can the State confirm that the Offeror is to provide test map, test cases, and test plans for only the technical requirements in Attachment I that is proposed for the evaluation period and not all requirements within Attachment I as indicated in Section 2.14.8? It is our understanding that many of the integrations with 3rd party systems will occur during the implementation phase of this procurement, after a 2ndRFP has been released and awarded. Therefore making it impossible to create test plans for those requirements during the evaluation phase.

Response: The Offeror is to provide test cases and test plans for all requirements specified as satisfied by the Offeror in their proposal response for Attachment I.1 Functional and Technical Requirements. Offerors are required to submit test plans and test cases for all requirements that the Offeror marks as being satisfied by the out-of-the-box COTS product and all requirements that the Offeror marks as being satisfied by configuration of the COTS product. Test plans and test cases for Acceptance Testing are

not required for any requirement that the Offeror marks as requiring customization or that is not provided by the Offeror's solution.

10. Due to the complex nature of the project and the Evaluation vs. Implementation phases of the project (being handled by 2 distinct RFPs) will the State clarify the following:
- The evaluation phase is to only evaluate and determine if the core COTS product suits and meets the States need and should be priced as the core COTS product only and not the full integration of other 3rd party software?
 - How many and what type, if any interfaces with external systems are associated with the evaluation phase?
 - How many and what type of interfaces will be required for the implementation/production phase?
 - If third party products are proposed as part of the total solution, is the integration into the core system to demonstrate ability to meet requirements in Attachment I required for the evaluation phase? Based on the answer can the State indicate where the pricing for the integration of 3rd party products be accounted for (evaluation vs. production)?

Response: The Offeror will make the determination as to whether third party software is included as part of their overall COTS solution or listed as recommended software and not included in the proposed price. Attachment T will indicate whether the Offeror has included the software as part of their solution and priced the software in their proposal. The State will not test interfaces with external systems under this solicitation. As stated in Section 1.1.6 of the RFP, all integration and interface services will be performed under a separate implementer solicitation. Integration and interface requirements are not part of this solicitation.

11. With an aggressive timeline from final questions and proposals due, would the State accept USB Flash Drives as the electronic submissions instead the required CD's. This allows for greater flexibility of changes and ease of production?

Response: The State will amend Section 1.10, Section 3.2.3, and Section 3.4.2 to include USB Flash Drives, in addition to CDs, as acceptable forms of electronic media. Please see Amendment #1.

12. Can the State make an overall clarification what is to be provided in the evaluation vs. production phase of the RFP and pricing? Since this RFP refers to a future RFP, it is not clear what the clear line of delineation is between what is expected to be delivered in respect to Attachment I, interfaces, and 3rd party integrations from Evaluation vs. Production phases.

Response: Section 1.1 of the RFP defines the State's expected purchase. The pricing of the separate phases of this solicitation is to be proposed using the tables within Attachment E with only the software indicated in Attachment T as included in the pricing for the Evaluation and Production phases. As stated in Section 1.1.6 of the RFP, all integration and interface services will be performed under a separate implementer solicitation. Integration and interface requirements are not part of this solicitation.

13. Can the state clarify whether they want professional service costs accounted for in evaluation and production worksheets or will that be handled through separate task orders? Examples of these professional services would be the creation of interfaces to external systems, integration or 3rd party products into the COTS product, and Fit-Gap analysis.

Response: Professional service costs are not to be included in the Offeror's response. See answer to Question #7 regarding the COTS Fit-Gap Analysis pricing and the answer to Question #10 for pricing of interface and integration services.