



State of Maryland
Department of Information Technology

LARRY HOGAN
Governor

BOYD K. RUTHERFORD
Lieutenant Governor

MICHAEL LEAHY
Acting Secretary

Amendment #1
TORFP

Independent Verification and Validation (IV&V) – MD THINK
#F50B8400008
November 22, 2017

Ladies/Gentlemen:

Amendment #1 is being issued to amend and clarify certain information contained in the above referenced TORFP. All information contained herein is binding on all Offerors who respond to this TORFP. Specific parts of the TORFP have been amended. The following changes/additions are listed below; new language has been double underlined and marked in bold (i.e., word) and language deleted has been marked with a strikeout (i.e., ~~word~~).

1. Revise the Key Information Summary Sheet of the TORFP as follows:

TO Procurement Officer:	Matthew Miekler Gayle Mealy 100 Community Place, Crownsville, MD 21032
e-mail:	matthew.miekler1@maryland.gov gayle.mealy@maryland.gov
Office Phone:	410-697-9679 410-697-9675
TO Proposals are to be sent to:	e-mail: matthew.miekler1@maryland.gov gayle.mealy@maryland.gov

2. Revise the language of Section 2.6.3, Progress Reports and Medicaid Eligibility and Enrollment Checklist of the TORFP as follows:

The IV&V TO Contractor shall provide the **final** progress reports to CMS at the same time they are presented to the State. ~~This reporting process, in accordance with federal regulations, includes final report issuance as well as all draft report submissions.~~

3. Revise the language of Section 2.7.1, Deliverables 2.7.1.5 and 2.7.1.10 of the TORFP as follows:

Deliverable 2.7.1.5 : IV&V Draft Baseline Findings Report –This report shall be submitted via secure communication. Secure communication can be in the form of a password protected SharePoint site, FedEx CD, or other secure communication as agreed by the TO Project/Contract Manager. The IV&V ~~Draft~~ **Final** Baseline Findings Report shall be submitted simultaneously to DoIT and all participating federal partners.



Deliverable 2.7.1.10: IV&V Project Financial Status Reports (Acceptance Criteria)

The **Final Report** ~~Draft Report~~ in Microsoft Excel shall contain, at a minimum, the following elements:

- All charges posted to the project account
- All funding and expenditures against funding
- Description of the methodology used to verify the costs
- Description of the methodology used to verify accurate posting of the costs
- Quarterly review and verification of postings. Yearly review of financial data sent to the Federal and State agencies for reimbursement of expenses.
- Where applicable a table describing deficiencies with risk categorization, and corrective recommendations

4. Revise Sections 3.6.A and 3.6.B of the TORFP as follows:

- A. Seasoned, demonstrable, extensive experience in large-scale IT projects in a number of **federal or** state government environments.
- B. Demonstrable experience performing IV&V activities on large-scale IT projects in a number of **federal or** state government environments.

5. Revise the due date for TO Proposals as follows:

TO Proposals Due (Closing) Date and Time:	December 22, 22 , <u>28</u> , 2017 at 2:00 PM Local Time Offerors are reminded that a completed Feedback Form is requested if a no-bid decision is made (see Section 5).
--	---

Issued By:
Gayle Mealy
Procurement Officer



State of Maryland
Department of Information Technology

LARRY HOGAN
Governor
BOYD K. RUTHERFORD
Lieutenant Governor

MICHAEL G. LEAHY
Acting Secretary
LANCE SCHINE
Deputy Secretary

Questions and Answers Document #1
CATS+ TORFP #F50B840008
IV&V DHS MD THINK
November 22, 2107

1. Question: The MBE sub-contracting company should only be MDOT certified MBE company?

Answer: This is correct. Please see Item 3 of the Instructions for Attachment D-1A

2. Question: The Task Order Duration: It is stated in the TORFP: "One year base period with 4, one-year option periods, commencing from the Effective Date". And our question is: is this TO likely to continue even if the development phase of the MD-THINK project is completed?

Answer: The Task Order will be utilized for in-scope IV&V services on an as-needed basis for a term of up to five (5) years, assuming all five options are exercised at the State's discretion and the contract is not terminated.

3. Question: Will there be any future conflict of interest between the MD Think Agile Scrum Resources, CJAMS, and MD Think IV&V Services TORFPs?

a. *Answer: There is the potential for a conflict of interest if a CATS+ Master Contractor is awarded to several of these contracts at once, and your company may be ineligible to participate in one or more of these opportunities. Please refer to Sections 4.11.2 through 4.11.3 of the TORFP.*

- b. If answer is yes, will the government accept a mitigation plan if we were to bid and win multiple opportunities?

Answer: No.

- c. If answer is yes, if we have bid on the Agile Scrum Resources TORFP as prime offeror, can we bid as a subcontractor to another vendor on IV&V Services TORFP?

Answer: There is still the potential for a conflict of interest in this scenario. Please refer to Sections 4.11.2 through 4.11.3 of the TORFP.

4. Question: Does the government have an estimate on the level of effort or value of the IV&V Services TORFP?

Answer: The Department does not provide this information to Offerors.



5. Question: Will the government be issuing any additional task orders for IV&V, or is this the only task order?

Answer: This is the only IV&V Task Order for the MD THINK project anticipated at this time.

6. Question: What is the estimated time for award?

Answer: The Department does not have an estimated time for award. The evaluation will be performed as expeditiously as possible, given the current availability of resources.

7. Question: Can the MBE subcontractor be a Non CATS+ master contractor?

Answer: An MBE subcontractor does not need to be a CATS+ Master Contractor in order to participate. In addition, see the answer to Question #1 and the D-1A form.

8. Question: Can reference projects from the candidate submitted be considered as offeror experience to be counted toward the 3 projects required?

Answer: Please re-read Section 5.4.2(F) of the RFP. This section does not require that the Offeror provide three examples of past engagements; rather, the Offeror is required to provide "up to three examples of engagements or contracts" that were similar to the requested scope of this project. The State is interested in experience of the entity in performing these services.

9. Question: If this effort only requires 1 PM, can we submit a justification not to use an MBE subcontractor?

Answer: An Offeror may request a waiver of the MBE goal, in whole or in part; however, please read the instructions for the MBE D-1A form. A determination must be made that the Offeror is unable to achieve the overall MBE goal.

10. Question: If justification not to use MBE subcontractor is submitted by a vendor, will he still be responsive?

Answer: So long as the MBE documents are completed correctly, a request for a waiver of the MBE goal, in whole or in part, will not result in a determination that the Offeror's proposal is nonresponsive.

11. Question: If justification not to use MBE subcontractor is submitted by a vendor, will he be scored less than others using MBE's?

Answer: Meeting the MBE goal is not one of the evaluation criteria set forth in Section 6.2; as such, a proposal with a request for a waiver of the goal, with



proper support, will not be ranked lower than a proposal from an Offeror who plans to meet the goal.

12. Question: Is there an existing IV&V contract for MD THINK?

Answer: There is no existing IV&V contract for MD THINK.

13. Question: Section 5.3.4.A and 5.3.4.C states that the 2 volumes for email submissions need to be password protected, and Volume 1 and Volume 2 should have different passwords. Section 5.3.5.A and 5.3.5.B state the 2 types of documents that should be submitted with each volume. Would DoIT/DHS like for the password to be the same in each volume (meaning the Volume 1 PDF and the Volume 1 Word file should have the same password, and the Volume 2 excel sheet and Volume 2 pdf have the same password but that password being different than the Volume 1 passwords)? Please advise.

Answer: See Section 5.3.4(C) of the RFP. Two unique passwords should be used – one for all documents in the Technical Volume, and the other for all documents in the Financial Volume.

14. Question: Section 5.3.4.C states "... Offerors will provide these two passwords to the DoIT TO Procurement Officer upon request or their TO Proposal will be deemed not susceptible for award." During the Pre-proposal conference it was stated that offerors should send the passwords in a separate email after rfp submission to make it easier for the evaluation team to have the passwords readily accessible for evaluation of rfp responses, so they are not delayed by hunting down passwords. Can DoIT/DHS please clarify how passwords should be submitted? If passwords are to be sent, in a separate email, after RFP's are submitted please clarify if the password emails need to be in the TO Procurement Officer's inbox prior to the submission deadline, as well as the preferred wording of the password email subject line.

- a. *Answer: The Procurement Officer will request the password from the Offeror after the close of the response period. Please do not submit passwords until requested to do so by the Procurement Officer. The Procurement Officer will outline the method for submitting the password.*
- b. *Answer: Any statement made at the pre-proposal conference which conflicts with the above was made in error.*

15. Question: Will the Contractor's team members be required to travel to other locations/Agencies? If so, could a list of those locations be provided?

Answer: The primary place of performance for this solicitation, as stated on the Key Information Summary Sheet, is the Department of Human Services offices at



311 W. Saratoga St., Baltimore, MD 21201. Other travel within the State may be required as necessary and as outlined in a particular Work Order.

16. Question: Section 3.6 states “Offerors must provide documentation in the TO Proposal that their organization has previous experience with providing size and complexity as the MD Think Project “ What kind of documentation is acceptable?

Answer: See Section 5.4.2 of the TORFP.

17. Question: 3.6 A &B state “ Seasoned demonstrated extensive experience in large scale IT projects in a number of state government environments.” Does this have to be experience with State government or is similar experience with a commercial client acceptable ?

Answer: Federal government experience has been added to Section 3.6 A&B through Amendment #1 to the TORFP. Commercial client experience is not acceptable.

18. Financial Proposal Attachment B, Tab C is asking to provide rates for all listed labor categories. Where do we find the list of labor categories? Or is it just for the IV& V Project Manager and the Task Order Contract Manager?

Answer: Master Contractors are to propose the labor categories they expect to use when performing the required IV&V services. The labor categories proposed must be from those listed in the CATS+ Master Contract Section 2.10. Labor rates must be at or below those proposed by the Master Contractor under the CATS+ Master Contract.

19. Question: The section 4.11.2. under Conflict Of Interest, mentions that, “Any TO Contractor (and its subcontractors) serving in the role of IV&V service contractor/provider to the State MD-THINK Project is prohibited from soliciting, proposing, or being awarded any project management, quality assurance, software design, development, or other manner of planning, design, development, or implementation phase activity on the MD-THINK Project for which these IV&V services are being procured. In addition, Master Contractors should be aware that the State Ethics Law, Md. Code Ann., General Provisions Article, Title 5, might limit the selected Master Contractor's ability to participate in future related procurements, depending upon specific circumstances.” Can you please clarify if the specific bid for the already submitted TORFP “CATS+ Agile Scrum Team Resources TORFP N00B8400064” raises this Conflict Of Interest?

Answer: Based on Section 4.11.2 of the TORFP, there is the potential for a conflict of interest in this scenario.



20. Question: The Conflict of Interest clause defined in the section 4.11.2, creates a significant risk of loss of opportunity for the interested Master Contractors, who are bidding for MD-THINK TORFPs, in that that have to decide upfront whether they should pursue this IV&V F50B8400008, even when the fate of their earlier bids for MD-THINK proposals (and also future MD-THINK proposals) are unknown. Keeping that in mind, could the government specify the “size” of this TORFP, so that the Master Contractors can make more informed decisions about this opportunity’s pursuit? The “size” could be any one or more of: 1) Budget for the IV&V TORFP; and/or 2) The number/description of MD-THINK system components that fall under the scope this IV&V TORFP; and/ or 3) Number of positions expected to be filled in Part-1 (Snapshot) and Part-2 (Lifecycle) phases?

Answer: 1) The Department does not release budget information to Offerors; 2) Information regarding the project can be found at the following link: <http://doit.maryland.gov/contracts/Pages/CATSPlusTORFPStatus.aspx>, specifically TORFP #N00B7400341 – Maryland Child, Juvenile and Adult Management System and Attachment 20; 3) Unknown.

21. Question: In order to plan travel requirements, how many work locations will be outside of the greater Baltimore area? Please list out-of-state locations

Answer: See the answer to Question 15.

22. Question: Will the state please clarify the weighting percentages for the selection criteria?

Answer: Please refer to Section 6.2 of the TORFP, evaluation criteria is weighted in descending order of importance.

23. Question: Will the state please clarify the weighting percentage for the financial component?

Answer: Please refer to Sections 6.3 and 6.4F of the TORFP.

24. Question: Appendix 4 Non-Disclosure agreement “Before TO proposal as directed in the TORFP.” Does the State intent to receive the Appendix 4 form prior to submission and/or with all other required attachments?

Answer: With the Technical Proposal submission.

25. Question: Taking into account the review and approval cycles generally associated with federal funds, can you estimate an approximate start date for orals, offeror award and start date?

Answer: Please see the answer to Question #6.



26. Question: The numbering on the proposal states 124 of 129, but ends on page 124.
Answer: The numbering took into account pages i through iv, the TORFP ends on page 124.
27. Question: What is the anticipated start date for the TO Contractor?
Answer: Please see the answer to Question #6.
28. Question: Has the State procured any MD THINK vendors yet?
Answer: No.
- a. If yes, can you please tell us who the vendors are and when they are scheduled to begin?
Answer: n/a
- b. If no, will the TO Contractor participate in this procurement effort?
Answer: No.
- c. How many RFPs or contracts does the State envision releasing over the next four (4) years, if known?
Answer: Unknown
29. Question: Please clarify the process for providing passwords for submitted proposals. Do Offerors not provide the password in an email separate from the initial proposal submission until it is asked for by the Procurement Officer?
Answer: Please see the answer to Question #14.
30. Question: What is the budget for this TORFP?
Answer: Please see the answer to Question #4.
31. Question: What is the budget for Stage 1 of 3 - Baseline Assessment?
Answer: Please see the answer to Question #4.
32. Question: Given the holidays, would the state consider moving the due date to 1/15/2018 to allow vendors additional time to respond to the answers to the Q&A and tailor their response?
Answer: The due date for responses will be extended to 12/28/2017, please see Amendment #1 to the TORFP.
33. Question: If you are shortlisted for MD DHS CJAMS Prebids, Does that preclude you for the IV&V SOLICITATION NUMBER F50B8400008 RFP?
Answer: Based on Section 4.11.2 of the TORFP, there is the potential for a conflict of interest in this scenario.



34. Question: As the Due date is Friday Dec 22nd 2pm, Can we extend the timeline to Monday Dec 25th around 10am so that the vendor community can get additional weekend to work given the holiday time as well as employees are in the middle of the vacations during the response timeframe? I am hoping vendor community can leverage it very effectively.

Answer: See the answer to Question #32.

35. Question: In regard to Section 6.2 – TO Technical Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Could the State provide a percentage associated with the evaluation criteria?

Answer: Please see the answer to Question #23.