Attachment B
Question and Answer Document Template
RFS 19-081

Question No.	DOC NAME (RFS or Attachment)	PAGE # OR SECTION #	RESPONDENTS QUESTION	STATE'S RESPONSE
1	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final.docx	Section 8.3.1 page 107	While there is a Enterprise Reporting Solution (ERS) platform envisioned, it is in a separate section from Data Conversion. Would DCS consider an Enterprise Data Service that would encompass report and data conversion?	Yes, as long as the requirements stated in the RFS are met fully.
2	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final.docx	Section 8.3.2 page 108	While section 8.3.2 identifies Cognos, Informatica and Teradata, DCS does NOT include them in their list of available licensed tools (are these FSSA-owned licenses?). Is it expected that they will not use these existing tools?	Yes, these are FSSA owned licenses. It is a separate agency.
3	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final.docx	Section 9.5 page 129	Does DCS have certain expected modules that will be available via mobile devices?	Yes, we are expecting a mobile friendly design/responsive design for the INvest system. The mobile app will require certain critical features and functions. CSB will choose functionality in backlog/design phase what is made available.
4	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final.docx	Section 9.6 page 131	Mulesoft is a requirement and there's a need to create a mesh-app and service architecture. Is it then expected that ALL transaction messages will flow through mulesoft in one way or another?	It needs to flow through Mulesoft and if it can't a justification needs to be approved by CSB.
5	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final.docx	Section 9.6 page 131	Is there an expectation that the BI/Reporting solution will be integrated also using Mulesoft?	Yes.
6	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final.docx	Section 9.8 page 133	Master Data Management (MDM) is mentioned along with the application database. Is it expected that MDM will live within the application database or could it be a separate service that serves the various modules?	Yes, it could be separate service that serves the various modules.
7	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final.docx	Section 9.11 page 144	It is stated that "counties use optional fields differently" Can DCS give an order of magnitude to the number of fields and how many counties are using them differently?	CSB wants to reiterate that we have a system which allowed for data to be entered in a non-standardized format in some fields. This has led to some work arounds by some counties. This is not a prevalent issue, but CSB wanted to make it known. The most well known example is St Joseph county. St Joseph county has used the field for "Maiden Name" to be used to enter "Felony Info". CSB has thought this to be a data mapping consideration during conversion. An effort is underway to identify any other anomalies such as this but this analysis does not expect to return many findings.
8	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final.docx	Section 9.11 page 144	There is a reference to "bi-directional" when referring to near-real-time synchronization. What scenarios does DCS see that would require synchronization of INvest to ISETS?	One scenario for near real time bi-directional synchronization may be if functionality has been released in INvest that still requires sync with ISETS.
9	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final.docx	Section 9.12.1 page 149	Since these applications will need INvest data, are they expected to receive that data via a service delivered by Mulesoft? I.e., will the applications that will remain be retooled to work with the service architecture?	Yes. If deemed necessary, then the application that will remain as ancillary will be modified to ensure it's working with the established INvest service architecture. Our goal and expectation is to have consistent, standardized and domain-independent data (internal & external) exchange across the INvest application.
10	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final.docx	Section 9.11 page 144	How much historical data is planned on being brought to the new system?	In order to compile the data requested, we will post the answer to the Round 2 Question/Inquiry responses.
11	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final.docx	Section 9.11 page 144	Are there efforts currently underway to identify data issues with the existing legacy data?	CSB has started to identify some of the ISETS data inconsistencies and a list will be provided to the chosen vendor.
12	Attachment F	5.2-4	CSB has invited the vendor to explain its approach for using CSB staff. Does the CSB have any parameters in mind for how much time the CSB can be available to contribute to this work? Is your goal to minimize CSB involvement or maximize it?	CSB embedded staff will be dedicated 100% to INvest. CSB wants to maximize involvement for knowledge transfer.
13	Attachment F	5.2-6	Is CSB willing to allow training content to be developed by team members located off-site, as long as the Training Lead works on-site?	Yes.
14	Attachment F	5.2-8	May training content be developed and authored on non-state-owned equipment? If yes, will the agency allow these developers to access the system's training and/or testing environment(s) remotely on these systems?	Yes, as long as DDI vendor is adhering to the security and equipment standards/guidelines and requirements established by IOT and CSB. CSB expects DDI vendor to provide their input and feedback based on their previous project experience in this regard. The non-state-owned equipment follows the same requirements as any non-state-owned equipment as listed in 5.2-8 and the development is not done off-shore. Also, any remote access must be secure.

Question No.	DOC NAME (RFS or Attachment)	PAGE # OR SECTION #	RESPONDENTS QUESTION	STATE'S RESPONSE
15	Attachment F	10.4-2	Will the agency manage the logistics associated with classroom training (providing lab space and computers, enrolling users, managing travel, etc.) or should the vendor plan to deliver those services?	Yes, CSB will manage these.
16	Attachment F	10.5-1	Is it the agencies intent that only one resource (the Training Lead) will be required for post-implementation training support? Can you quantify the volume and nature of support needed?	The DDI vendor Training Lead (1) will be utilized throughout the project for assisting the CSB OR and training teams for post-implementation.
17	Attachment F	10.5.1-5	The Onsite Support section simply refers to providing "assistance." Can you clarify the nature and volume of assistance you anticipate needing?	See Q16.
18	Attachment F	10.5.1-3	The RFP distinguishes between primary users and on-site users. Except for the geographic locations, how does the agency anticipate training being different for these groups?	CSB did not find a reference to on-site users. Primary users are the only group that needs on-site assistance.
19	Attachment F	10.5.1-5	How much time is the agency willing to allow to fully train all users? Do you have a training interval in mind (both before and after system go-live)?	CSB expects the vendor to propose the schedule based on experience with the solution and how users adapt to it.
20	Attachment F	10.5.1.-3	There do not appear to be use cases developed for all system requirements. For those requirements where no use case have been noted, are these functions that would require user training? Or are they back-end processes that primary users will not normally touch?	Most likely yes, however, CSB requires the DDI vendor Training Lead to provide training guidance and expertise on all core and non-core requirements and not necessarily focusing on use cases only.
21	Attachment F	10.5.1.2	Several of the training requirements specify examples and experience from a previous child support implementation. If the intent is to determine the level of expertise in adult learning the vendor can provide, relative to building an impactful training program, would the agency accept examples from other complex system implementations?	No, the DDI vendor will work directly with CSB's Communication and Training Unit (CTU) to craft and develop the super user and train the trainer training sessions. Therefore, CSB expects Child Support experience for these requirements.
22	RFS 19-081 - Attachment F	Section 3.1 Page 18	Can you confirm that by modernizing the original CICS COBOL application, it will cover the AS400 TELON version, since the TELON code is generated from the original CICS code version?	CSB does not expect the DDI vendor to modernize the CICS COBOL application. The DDI vendor solution must ensure there are no longer any mainframe components needed once INvest is implemented.
23	RFS 19-081 - Attachment F	Section 3.1 Page 18	Can you confirm that we do not need to modernize the custom application that generates the Telon. The understanding is that we can address both by modifying the original mainframe code?	We do not need to modernize the custom application that generates the Telon code. Also, we are not expecting vendor to modify the original Mainframe code. We are expecting Vendor to build the new web based application with the agreed upon and chosen platform based on the requirements. If needed, the original Mainframe source code can be used as one of the reference artifacts which contains the technical/functional and business logic details.
24	Attachment F1	Page 3 Instructions	Is it permissible for Respondents to submit the Attachment Example files as PDFs rather than Word Files because some of file sizes may be very large.	Yes.
25	Attachment F	Page 156 Section 10.2	The State requests that the vendor track attendance, assessment scores etc. Would the State please confirm that it has a Learning Management System that will be used or is the expectation the vendor provide one?	CSB currently utilizes Moodle as a Learning Management System. We do not expect the DDI vendor to bring one.
26	Attachment F	Page 90 Section 7.6	Section 7.6 states "ISETS does not have a way to complete a thorough recording of a Professional License Suspension action. INvest needs to be able to allow users to document the actions taken related to the various professional licenses that are issued by the State of Indiana". Does the state maintains all professional licenses in a single repository? If no, can the State provide the list of Professional Licenses that are intended to be in the scope of INvest project. Can state also provide details if these are existing interfaces or new interfaces as part of INvest project?	ISETS does not currently interface with the State's Professional Licensing Agency nor does ISETS have a repository. CSB requires an interface to/from this agency.
27	Attachment F	Page 97 Section 8.1.1	What are the different types of users (e.g., citizens, business partners, employees, administrators etc.) and what are the user counts respectively?	Refer to Attachment H, Invest Stakeholder List. Also refer to Chapter 2, in Attachment F which provides background on Indiana's IV-D Program. Primary users count is 1400. This does not include Secondary users which are external such as CP/NCPs and Employers who will access the system to pay income withholding and Annual Support Fees. If this question pertains to stakeholders outside of primary and secondary users, it would be hard to estimate as this portal would be open to the public.
28	Attachment F	Page 97 Section 8.1.1	Does the State maintain one active directory for all users (both internal or external) or are there two active directories against which to authenticate?	Yes. State maintains one active directory (AD) with different AD group levels within the scope of domain or forest. For INvest Access management; Authentication; Identity governance; Privileged access will take place in the IAM solution.
29	Attachment F	Page 136 Section 9.9	Is it fair to assume that the State is responsible for documentation of IRS Safeguard Security Report (SSR), SSA Security Design Plan (SDP) and Risk assessment? Is the expectation from Respondents that they are only required to provide input to the agency for the SSR, SDP and Risk assessment, as needed?	Yes, CSB will remain responsible for the IRS documentation. CSB would require input as needed.

Question No.	DOC NAME (RFS or Attachment)	PAGE # OR SECTION #	RESPONDENTS QUESTION	STATE'S RESPONSE
30	Exhibit 3, Software-as-a-Service Attachment F. Technical Proposal10.2 System Performance Standards, Table 13	10. Responsibilities and Uptime Guarantee: The Contractor shall be responsible for the acquisition and operation of all	Cloud Services Provider (CSP) uses commercially reasonable efforts to make its on-demand services available to its customers 24/7, except for planned downtime, for which the CSP gives customers prior notice, and force majeure events. While availability SLAs can be negotiated in a contract, the calculation is measured quarterly and not monthly. Can the State please adjust this requirement and specify that the SLA requirements can be negotiated based on the	Yes, as long as the requirements stated in the RFS are fully met, the interval in which they are measured can be adjusted based on the chosen service provider.
31	Attachment F. Technical Proposal	Req. #: 9.9-2 The most recent versions for standards and specification will be applicable. All cloud solutions must be FedRAMP and FISMA compliant as well as adhering to the IRS cloud requirements in Pub 1075.	Does the State anticipate storing FTI data as a part of the solution? If so, will you accept a hybrid solution where FTI data is stored on-premise or in a third-party solution that meets IRS 1075 requirements? If the State does not anticipate storing FTI data in the solution, can the State please adjust and remove the RFP requirements that refer to mandatory 1075 compliance? By not removing this requirement, this will make a significant difference in complexity and cost in the vendor's proposed solution.	Yes, CSB is requiring a cloud solution that is FedRAMP certified and the IRS Pub 1075 must be followed wherever FTI is stored, transmitted, or processed. This would enable no data storage on premises.
32	Attachment F. Technical Proposal	10.2 System Performance Standards, Table 13 Any security incident must be communicated to the CSB Security Manager within one hour of discovery	The Cloud Service Provider (CSP) is a service provider and the State would be one of hundreds of thousands of customers using the service. CSP can contractually commit to incident response reporting timeframes in a customer contract. One component driving the timeframes are the CSP's ability to communicate to a wide customer base in the event of an incident. In a multi-tenant cloud environment, the CSP could be reporting to thousands of customers if there is a security incident impacting multiple customers. CSPs utilize one incident response process for all customers. Utilizing one approach allows for scalability and ease of operations. Additionally, due to the nature of the CSP's service, the CSP can only report confirmed breaches, not attempted, suspected, threatened, or foreseeable breaches. As a multitenant environment, an attempted breach against another tenant would not be reported to the State. In the event of a security breach and if negotiated in the agreement, the CSP can notify the State identified points of contact. The CSP cannot notify affected parties because the CSP does not view customer data. The CSP is responsible for maintaining access in terms of performance and availability to the data. The data is owned by the customer. As such, we would like to request the requirements for breach notifications should align with the existing CSP reporting requirements that also align with FedRAMP and request that the State change this requirement to "within 48 hours of an incident".	CSB will not remove at this time. CSB wants visibility into ongoing threats.

Question No.	DOC NAME (RFS or Attachment)	PAGE # OR SECTION #	RESPONDENTS QUESTION	STATE'S RESPONSE
33	Attachment F. Technical Proposal	10.2 System Performance Standards, Table 13 For Production and Sandbox Environments, 90% of response times are less than 2 seconds. 98% less than 10 seconds. Applies to Core Functionality, excluding certain complex reports (e.g., ad hoc)	This can be difficult to measure and relies on other components outside of the Cloud Service Provider's control. The CSP provides a transparent display of its performance through a public website that the State will be able to access at any time during the subscription service. Therefore, can the State please remove this requirement?	No, The solution design performance needs to facilitate this and not impede this.
34	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	122	Does CSB expect the DDI Vendor to fully use Open source software and tools for custom coding requirements?	No, CSB doesn't expect the full use of "Open Source" (See Section 9.2). CSB would like as much of the source code used by the INvest solution to be made available to CSB, for purposes including but not limited to maintenance, operations and future enhancements. Where this is not possible we require the DDI vendor to include that in the architecture approach in requirement 9.2-1. CSB also expects wherever open source software tools are used for INvest code development, they need robust support and ownership of the code is with CSB.
35	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	122	Does CSB expect object/source code access only for the custom product or both the custom and the base product?	CSB would like as much of the source code used by the INvest solution to be made available to CSB, for purposes including but not limited to maintenance, operations and future enhancements. If maintenance, operations and future enhancements can be managed by custom configuration, rather then source code, then CSB would need to the appropriate documentation of the custom configuration to do so. Where this is not possible we require the DDI vendor to include that in the architecture approach in requirement 9.2-1.
36	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	122	Will the CSB choose an escrow agent like Iron Mountain and who will bear the cost of maintaining escrow?	Yes, CSB will utilize an escrow agent like Iron Mountain. CSB will own the relationship with the escrow agent, and the DDI vendor will be required to be in compliance with the terms of the escrow SOW.
37	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	122	Will the CSB prefer the source code version of Existing/Base Product be provided with an appropriate license as opposed to escrow?	CSB expects to own the dev and source code safe environment that contains all branches of the DDI source code, but an escrow agent may be utilized for validation and verification.
38	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	120	Some of the assets/platforms currently available with CSB may not provide the complete access to the source code. How will it impact decision making process?	The DDI vendor should identify configuration, custom configuration, and custom code. CSB is fully aware that for configurations there won't be a code source, but for any code that supports that configuration we would expect the source code. There is a different type of maintenance support structure needed to manage configuration vs development which will impact the decision making process.
39	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	120	Some of the assets/platforms currently available with CSB may not be open source based? How will it impact decision making process?	See Q38.
40	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	161	Is there a requirement for an LMS (Learning Management System), or does the State have any in-house learning/training/knowledge management system?	See Q25.

Question No.	DOC NAME (RFS or Attachment)	PAGE # OR SECTION #	RESPONDENTS QUESTION	STATE'S RESPONSE
41	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	34	For the functional lead, the experience column says " 5+ years of experience managing functional teams in Child Support Enforcement (CSE) and/or 3+ years of experience managing functional teams for large-scale system implementation projects. " Should we read it as "OR" i.e., either "5+ years of experience managing functional teams in Child Support Enforcement" or "3+ years of experience managing functional teams for large-scale system implementation projects"? Similar question around the interpretation of "and/or" for the Technical Lead, Implementation Lead roles.	See updates to Attachment F in Addendum 3.
42	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	144	Is it safe to assume that data migration should be done only from the IBM Mainframes (Master) database and possibly some delta from the county DB's? This is considering that the same data is pushed to separate county database.	That is correct. All data but Letter Genie documents are in the DB2 mainframe database.
43	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	96	How many external users (CP's,NCP's and other agencies) are expected to use the system?	See Q27.
44	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	96	How many internal users are expected to use the system?	See Q27. Plan for 200 CSB users and 1200 county users for a total of 1400 primary users.
45	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	152	Please provide a list of interfaces (additional new interfaces) the system is expected to implement for information exchange.	Refer to Attachment S, pg. 15 of 19, New Interfaces section. See Q26.
46	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	100	Which is the existing imaging solution/ECM solution that is being used by some of the counties? Does it have integration capability?	Refer to Attachment Y, ECM Scanning Solutions. CSB has no insight into the counties applications so we are unclear of the integration capabilities.
47	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	102	What is the total number of scanned documents stored in the current ECM solution across the counties which have ECM.	In order to compile the data requested, we will post the answer to the Round 2 Question/Inquiry responses.
48	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	104	Regarding Req # 8.2-3, what is the total number of un-scanned documents that are expected to be scanned into the new system?	Undetermined as estimates would be thousands statewide. Scanning is an optional service, see Chapter 14 of Attachment F.
49	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	108	What is the total number of Scheduled (daily/monthly), Ad-hoc and Data Warehouse reports?	There are currently 89 total reports of which 15% are adhoc.
50	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	134	Can the existing DB2 licenses be re-used for the modernized system?	Re-use could not occur until ISETS is shutdown. ~~If the DDI vendor wishes to utilize DB2, list it as a zero cost on the cost proposal. Software_Hardware tab.~~
51	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	124	State has shown an inclination towards IaaS/PaaS/SaaS. Does it mean that the State is open to store data on the Cloud?	Yes. The most recent versions for standards and specification will be applicable. All cloud solutions must be FedRAMP and FISMA compliant as well as adhering to the IRS cloud requirements in Pub 1075.
52	Attachment F - Technical proposal Final	23	Is there a regulatory or a policy-driven need to have a separate county DB's?	No, this is background information only. CSB does not want this to continue.
53	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	Introduction, Template Response Approach, page 6	The State limited the entire F-1 response to 250 pages. However, the State also requires a number of plans, example plans from previous projects, resumes, and other various attachments (e.g., Attachment C) to respond fully to each of the response guidelines. Do these documents count toward the 250 pages?	No, any response requirement asking for additional documents should be an attachment to the F1 Template.
54	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	Introduction, Template Response Approach, page 6	In page limited responses, often vendors summarize their response within the given page limit, then provide attachments with much more detailed responses, in essence, circumventing the page limits. Is it the State's intent that attachments to the responses will be limited only to the additional plans and examples required for each response?	See Q53.
55	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	7.3 Locate, page 76	What criteria is used today to score and rank the different data sources used in the Locate Process? Will the State please provide examples?	CSB does not have this functionality currently nor examples.
56	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	7.5.2, page 81	What platform is the Employee Maintenance Unit application built on?	Technology & Platform Details: InfoPath, MS-Access, Stored Procedures, C#.NET, SharePoint Server, Windows OS Security Methods: InfoPath - Active Directory Authentication

Question No.	DOC NAME (RFS or Attachment)	PAGE # OR SECTION #	RESPONDENTS QUESTION	STATE'S RESPONSE
57	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	8.3.4, page 114	Would the State please provide examples of unstructured data types gathered by CSB today?	CSB does not gather unstructured data today. As stated in 8.3.4, CSB's vision is to move forward into Advanced Analytics which may require to store and process unstructured data types.
58	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	9.1 Solution Considerations, page 120	Is the DDI vendor expected to set up the MuleSoft Anypoint Studio Platinum platform or will this be carried out by MuleSoft?	DCS/CSB currently has and is using the MuleSoft Anypoint Studio Titanium. CSB and MuleSoft will assist with the establishment of the DDI vendor within the CSB environment. The DDI vendor will be responsible for the creation of any API configurations needed to make their INvest solution function as intended. MuleSoft will be available for support.
59	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	9.2-2, page 23	Will the State provide CloudHub for use by the DDI vendor?	There will be an instance of CloudHub available for the DDI Vendor to build MuleSoft APIs for INvest.
60	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	General	How many external concurrent users will be accessing the INvest external portals?	See Q27.
61	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	6.1.2 Quality, page 47	The second paragraph of this section states: "The INvest PMO and QA vendor will also establish the tools (e.g., checklists) and templates (e.g., delivery expectation document) to conduct quality assessments." Would the State please confirm the DDI vendor have the opportunity to review and provide input to the tools and templates.	Yes, the DDI vendor will review and provide input.
62	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	6.10 Project Deliverables and Milestones, Table 9, page 70	Will CSB consider changing the CSB Initial Review for "Pages and/or Artifact Size 101-250 Pages/Small" from 13 days to 10 days?	CSB will not decrease the review days. The vendor is welcome to identify this as a potential cost savings in the cost proposal.
63	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	6.10 Project Deliverables and Milestones, Table 9, page 70	Will CSB consider changing the CSB Initial Review for "Pages and/or Artifact Size 251+ Pages/Large" from 13 days to 10 days?	CSB will not decrease the review days. The vendor is welcome to identify this as a potential cost savings in the cost proposal.
64	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	8.2.2 Current State - ECM, page 101, paragraph 1	This paragraph talks about counties with existing ECM solutions. Will CSB provide the taxonomies and metadata for the counties that utilize Docuware, Intact, LaserFiche, Imaging, CSI Paperport, Kofax?	An example of a Docuware document types from one county has been included with this response. See Attachment GG. CSB may provide any additional taxonomies received in round 2.
65	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	8.2.2 Current State - ECM, page 102, paragraph 6	Will CSB provide a copy of the existing CSB business units' electronic document image taxonomy?	CSB and the County Partners discussed our proposed taxonomy in requirements sessions. See Attachment HH.
66	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	10.2.1 CSB Training Staff, page 157	What is the approximate number of CSB trainers the DDI vendor will train during the "train-the-trainer" sessions?	The DDI vendor will work directly with CSB's CTU to develop the training for the Super User and Train the Trainer session. The DDI vendor will then Train the Trainers of approximately 30 to 35, Super Users - approximately 75 to 80. Note - All trainers will be Super Users but not all Super Users will be trainers.
67	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	10.3.1 Technical Environments for Training, page 158	How many concurrent training sites does CSB anticipate for CSB led training?	CSB expects there to be at least 4 simultaneous trainings that include approximately 200 to 250 trainees.
68	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	10.4 INvest Train-the-Trainer/Super User, page 160	What is the approximate number of CSB Super Users the DDI vendor will train during the "train-the-trainer" sessions?	See Q66.
69	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	12 INvest Post Implementation, Paragraph 2, page 180	Will CSB change the last sentence in the second paragraph to: "The warranty will end when all blocker, critical and high defects are fixed, certified letter is received and no additional blocker, critical and high defects created?"	No. The vendor is welcome to identify this as a potential cost savings in the cost proposal accompanied by the risk mitigation to OCSE certification.
70	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	12.1 Warranty/ Maintenance and Operations, Paragraph 1, page 176	Will CSB change the last sentence in the first paragraph to: "All warranty periods will be extended until all blocker, critical and high defects identified prior to or during the warranty periods are remedied by the DDI vendor?"	No. The vendor is welcome to identify this as a potential cost savings in the cost proposal accompanied by the risk mitigation to OCSE certification.

Question No.	DOC NAME (RFS or Attachment)	PAGE # OR SECTION #	RESPONDENTS QUESTION	STATE'S RESPONSE
71	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	13.2 System Performance Standards, Table 13, page 187	Would the State please clarify the liquidated damages for Architecture Design Impacts?	CSB expects a sound architecture to be developed for INvest. If performance is impacted in those four categories because of design flaws the performance issue will be treated as a defect until corrected.
72	Attachment, Technical Proposal	8.2 Enterprise Content Management, page.99	Would the State please provide the existing sizing information for the ECM storage in the counties?	In order to compile the data requested, we will post the answer to the Round 2 Question/Inquiry responses.
73	Attachment, Technical Proposal	8.2 Enterprise Content Management, page 99	Would the State please provide the estimate of the maximum number of documents created per active user during a typical day?	In order to compile the data requested, we will post the answer to the Round 2 Question/Inquiry responses.
74	Attachment, Technical Proposal	8.2 Enterprise Content Management, page 99	How many documents will each county send to the central ECM on a daily basis?	In order to compile the data requested, we will post the answer to the Round 2 Question/Inquiry responses.
75	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	8.2 Enterprise Content Management, page 99	What is the average document size? (document size not page size)?	In order to compile the data requested, we will post the answer to the Round 2 Question/Inquiry responses.
76	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	8.2 Enterprise Content Management, page 99	What is the approximate volume of Backfile Conversion/Migration documents? What percentage of these documents are in paper form?	In order to compile the data requested, we will post the answer to the Round 2 Question/Inquiry responses.
77	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	8.2 Enterprise Content Management, page 99	What is the daily average document volume to be stored in new ECM Repository?	In order to compile the data requested, we will post the answer to the Round 2 Question/Inquiry responses.
78	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	8.2 Enterprise Content Management, page 99	What is the total number of document types or document categories?	See Q65. Also the current Letter Genie Standard Documents are in Attachment Z.
79	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	8.2 Enterprise Content Management, page 99	What is the average number of fields or properties in each document category?	In order to compile the data requested, we will post the answer to the Round 2 Question/Inquiry responses.
80	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	8.2 Enterprise Content Management, page 99	Please confirm the State's expectation regarding the percent of documents that will be full-text indexed in the repository? If the State requires full-text indexing, please provide an estimate for the number of full-text searches per Active User during a typical day. Do any existing county imaging systems have this capability?	CSB wants at a minimum five key fields: name, ssn, case #, MPI#, and date scanned to be indexed on every document. Please see the ECM Requirements in Attachment O for more information. This will need to be able to be expanded in the future.
81	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	8.2 Enterprise Content Management, page 99	How many number of users will use capture/imaging/scanning features?	1400 primary users will utilize the ECM functionality.

Question No.	DOC NAME (RFS or Attachment)	PAGE # OR SECTION #	RESPONDENTS QUESTION	STATE'S RESPONSE
82	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	8.2 Enterprise Content Management, page 99	In how many locations will the proposed imaging (OCR) system need to be rolled out?	The solution needs to be able to scan at 184 county offices (92 each clerk and prosecutor offices) and CSB.
83	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	8.2 Enterprise Content Management, page 99	Is there any requirement for manual classification for documents? (e.g., exception handling for batches where the auto identification of the document failed).	Yes.
84	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	8.2-6, page 105	How many record classes need to be maintained and how many levels of record category need to be implemented?	This needs to be determined during design time.
85	Attachment F, Technical Proposal	General	Does the State of Indiana holds any licenses on "electronic and digital signatures?"	No. CSB has requested this as a proposed feature for the INvest solution.
86	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final	Pg. 95, Section 7.7-2	Please define "Out of the Box Configuration", "Custom Configuration", and "Custom Code"	•"Out of the Box Configuration" - Any feature or functionality of a product or a platform that can be immediately used without any special modification used to create, operate, manage the INvest solution. •"Custom Configuration" - Any "App-Store" Apps and/or 3rd party applications that utilize plug-ins or connectors that create a direct integration to the base platform and any feature or functionality of a product or platform that can be utilized with custom modifications, used to create, operate, manage the INvest solution. •"Custom Code" - Any code written/developed in and/or outside of the base platform, used to create, operate, manage the INvest solution.
87	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final	Pg. 41, Section 5.2-8	What are determining factors regarding if the State provides hardware and software? How do we obtain details regarding authorization and approval of non-state-owned equipment including specifications for full disk encryption, CBS approved anti-virus software	CSB is expecting the DDI vendor to bring the appropriate hardware and software for their staff. Any solution for full disk encryption must be FIPS 140-2 compliant. CSB will review the antivirus software proposed for non-state-owned equipment. If equipment listed in response to 5.2-8 is not approved by the State, the Contractor will provide alternate equipment that the State will approve.
88	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final	Section 6.4 and 7.0	Core Functional Requirements – There are seven Core Functional Requirements in Att F Section 7. Six of these requirements reference associated BPMs and UCs. Under each table that is inside a requirement's table, the verbiage includes "(features)" immediately following the word "requirements". For purposes of requirements traceability, is there distinct list of the items that are referred to throughout Attachment F as "requirements"; e.g., are "Features" from the BPMs a one to one of what DCS/CSB expects traceability to exist for?	CSB's high level business requirements are written as "Features" in the attachments. Requirements traceability will start with the Features which can be tied to the Federal Certification Guide.
89	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final	Pgs. 52-53, Section 6.4.1	Section states there will be Requirements Confirmation Sessions for the functional requirements that will last no more than two weeks and that the agenda for these sessions is: "Agenda for Requirements Confirmation Sessions: • Indiana Uniqueness • BPM Features/Use Case (UC) description/Walk-Thru • Questions" Indiana's uniqueness as measured against what? Please define baseline. Will these sessions cover Core and Non-Core Functional Requirements?	Indiana Uniqueness are the rules/operational items that make child support practices differ in this state from other states. For example, Indiana disburses child support payment directly, not the SDU. Requirements confirmation sessions will review at a high level, both Core and Non-Core Functional Requirements with a focus on the Features for those functions.

Question No.	DOC NAME (RFS or Attachment)	PAGE # OR SECTION #	RESPONDENTS QUESTION	STATE'S RESPONSE
90	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final	Pg. 52, Section 6.4.1	"To ensure that the DDI vendor fully understands the intent and scope of the functional requirements, the State Functional Analysts will review the features of each module and build a common understanding of requirements with the DDI vendor's designers, at the start of the contract prior to the DDI vendor's project work beginning." Please clarify "….prior to the DDI vendor's project work beginning." Which work is this statement referring to?	Actual design and development work.
91	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final	Pg. 55, Section	"The agile approach for INvest is to be based on known requirements realized and implemented using short cycles of analysis, design, development, and testing, enabling the system to evolve." Does the phrase, "enabling the system to evolve" mean "enabling the system to be developed as specified in the requirements" or "enabling the system to evolve based on iterative requirements discovery"?	CSB prefers enabling the system to evolve based on iterative requirements discovery.
92	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final	Section 6.5.1 Section 1.4, 1.4.1	Section 6.5.1 states: "An iteration for INvest is to be a distinct sequence of tasks focused on a desired goal within a time box, or simply multiple mini-projects that are part of a project phase".	This is not phrased in a question. Please clarify this question and resubmit for Round 2.
93	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final	Section 10	Does DCS/CSB or other applicable stakeholders have restrictions regarding training begin/end time, course durations, travel, etc. that vendors should be aware of?	Yes, Training efforts will need to work with counties regarding hours, days of the week. Note - Indiana has counties in both Eastern and Central time zones.
94	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final	Section 10	Is there a standard division of counties that represents smaller groups of counties and/or courts that DCS/CSB has consistently used in their operations?	CSB is unclear about what this refers to. Please clarify this question and resubmit for Round 2.
95	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final	Pg. 155, Section 10	"CSB requires that the DDI vendor deliver a comprehensive train-the-trainer, and super user course to designated CSB and county staff." What is the number of Train-the-Trainer staff to receive training from DDI? What is the number of super users to receive training from DDI?	See Q66.
96	Attachment F - Technical Proposal Final	Pg. 156, Section 10.1	Can the State confirm that the vendor's Training Plan should address the development and delivery of train-the trainer and super user training only? Is this assumption accurate for Requirement 10.1-1 and for requirement 10.1-2 ? If not, what is correct?	Yes, this is correct.
97	Attachment F- Technical Proposal Final	Pg. 157, Section 10.2.1	Regarding the statement: "The DDI vendor has primary responsibility for training CSB designated staff.", can DCS/CSB confirm the training referred to is in the form of the Train-the Trainer or Super User training that DDI is responsible for?	Yes, this is correct.
98	Attachment F- Technical Proposal Final	Pg. 157, Section 10.2.1	Regarding the statement; "In addition to CTU staff, other identified DCS/CSB staff will be available to serve as Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) in the development of the INvest training and on-site support curriculum and materials." Can the State confirm that "on-site support curriculum and materials" refers to curriculum and materials that DCS/CSB will develop?	Yes, CSB is developing material for On Site Support. Note - The vendor's Training Lead will be utilized throughout the project for assisting the CSB OR and training teams.

Question No.	DOC NAME (RFS or Attachment)	PAGE # OR SECTION #	RESPONDENTS QUESTION	STATE'S RESPONSE
99	Attachment F-Technical Proposal Final	Pg. 157, Section 10.2.2	Regarding the statement; "The DDI vendor must provide a sufficient number of staff to successfully accomplish all of the requirements of the training and on-site support effort." How should vendors account for this need in their estimates based on DCS/CSB having the lead role for Primary User Training and On-Site Support Training with the DDI vendor providing support? Can DCS/CSB provide their expectations on the level of support they envision?	Yes, CSB is developing material for On Site Support. Note - The vendor's Training Lead will be utilized throughout the project for assisting the CSB OR and training teams.
100	Attachment F-Technical Proposal Final	Pg. 161, Red 10.4-1	• To provide classroom training for Super User and Train-the-trainer to designated CSB, county, and vendor staff. Can CSB provide the number of staff to receive each type of training? Is the vendor required to acquire space for the training? Is the vendor required to provide equipment and supplies for the training sessions? Are there geographical training location requirements?	See Q66 and Q15. The DDI vendor is not responsible for equipment but should bring curriculum materials and any supplies that are to be used in super user and train the trainer classroom exercises. The DDI vendor is required to attend the locations of the super user and train the trainer sessions.
101	Attachment F-Technical Proposal Final	Pgs. 161-162, Section 10.5	"Vendor will be responsible for providing a comprehensive user manual and assist CSB in the development of other materials needed for these CSB-provided trainings. Vendor will provide CSB assistance with trainer manuals, guides, quick tips, e-learning, and exercises for the training sandbox." How many resources does CSB require for "assistance with trainer manuals, guides, quick tips, e-learning, and exercises for the training sandbox" and for what duration will these vendor resources be expected to be available??	For CSB provided trainings the only DDI vendor resource required is the Training Lead.
102	Attachment F-Technical Proposal Final	Pg. 157, Section 10.2.2	"Under the direction of CSB, vendor staff may be required to attend and make presentations at child support meetings and conferences throughout the State." How should vendors account for this potential need in their response and cost estimates?	This requirement is for the OCM/Training Lead(s) only. This is primarily a part of their daily responsibilities. Indiana has 1 conference each year that sometimes is outside of Indianapolis. All other meetings that occur outside of the central office are conducted within driving distance and in the same day.
103	Attachment F-Technical Proposal Final	Pg. 161, Section 10.4	"Additional details are provided in INvest Training Courses, Attachment V, column – K." This column is titled "Trainer Preparation". Specifically what additional details does this column provide for Train-the-Trainer and Super User training?	None
104	Attachment F-Technical Proposal Final	Pg. 162, Section 10.5	Based on CSB's expected staffing, how many resources is the vendor expected to provide for the assistance described in Requirement 10.5.1-2 ?	See Q101.
105	Attachment F-Technical Proposal Final	Pgs. 163-164, Section 10.5	Based on CSB's expected staffing, how many resources is the vendor expected to provide for the assistance described in Requirements 10.5.1-3, 10.5.1-4, 10.5.1-5 ?	See Q101.
106	Attachment F-Technical Proposal Final	10.3.1	"The training environments must allow multiple training sessions to be conducted concurrently (e.g., four different locations are utilized for classroom training simultaneously during the pilot training or subsequent regional roll out)." In keeping with CSB's regional, just-in-time training approach, and trainer/trainee ratios, can CSB provide an estimated number of locations, number of classes by location and number of concurrent sessions, required for Primary and On Site Support Training	CSB expects there to be at least 4 simultaneous trainings that include approximately 200 to 250 trainees.
107	Attachment F-Technical Proposal Final	Pg. 155, Section 10	If a vendor proposed an early roll-out of some Non-Core Functionality, what is CSB's expectations for Training and Onsite Support for those early roll-outs?	It is expected that non core functionality such as ECM, or Security will have just in time training. Whether the Portal is implemented early or not, it must be a self-directed solution that will allow a user to use without training.

Question No.	DOC NAME (RFS or Attachment)	PAGE # OR SECTION #	RESPONDENTS QUESTION	STATE'S RESPONSE
108	Attachment F-Technical Proposal Final	Page 99, Section 8.2	"• County Partners with existing Imaging Solutions (approximately 40 as of 2018)" Can CSB identify the 40 counties with an existing Imaging Solution as well as the imaging software solution used by each of these counties? Can CSB provide the current types of imaged files each of these counties have that CSB expects to be converted?	Refer to Attachment Y, ECM Scanning Solutions and Q64. The second question will be addressed in round 2.
109	Attachment F-Technical Proposal Final	Pg., 168, Section 11	11.2.1 and 11.2.2 both use the phrase "regional statewide rollout". What is the State's definition for this phrase?	CSB anticipates vendors will choose to implement core/non-core functionality to the state by regions. If that is not the intention, be clear on the approach to implement functionality to users.
110	Attachment F-Technical Proposal Final	Sections 11.1.2 and 11.2.2	Per the State's requirements for Core Functionality Pilots and Implementations, is it correct to assume the State expects no more than two Core Functionality rollouts statewide? • Pilot –Must be 60 days and must include end of quarter • Implementation – Must completed within six month and "ideally" be in the same FFY	No, CSB is wanting the vendor to provide the best core functionality implementation approach based on the solution and experience. The DDI vendor's implementation approach should be clear in requirement 11.2-1.
111	RFS 19-081 - Attachment F	Page 118, Req #8.3-11	Can the state provide examples of the unstructured data that is referenced in this requirement? This information will help the DDI vendors ensure that the ERS solution is capable of processing and analyzing both structured and unstructured data.	Unstructured data would be things like file attachments, emails, and links. See Q57.
112	RFS 19-081 - Attachment F	Section 4.6 Indiana IV-D Program Performance and Systems Data	The state's assessment of the lines of source code for ISETS has changed from 2,318,851 to 7,000,000. What caused this increase?	In the initial RFS, only the Mainframe source code line count was mentioned and the tool generated code was not mentioned. In order to ensure clarity we included the tool generated code line count as well. That's caused the increase. The original Source codebase is Mainframe COBOL code which is the lower number.
113	RFS 19-081 - Attachment F	Page 41, Req #5.2-6	Would the State consider flexible work arrangements for DDI vendor staff, such that staff provided 40 hours onsite per week, but not necessarily beginning at 8 am each day and ending at 5 pm?	Yes.
114	RFS 19-081 - Attachment F	Page 151, Req #9-12.1	The primary ancillary applications table in Attachment Q - INvest Ancillary Applications Inventory has truncated data. Would the State please provide an update copy with clean data?	Yes.
115	RFS 19-081 - Attachment F	Page 151, Req #9-12.1	Would the State please provide an additional column in the primary ancillary applications table in Attachment Q - INvest Ancillary Applications Inventory to include relevant sizing data such as number of pages, tables, procedures, etc. according to each type of application?	Yes.