

Attachment B
Question and Answer Document Template
RFS 19-081

Round Three Response to Written Questions

Question No.	DOC NAME (RFS or Attachment)	PAGE # OR SECTION #	RESPONDENTS QUESTION	STATE'S RESPONSE
1	Addendum 5	Page 4 of 10	This is a major change to the proposal and costing which necessitates us to revisit all HW/SW choices, reach out to additional vendors, negotiate costs and finalize prices, and update our proposal in several place to reflect the new technology choices to provide the best value to the State. Could the State please provide a four (4) week extension to achieve these goals, so that the State could save on the HW and SW costs based on our evaluations and negotiations?	The due date has been extended to 3:00 p.m. Eastern Time on July 10th.
2	Addendum 5	Page 6 of 10	Does the State have preferred pricing from any of these vendors? If so, what is the pricing, so that our responses are realistic?	Please refer to the new instructions in Addendum 7 and the Software_Hardware tab of the cost proposal.
3	Addendum 5	Page 5 of 10	If the State purchases (or partially purchases) different hardware or software than what we propose, the costs of the solution that depend on the bundled features that come with the H/W and S/W will be different. How will this be accounted for?	If the State chooses to purchase different hardware or software than what was proposed in the awarded Respondent's proposal, the State will assess the impact with the awarded Respondent to determine the change in costs to the vendor and adjust the contract value.
4	Addendum 5	9.1 Solution Considerations	The state has invested in common architecture, components, and operational support strategies. If a bidder elects to use a platform that is not currently part of the Indiana architecture, how will the cost of learning the new asset, change management for operational support (call centers support) and IT support costs, change management for support operations, disaster recovery, backup and restore, and similar costs associated with adopting a new platform be evaluated? (Addendum 5, 9.1 Solution Considerations)	Please see the response to Question 2.
5	Addendum 5	9.1 Solution Considerations	As the state currently owns licenses for products that could be part of the solution, and there is an overlap of use cases such that no additional licenses are required because that user is already licensed, can we assume we do not need to bid that user cost in our proposal? We want to avoid double charging for the same license rights. (Addendum 5, 9.1 Solution Considerations)	Please see the response to Question 2.
6	081_RFS 19-081 - DDI v5	3.1 PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCEDURE (Page 25)	Could you clarify who is going to be on the evaluation team (by name and title)?	This information cannot be shared.
7	081_RFS 19-081 - DDI v5	1.8 DUE DATE FOR PROPOSALS (Page 9)	Considering that the state has amended the RFS with new details on 19th June and the impact that new QnA session will have on the solution and pricing, we request the state to extend the submission due date by two weeks.	Please see our response to Question 1.
8	Attachment F-1 Technical Proposal Response Template - UPDATED 2019.06.19	NA	Can the respondent include the samples, reports and other past performance data that the state is asking for as separate attachments? If yes, can the state exclude the attachments outside of the page limit of 250 pages?	Yes.
9	Attachment F-1 Technical Proposal Response Template - UPDATED 2019.06.19	7. INvest Core Functional Requirements (Page 72)	For better understanding of proposed system, we would like to share screenshots of the system functionalities with the state. Can we include the screenshots in a separate attachment? If yes, can the state exclude the attachment outside of the page limit of 250 pages?	Yes.
10	Attachment E - Business Proposal Template	The anticipated dollar amount for each subcontract (Row 154)	How should the prime show the dollar amount that is being passed to a secondary subcontractor through a prime -> subcontractor -> subcontractor relationship? If any subcontractor is bringing a next level subcontractor under it, the dollar amount allocated to it should also include the dollar value allocated to all of its next level subcontractor. Is the state okay with this approach?	Yes, this is the correct approach. The subcontractor amounts in Attachment A and the first chart in Section 2.3.9 of Attachment E should include the total value to the subcontractor, including any intended amounts to the subcontractor's subcontractor(s).
11	Attachment D - Cost Proposal Template - UPDATED 2019.06.19	TOC -> Total Cost Summary	Our understanding is that the cost evaluation will only be done for the cost proposed by Respondent for first three years. Can the state please confirm this?	This is correct.
12	Attachment D - Cost Proposal Template - UPDATED 2019.06.19	TOC -> Total Cost Summary	If the warranty period is beyond the base year (first 3 years), do you expect the respondent to include the warranty cost in the base year pricing or in the optional year pricing?	The base years' pricing must cover the full warranty period for each release in the base contract years.
13	Attachment P - Current and Proposed INvest Reports Inventory	NA	Cin attachment P, the list of reports as classified as Dataware House or Bathc report type. Can we assume that all reports not from the data warehouse are operational reports?	Yes, these are primarily work reports for county and state workers and are based off of ISETS functionality.
14	Attachment F-1 Technical Proposal Response Template - UPDATED 2019.06.19	8.3 Business Intelligence/Reporting (Page 106)	How many Dashboards and Score Cards the State is looking for? The count will help us arrive at the correct estimates.	CSB Exec Statewide Dashboard for case management and for performance reporting, Management Dashboard for case management and performance reporting, and User/Case worker Dashboard.
15	Addendum 5	General Question	It is often the case that software and hardware companies provide discounts to government agencies. If the State cost is lower than a vendor-provided cost for any software or hardware for which the State already owns, please confirm the State will use the lower cost for the cost evaluation. If the State is able to obtain better pricing, a more accurate evaluation of cost of the contract would be to use the State's price.	Please see the response to Question 2. The cost evaluation will be based on the Total Bid Amount in the Summary tab of the Cost Proposal. The State will not substitute the State's pricing for the DCS assets listed in Attachment F Section 9.1 for the cost evaluation.

Question No.	DOC NAME (RFS or Attachment)	PAGE # OR SECTION #	RESPONDENTS QUESTION	STATE'S RESPONSE
16	Addendum 5	#44; page 10	In the third round of answers to questions, the change in the answer to question #44 represents a material change to the RFS requirements only two weeks before proposals are due. If we had been aware of this requirement when the RFS was released, we would have most likely proposed materially different solution components. At this point in the proposal process, we are finalizing the proposal for submission; however, these changes will require significant revisions. For this reason, we are requesting a three week extension to obtain the requested pricing, review our solution against the new requirement and other information released by the State.	Please see the response to Question 1.
17	081_Adden 5 - Addendum 5	1.24 Summary of Milestones	In order to appropriately accommodate the updates and new requirements associated with Addendum 5, would the State please consider providing a four (4) week extension to the response period?	Please see the response to Question 1.
18	081_Round Two Response to Written Questions - UPDATED 2019.06.19	Question No. 44	As the state mandates the use of MuleSoft Anypoint, does the State require the number of licenses and associated fees for the product?	Please see the response to Question 2.
19	081_Adden 5 - Addendum 5	2.5 Cost Proposal	Can the State please explain how a vendor's reuse of existing State-owned licenses will be factored into the cost scoring? Will they be removed prior to cost consideration since double counting them would falsely inflate Total Cost of Ownership for INvest?	Please see the response to Questions 2 and 15.
20	081_Adden 5 - Addendum 5	General	Could the State please elaborate on what caused this change in direction described in the latest Addendum 5?	The State wishes to have the best approach to cost evaluations for this RFS. Please note the changes to the cost proposal in Addendum 7.
21	Attachment D - Cost Proposal Template - UPDATED 2019.06.19	Tab: Cost Savings Opportunities	Could the State please elaborate on how the information in Tab: Cost Savings Opportunities of ATT D will be used in scoring? Will this information be used when calculating the Total Cost of Ownership of INvest? How will the ROI be calculated when factoring in Risk to Project, etc.?	The Cost Savings Opportunities tab will not impact the cost scoring. The cost evaluation will be based on the Total Bid Amount in the Summary tab of the Cost Proposal.
22	Addendum #5	Page 10, Answer to Question #44	Addendum 5 and answer to question 44 states: "No, the instructions regarding how to indicate costs for CSB/DCS assets has been modified in Addendum 5. If CSB/DCS assets are utilized for your solution, you must still include costs for such assets in the Software_Hardware tab for the purposes of the cost proposal evaluation." Can the State please clarify how cost will be evaluated if a vendor chooses to include assets including hardware, software or hosting that the State already owns in their bid? In light of the desire for the State to receive qualified competitive bids at the best price, how will the State evaluate vendors that have chosen to use assets that CSB/DCS owns in relationship to the Cost Proposal? Given that the State already owns these technology assets, it appears that the State has conflicting statements in regard to the evaluation of cost in relationship to its preference to use CSB/DCS assets that the state has already procured. How will these conflicts be reconciled in the evaluation of competitive bids?	Please see the response to Questions 2 and 15. Additionally, the State's preference for reuse of DCS assets will be addressed in Requirement 9.2-9 of the Technical Proposal.
23	Addendum #5	Page 6, Section 9.1 Solution Considerations	MuleSoft is identified as a mandatory solution component for the INvest solution. Per Section 9.1, Indiana DCS already owns MuleSoft licenses. Since Mulesoft is a mandatory requirement, is it reasonable to assume all bidders will have the same price for this line item and that we can remove it from our cost sheet?	Please see the response to Question 2.
24	Addendum #5	Page 6, Section 9.1 Solution Considerations	The State has provided a list of existing CSB software assets for potential reuse for the INvest Project. Can the State please provide a full list of hardware and software assets that the State currently owns, including the number of licenses and costs, so that vendors can include these in their proposals?	Additional information about the DCS assets has been added to Section 9.1. Additionally please see the response to Question 2.