

## CLARIFICATION OF PREVIOUSLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Q31: How are dependencies between filings defined?

A31: OSOS requests clarification to this question.

Q31Clarification: User Story 4.5.3.1: How are “Dependent filings” associated to each other? Is there a place where one filing is marked as a child or dependency of the other? This is managed by the system, or the user must always associate filings each time then enter them? Perhaps this is in the meta-data?

A31Revised: The scenario will require further analysis. Dependent filings may often come in under the same transaction (as in the user story 4.5.3.1), but that is not necessarily the case all the time. The system may be able to assist in managing dependent filings, but the logic to do this 100% might not be realistic or even possible.

Q37: Metadata “defines things”, but is there going to be tooling around how the metadata is managed?

A37: OSOS requests clarification to this question.

Q37Clarification: Solution Architecture (EX J - Filing Sub-System) and REST API (EX M, throughout): The architecture and REST Api have mentions of “Meta Data” and that it will define various things about entities and their relationships. However, other than on the REST Api, I do not see how someone would be able to manage that meta data (add, update, visualize). There are no user stories around managing it, and I am not sure if it is completely defined yet what specific meta data will be used, where it will be used and specifically for what.

A37revised: OSOS does not believe that a management interface is necessary for “metadata” at this time due to the anticipated low frequency of change.

Q38: Assuming the system will need to be able to manage items with previous meta-data definitions and keep them valid, while new items use the new meta data once entered. Can meta data be changed on items that are in mid-flight?

A 38: OSOS requests clarification to this question.

Q38Clarification: The REST Api allows the meta data to be changed. My understanding is that meta data defines, among other things, relationships between entities (e.g. dependent filings). So for example, if meta data starts out defining that filing type B is needed for filing type A and filings A1 and B1 are entered into the system. What should happen when the meta data is changed to specify that filing type C is now also needed for filing type A? There are scenarios here around A1 and B1 being complete, pending, in discrepancy, etc. Can that relationship even be changed while there are pending filings (what I called “mid-flight” before)? I am wondering if there is some complexity here that hasn’t gotten the full detailed design treatment will be helpful in order to understand the scope.

A38Revised: Please see revised responses to Q31 and Q37.

**NEW QUESTIONS:**

Q67: 8 months seems like an aggressive timeline. Is a staggered release planned?

A67: OSOS has not made an assumption of a staggered release. Meaning, we do not intend to run two production systems in parallel. However, we look to vendors to provide a proposal that they believe will net the most effective and successful deployment of a replacement system.

Q68: Are user acceptance testing and deployment to the State's environment within the scope of this RFP?

A68: The selected vendor must respond to the results of user acceptance testing, yes. A second vendor will assist OSOS in establishing best practices around QA testing and release management. The second vendor will be responsible for crafting test cases, and conducting IV&V.

OSOS development staff will push builds from QA to production. It is desirable to OSOS to have development vendor support through deployment. Vendors are asked to propose their recommended timeline and approach to ensure a successful deployment and hand off to OSOS developers for maintenance and support.

Q69: The sample agreement does not include a discussion regarding acceptance of deliverables criteria. Could you provide acceptance language that would likely be used on this project?

A69: Contractor shall document the formal deliverables that will be reviewed, commented on, and approved by OSOS:

- Deliverables shall be submitted to OSOS' Project Manager in outline form for discussion of the scope, analytical methods, and organization.
- After OSOS accepts the outline, the Contractor shall produce a draft for submission to OSOS.
- OSOS will advise Contractor of any errors or concerns before Contractor completes the final deliverable.
- Contractor shall produce a final version of each deliverable that addresses OSOS's feedback.

Q70: The project timeframe indicated on page 1 of the RFP says the tentative start day is November 1, 2015 and the ending date is June 30, 2016. Based on the scope of work and some of the "undefined" aspects of the solution, has consideration be given to a 12 month schedule?

A70: OSOS looks to vendors to prescribe their recommended project approach for successful completion of the project. In the case that a vendor does not believe 8 months is enough time to complete the project successfully, they should propose the timeline they believe is sufficient to complete the project.

Q71: is SOS is amenable to receiving a partial response that is for specific components of the new Corporations and Charities System?

A71: No. OSOS requires complete responses in order to fairly evaluate all responses provided.

Q72: Please confirm that following are the only external systems that this proposed new Corporations and Charities system

- UBI Interface
- DOR Business Licensing System
- DOR Open Affiliate Interface
- Query Interface
- Revenue System

A72: The system will also interface with Cybersource for credit card processing.

Q73: In section 1.4 of Conceptual Solution Architectural Model, one of the constraint and consideration listed states – “No rewrite of existing Revenue System”. Whereas, the Logical Architecture Document states that – “SOS revenue is an aging system and there are plans to replace the system with a commercial off the shelf package or another more modern implementation. The Corporations and Charities system still needs to interface with the revenue system for overall accounting and statewide AFRS interface.”

Can you please confirm the same? Also, please clarify what is “overall accounting”? Does this mean that this could change for some specific transaction types? Reference from RFP: Page 5 of RFP 16-01 Ex\_J.pdf, Page 17 of RFP 16-01 Ex\_K.pdf

A73: OSOS intends to replace the Office’s revenue system at an undefined time in the future. This replacement will occur sometime after deployment of the new Corporations and Charities system. Therefore, the system developed by way of a contract resulting from RFP 16-01 will interface with the existing OSOS Revenue system.

Q74: Under Payment Components in section 3.1, it is stated that – “The payment components will interface with the existing credit card module or other methods of payment.”

Is it fair to assume that there will be no change to this?

Can you elucidate what “other methods of payment” means? Reference from RFP: Page 9 of RFP 16-01 Ex\_J.pdf

A74: Yes the payment components will interface with the existing credit card module or other methods of payment. Other methods of payment include cash and check.

Q75: Please elucidate on what functions are expected to be within scope of “Mini CRM Functionalities” as stated in the text explaining Staff Console in the Conceptual Solution Architecture Model.

“The Staff Console will provide an interface over the order receipt and fulfillment process to provide intake of orders, manage exception queues and fulfillment processing workflows, manage to-do’s and follow-ups, provide document and letter generation for exceptions, and provide “**mini-CRM**” functionality and other staff functions.” Reference from RFP: Page 12 of RFP 16-01 Ex\_J.pdf

A75: Notes and comments associated with an entity and/or transactions are expected to be within scope of “mini CRM functionalities”.

Q76: The ‘About this Document’ section of Exhibit F sounds like review of the document by the subject matter experts is pending. Is this the final version of the document or would be seeing a later version shortly. Also, if there is a later version, how much would that be different from the current one?

Extract from the document –

‘Subject matter experts and stakeholders are requested to review and mark up this document. The targeted end product is a list of fields that should be included on each data-entry screen, arranged in the order that will best facilitate efficient entry of the data as it is transcribed from paper documents....’  
Reference from RFP: Page 1 of RFP 16-01 Ex\_F.pdf

A77: This is the final version, which was reviewed by subject matter experts and contains revisions from their review.

Q78: The ‘About this Document’ section of Exhibit G sounds like review of the document by the subject matter experts is pending. Is this the final version of the document or would be seeing a later version shortly. Also, if there is a later version, how much would that be different from the current one?

Extract from the document –

‘Subject matter experts and stakeholders are requested to review and mark up this document. The targeted end product is a list of fields that should be included on each data-entry screen, arranged in the order that will best facilitate efficient entry of the data as it is transcribed from paper documents....’  
Reference from the RFP: Page 1 of RFP 16-01 Ex\_G.pdf

A78: This is the final version, which was reviewed by subject matter experts and contains revisions from their review.

Q79: Exhibit J states the following:

The new system must provide an open interface to search and query filing information. The query interface should allow the public and affiliates to query for the information in the SOS filing system.

Does this mean that a new search interface should be included within the proposed new Corporations and Charities System? Please confirm and provide more details. Reference from RFP: Page 19 of RFP 16-01 Ex\_J.pdf

A79: Yes, confirmed. Output from the new search will be similar to the current web searches, but will hit the same data source. Current searches can be found here: <http://www.sos.wa.gov/corps/> and <http://www.sos.wa.gov/charities/>.

Q80: The RFP states that the tentative date by when this new system should go live is June 30, 2016. Is there a specific business reason behind this end date? If yes, please provide more details. Reference from RFP: Page 3 of RFP 16-01.pdf

A80: The primary reason for this timeframe is that it avoids peak workload periods for both Corporations and Charities workflow. Corporations is especially busy from November through May. Charities has workload peaks in May and November. In addition, limited support of the current filing system encourages a timely release date. This timeframe allows us to stand up the system and get our customers and staff somewhat proficient with it before we go into our busy season and OSOS desires a cutover at new fiscal year.

Q81: In continuation to the above question, what will be the possible impact if this end date is not met for some unforeseen reasons? Reference from RFP: Page 3 of RFP 16-01.pdf

A81: Later implementation cuts into the time to develop expertise in our system, both for our staff and our customers, before we enter peak production periods. In addition, there is risk associated with delaying implementation because of the limited support of our current system.

Q82: Does the state have any preference for onsite / offsite / offshore development?

A82: No. See answer to Question 3: There are no specific requirements for onsite time. It is expected that the vendor plan for onsite time as necessary to complete a successful project, but no specifics are defined.

Q83: If the Vendor can propose a less expensive solution, can the Vendor propose an approach where the Vendor has resources located outside of the US (i.e. Canada)?

A83: Yes.

Q84: Please confirm that the state will not provide a lower score to a Vendor that proposes Offshore application development (for example an application development center in India).

A84: Please see section 3 of the RFP for "Scored" items. Primary working location of developers has not been called out as a scored criteria. OSOS expects primary working location of development resources to be a non-issue based upon the anticipated quality of work and project management of the selected vendor.

Q85: Will a proposal with offsite / offshore work scored less?

A85: See response A84 above. Location of work completed is not a scored criteria.

Q86: Does the vendor staff need to travel to any other city? If yes, please provide the information about locations, who from vendor staff needs to visit the locations, time/duration and frequency of such visits

A86: See answer to Question 3: There are no specific requirements for onsite time. It is expected that the vendor plan for onsite time as necessary to complete a successful project, but no specifics are defined. The OSOS Corporations and Charities Division office is in Olympia, WA.

Q87: In case of onsite model, How many onsite vendor resources can be accommodated by the State

A87: OSOS does not anticipate onsite development. Office space is limited at the Corporations and Charities building. However, OSOS will accommodate onsite vendor visits as necessary.

Q88: In case of onsite model, please confirm that the state will provide necessary office facilities, phones, cubes, pc, software, etc. to the Vendor onsite resources?

A88: See answer to Question 3: There are no specific requirements for onsite time. It is expected that the vendor plan for onsite time as necessary to complete a successful project, but no specifics are defined. OSOS has limited office space at the Corporations and Charities building, but will accommodate vendors with desk space (possibly at a conference table) and internet access. Vendors are expected to provide their own office facilities otherwise, as referenced in the question.

Q89: In the case of offsite service, will the state provide VPN access to Vendor team members?

A89: Yes.

Q90: Please confirm that no bonds or damages are required under this RFP

A90: OSOS does not require a performance bond. Damages are addressed in Section 28 Termination For Cause. "Contractor shall be liable for damages as authorized by law including, but not limited to, any cost difference between the original Contract and the replacement or cover Contract and all administrative costs directly related to the replacement Contract, e.g., cost of the competitive bidding, mailing, advertising and staff time. OSOS reserves the right to suspend all or part of the Contract, withhold further payments, or prohibit Contractor from incurring additional obligations of funds during investigation of the alleged compliance breach and pending corrective action by Contractor or a decision by OSOS to terminate the Contract." And in Section 29 Termination For Convenience. "The rights and remedies of OSOS provided in the Contract are not exclusive and are in addition to any other rights and remedies provided by law."

Q91: Will any preference be given to a particular group of companies (for example, local, non-profit, minority owned)?

A91: No. Please see RFP section 2.7.

Q92: Please confirm if the state will provide necessary hardware and software for this project in all environments.

A92: Yes. Please see amended cost proposal section 3.4.A in Amendment 4: Vendors must include the cost of licenses required to support their prescribed solution. Likewise, vendors must also include any applicable support and maintenance costs. Licensing and S&M must be provided for 5 years.

Q93: Please confirm that the state is responsible for the costs of acquiring any 3rd party tools / technology (for example, web server, development and test tools, source code control, database, communication infrastructure) required by various phases of the project.

A93: Yes the OSOS is responsible for 3<sup>rd</sup> party tools approved by OSOS, and infrastructure is in place to support development (hardware and Kofax licenses). Please see amended cost proposal section 3.4.A in Amendment 4: Vendors must include the cost of licenses required to support their prescribed solution. Likewise, vendors must also include any applicable support and maintenance costs. Licensing and S&M must be provided for 5 years.

Q94: Does the Vendor need to integrate with other state agencies or Vendor team(s) to deliver a complete solution. If yes, what are such dependencies and what is the integration process?

A94: Yes: DOR for testing of data handoff to their BLS system (or replacement) and the to-be-selected (via RFP 16-02) OSOS QA/IV&V vendor. See also response to question 10:

RFP 16-02 is not available for review. It has not yet been crafted. Proposal content from the ASC for RFP 16-01 will be considered during writing of RFP 16-02 for Independent Validation and Verification (IV&V)/Quality Assurance (QA). Specifically, 16-01 ASC response to section 3.2.B, "Include any required involvement of OSOS staff and the OSOS IV&V/QA vendor, including recommended service level commitments for all three parties determined necessary by the Consultant in order to accommodate the specified timeline."

In regards to scope of work for the IV&V/QA RFP 16-02: External Contractor resources will be used to perform IV&V and QA in parallel with the development work effort. The QA/IV&V Contractor will 1) develop and execute test cases to validate and verify the work performed by the external Developer Contractor resources 2) guide the OSOS staff in implementing and adopting best practices around QA in support of software lifecycle activities and 3) write user system documentation.

It is expected that RFP 16-02 will be released mid-October or early-November, with contract signing targeted for early-January 2016. The contract term is estimated as January- July, 2016.

Q95: Does the state want the Vendor to use specific templates for project deliverables like Project Reporting, Detailed Requirements Document, Architecture Design document, Deployment Plan, Testing Plan etc. or is it expected that Vendor templates will be used for the project?

A95: OSOS PM and Vendor PM will agree upon templates upon contract award. OSOS does not require use of prescribed templates, but will review vendor-proposed templates to ensure they satisfy OSOS.

Q96: In relation to the above question, if a Vendor needs to use the state provided templates, please provide a copy of the templates so that we have a clear understanding of the level of details required.

A96: NA. See response to question 95.

Q97: Please confirm that the State is looking for a fully custom built Microsoft.NET solution

A97: Not confirmed.

Q98: Please confirm that the State will provide the licenses for all the COTS software (document management, workflow etc.) used in the development of this application?

A98: Please see response to question 93.

Q99: Please confirm that the State will provide the licenses for all the COTS software (document management, workflow etc.) used in the development of this application?

A99: Please see response to question 93.

Q100: With responsive web design, a web application can be supported on Mobile devices. Does the State expect the vendors to estimate for separate native applications for mobile devices? Reference from RFP: Mobility

A100: No.

Q101: If a separate Native mobile application is required, Please provide the detailed requirements for each native mobile application. Reference from RFP: Mobility

A101: NA. See response to question 100.

Q102: Does the State have a preferred Mobile application development platform? Reference from RFP: Mobility

A102: Bootstrap version 3+ for responsive web site design/UIs.

Q103: Please specify the Mobile operating systems (and associated versions) that must be supported with this application. The development and testing effort varies based on the number of mobile operating systems that must be supported, hence the question. Reference from RFP: Mobility

A103: Web sites should function on mobile browsers on the following platforms: Android 4+, iOS 7+, Windows Phone 8+.

Q104: Please confirm is design and development of a workflow is in scope of this project. Reference from RFP: Workflow

A104: Yes.

Q105: In relation to the above question, if yes, does State have any preference in terms of the technical solution/tool to be used for a workflow. Please clarify. Reference from RFP: Workflow

A105: OSOS looks to vendor to propose the workflow solution that they believe will net the most superior solution.

Q106: Does State have any expectation in terms of the document deliverables that should be prepared and submitted during various phase of the project? If yes, please provide the list. Reference from RFP: Documentation

A106: OSOS expects vendors to prescribe the deliverables they believe necessary to successfully complete the project.

Q107: Is Data Migration in scope of this project. Reference from RFP: Data Migration

A107: Yes. Please see Exhibits N and O.

Q108: In relation to the above question, if yes, Please confirm that State will be responsible for legacy data cleansing prior to the Vendor starting the Data Migration/Conversion activities. Reference from RFP: Data Migration

A108: Yes.

Q109: In relation to the above question, please confirm that the State will provide the cleansed legacy data for migration to the vendor in a RDBMS format. Reference from RFP: Data Migration

A109: Yes.

Q110: How many business days of User Acceptance Testing does the State expect to perform for this application? Reference from RFP: Testing

A110: Yet to be determined.

Q111: Would the State like to perform Performance\Stress testing? Reference from RFP: Testing

A111: Yes.

Q112: Will State assume responsibility for performing integration testing from the perspective of external systems not included in the project? Reference from RFP: Testing

A112: OSOS will work with the QA/IV&V vendor to conduct integration testing with external systems.

Q113: Please confirm that, the State will provide sample or test data for user and system testing. Reference from RFP: Testing

A113: Yes.

Q114: Please confirm that, the State will be responsible for data loading in the UAT and production environments. Reference from RFP: Testing

A114: The QA/IV&V vendor awarded based upon RFP 16-02 will be responsible for these activities.

Q115: Will the State conduct User Acceptance Testing after every deliverable (each Sprint) or will conduct only one UAT? Reference from RFP: Testing

A115: The QA/IV&V vendor awarded based upon RFP 16-02 will be responsible for these activities and will advise OSOS of best practices.

Q116: Please confirm that the UAT scripts be available to the Vendor, so that the Vendor can address the problems discovered during the UAT. Reference from RFP: Testing

A116: Yes.

Q117: Please confirm that the State will be responsible for production deployment and the Vendor will assist the deployment efforts (Note: Vendor may not have access to the production environment) Reference from RFP: Deployment

A117: OSOS development staff will deploy from QA to production.

Q118: How many environments does the State have for this project (for example, Development, Testing, Production) Reference from RFP: Infrastructure

A118: The three cited.

Q119: Does the DOC have any preference w.r.t. the skills and experience of the Vendor team members who will be deployed to the project. Reference from RFP: Resources

A119: Please see sections 1.3 and 3.3 for staff qualifications and experience requirements.

Q120: Does the Vendor need to provide technical / maintenance support after implementation? If yes, how many months of support does the Vendor need to provide? Reference from RFP: Support/maintenance

A120: Yes. OSOS looks to vendors to propose the model that they believe will best ensure project success, to include OSOS Development Team adoption of the implemented system.

Q121: In continuation to the above question, should Vendor estimate the cost for Maintenance and Support as part of the response for this RFP? Please clarify Reference from RFP: Support/maintenance

A121: Yes. See amended section 3.4.A from Amendment 4.

Q122: Can the support be provided by offsite team? If yes, please confirm that the State will provide VPN connectivity. If not, please confirm that the State will provide the travel costs, in addition to the support costs. Reference from RFP: Support/maintenance

A122: Yes support can be provided by an offsite team. OSOS will provide VPN connectivity. OSOS will not provide the travel costs.

Q123: Does the Vendor need to provide Warranty after implementation? If yes, how many months of support does the Vendor need to provide? Reference from RFP: Warranty

A123: OSOS did not prescribe a requirement for warranty.

Q124: In continuation to the above question, should Vendor estimate the cost for Warranty as part of the response for this RFP? Please clarify Reference from RFP: Warranty

A124: NA. Please see response to question 123.

Q125: Can the warranty support be provided by offsite team? If yes, please confirm that the State will provide VPN connectivity. If not, please confirm that the State will provide the travel costs, in addition to the support costs. Reference from RFP: Warranty

A125: NA. Please see response to question 123.

Q126: What technology (Java, .net ..... ) was used to develop the current legacy System? Reference from RFP: Current System

A126: .Net

Q127: What database (Oracle, SQL Server, DB2 ..... ) is being used in the current legacy System? Reference from RFP

A127: SQL Server

Q128: In Exhibit E for numerous business entity types, the field *Effective Date* is presented. In the corresponding Notes column, the following description is provided:

***“Maximum date range in screen part may not be accurate for this screen. Consult business rules.”***

Are the business rules being referred to for Effective Date those presented in Exhibit H, pages 16 – 18?

A128: Business rules are found in RCW (Revised Code of Washington) and WAC (Washington Administrative Code). Please see new Exhibit Q, Business Rules.

Q129: Sequence of Events – Are you willing to consider extending the proposal due date from August 31, 2015? With the responses to the vendor questions on the RFP not being posted until August 19<sup>th</sup> that does not leave a lot of time to complete the proposal response.

A129: Please see Amendment 4 for 3-day extension for a revised proposal due date of September 3, 2015. OSOS is not considering a further extension at this time.

Q130: We notice that cost evaluation forms are located in various documents. Will one cost proposal form, covering all pricing proposals be generated into one document?

A130: Please cite specific reference to the cost evaluation forms referenced.

Q131: The RFP asks for a detailed MS project schedule covering each sprint. With an agile methodology, the sprints are usually put into a product backlog determined by the business and the product owner(s). Would a high-level sprint schedule meet your requirements?

A131: Yes.

Q132: Are user acceptance testing and deployment to the State's environment within the scope of this RFP?

A132: A: The selected vendor must respond to the results of user acceptance testing, yes. A second vendor will assist OSOS in establishing best practices around QA testing and release management. The second vendor will be responsible for crafting test cases, and conducting IV&V.

OSOS development staff will push builds from QA to production. It is desirable to OSOS to have development vendor support through deployment. Vendors are asked to propose their recommended timeline and approach to ensure a successful deployment and hand off to OSOS developers for maintenance and support.

Q133: Is the new Corporations and Charities system intended to completely replace the Oracle IPM implementation?

A133: Yes.

Q134: Is migrating data from the Oracle IPM data store a requirement of this RFP? If not, does OSOS plan on migrating that data at a later date?

A134: Yes the data migration is part of this RFP. See Amendment 4 for new Exhibits pertaining to data migration requirements.

Q135: Does the new system need to support SRDP processing?

A135: No.

Q136: We note the requirement to provide source code in order for OSOS to support ongoing system enhancements and law changes. We consider that OSOS will be able to achieve this support through configuration, without requiring the source code for our product. Can you confirm such an approach is

acceptable, provided we can demonstrate to OSOS the ability to support and enhance the system via configuration?

A136: Not confirmed. OSOS will require source code.

Q137: A list of former state employees are requested to be provided by the consultant in in two separate sections of the RFP.

Section 3.1, Letter of Submittal (page 6 of the RFP), #6: "Identify any State employees or former State employees employed or on the firm's governing board as of the date of the proposal..."

Section 3.3, Management Proposal (page 8 of the RFP), #D2: "If the Consultant's staff or subcontractor's staff was an employee of the state of Washington during the past 24 months, or is currently a Washington state employee, identify the individual..." Should vendors and former state employees in both sections of their response?

A137: Yes

Q138: Should vendors list all former state employees, or only those employed with the state within the past 24 months? Regarding Section 3.2, Technical Proposal

A138: Only within the past 24 months.

Q139: Will the ASB be required to host the Team Foundation Server, or will this be hosted by OSOS? Regarding Section 3.2, Technical Proposal

A139: OSOS will host TFS.

Q140: For a custom solution, is the system expected to be hosted at CTS, or OSOS? Regarding Section 1.2, Objective

A140: OSOS will host the solution.

Q141: Would the agency be interested in staying with Oracle and upgrading/migrating to the latest version as part of this system development effort or is any Oracle platform change, if any, outside the scope of this project? Regarding Understanding that Oracle Web Center Content v11G is the current replacement for the Oracle IPM platform in use at SOS,

A141: No.

Q142: Terms and Conditions in the sample Contracts provided appear based on delivering a custom developed solution. Would OSOS like suggested amends to the wording as per the RFP, or would OSOS provide a different standard contract for a COTS based solution?

A142: The enclosed requirements were created with the intent of a custom solution, however OSOS will consider integration of existing commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) products for modules throughout the

system. Full COTS providers are encouraged to bid on development of a custom solution as defined by our enclosed requirements.

Q143: Can we assume OSOS would be reviewing and negotiating the COTS End-User License Agreement (EULA) after NOIA?

A143: With the Apparently Successful Bidder, OSOS will agree to negotiate a COTS agreement that does not violate state law and is otherwise acceptable to the agency.

Q144: Per Section 3.4, A. Cost Proposal, the tasks will be billable at the amount of proposal. Would OSOS also accept Time & Materials estimates for some of the more open ended requirements such as ETL, Data Migration, Data Cleanup? If acceptable would this type of pricing proposal be considered equally from an evaluation standpoint?

A144: No, OSOS will not accept Time and Material estimates.

Q145: Can you please identify any data or records retention policies that would apply to the data conversion and migration.

A145: Public Records / Records Retention policies of the state define guidelines.

Q146: Does the state have an existing system that it uses to send out user notifications? If so, is this system available for use by the vendor?

A146: OSOS has various automated notification mechanisms in place today. The existing notification systems do not satisfy our requirements and will not be used upon system replacement.

Q147: What level of testing of functionality is required of the vendor prior to turnover to the IV&V team for testing?

A147: Unit testing is expected of the development vendor in advance of release from Development to QA.