

#	Vendor Question	State Response
1.	RFO Page 79, III-E, CWDS Tech Stack Please clarify why the software stack omits technologies, such as Ruby on Rails or React.js, which are part of the qualifications for the Front End Developer roles.	The updated Stack will be provided in Addendum 1.
2.	References May we submit previously scored and signed reference forms, even if they are in a different format (from a previous RFO), to alleviate the burden of obtaining new, duplicative ratings from the same candidate's identical references? In approving staff additions the state has allowed such re-use of references across CWDS RFOs, provided that the reference covers all mandatory qualifications (MQs) and the vendor uses the Staff Resume Table to map from the candidate's experience to the MQs.	Yes, but only if the previous reference forms validate the same experience required to meet the MQs in this RFO, otherwise, new Staff Reference Forms are required.
3.	Design artifacts and activities Under Task 19 (<i>Extend Design Solutions</i>) in the Scope of Services the state indicates that vendors may be responsible for developing sketches, wireframes, clickable prototypes and high-fidelity mock-ups. These artifacts would combine and extend components from the CWDS pattern library. Also, vendors may be responsible for conducting design spikes and usability testing. Typically user experience designers would produce such design artifacts and conduct such design activities. There are no design roles on the vendor team, however. Would the state consider removing those requirements? If not, could the state clarify who, in which project roles, would be responsible for the design work outlined under Task 19?	The updated Stack will be provided in Addendum 1.
4.	The RFO outlines the vision for CALS, Intake, and Case Management modules. Will this team of Front End Developers be working as a single unit on one of these modules, or will they be working on all three. If one, which one?	The vision of this team is to work on any or all teams as needed.
5.	What facets of the assigned modules will this team be working on?	The vision of this team is to work on any or all teams as needed.
6.	How will this team collaborate with the existing CALS, Intake, and Case Management teams?	The vision of this team is to work on any or all teams as needed.
7.	Will the State please consider permitting the team to work partially on-site partially off-site elsewhere in The State of California? We would like our staff to be physically present in Sacramento 2d/wk and in the	No. The State requires all staff to work onsite at the Sacramento location.

#	Vendor Question	State Response
	Bay Area 3d/wk. Because this RFO is structured differently than previous RFOs, we hope the State will consider a slightly different model for this work.	
8.	The Narrative Response requests that we outline our understanding of the Scope of Work and the Major Activities. What are the Major Activities we are expected to respond to?	See the list of Tasks outlined in the SOW.
9.	Will the State please consider accepting questions on a rolling basis, as it has in the past, until a date much closer to the RFO response deadline?	The State will accept questions up to the Response deadline; however, vendors should submit questions as soon as possible to ensure they are clear about the RFO requirements when developing their Response.
10.	It is quite challenging to assemble the required large technical team that can meet the experience requirements, we therefore ask that the State reduce the required years of experience level in the Mandatory Qualifications.	The State feels two years of experience is the appropriate minimum requirement for this project.
11.	Can we reuse Staff Resume Tables and or Staff Reference Forms for proposed staff that we submitted for a recent OSI – CWDS RFO?	The reuse of Staff Resume Tables is allowed only if the MQs are the same as this RFO. Also, the reuse of Staff Reference Forms is allowed only if the previous reference forms validate the same experience required to meet the MQs in this RFO, otherwise, new Staff Reference Forms are required.
12.	Is there an incumbent or recent vendor that is currently or has recently provided these services or similar services to CWDS and if so, will they be allowed to bid on this procurement?	Although there is an incumbent vendor, the work outlined in this RFO is expanded from the original contract. It is not the intent of the Office of Systems Integration (OSI) to preclude any vendors from this procurement. However, vendors are advised that there are a variety of state and federal conflict of interest and related laws that may apply and may impact a vendor's ability to perform work for the State of California. These laws include, but are not limited to, the Political Reform Act (Government Code section 81000, et. seq.); Government Code section 1090, et. seq.; Government Code section 87400, et. seq.; Public Contract Code section 10365.5; and Code of Federal Regulations, title 2, section 200.319.
13.	If there is an incumbent or recent vendor that is currently or has recently provided these services or similar services to CWDS, who is the vendor?	Although there is an incumbent vendor, the work outlined in this RFO is expanded from the original contract. The incumbent is Case Commons.
14.	ATTACHMENT II-K, Cost Worksheet Please clarify RFO Submission requirements. A cost worksheet in excel format was not provided by the State for this RFO however the RFO and Submission requirement specify Attachment II- K being in excel	Vendors are required to develop and submit a Cost Worksheet in Microsoft Excel format using the provided Microsoft Word version format. The Excel format will ensure costs are calculated correctly using the formula features.

#	Vendor Question	State Response
	<p>format several times.</p> <p>a. Electronic Copy The Vendor must submit one (1) electronic copy on a Compact Disk (CD), Digital Video Disc (DVD), or a Universal Serial Bus (USB) flash drive containing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A <u>complete</u> copy of the Response in Portable Document Format (PDF), • A <u>complete</u> copy of all Staff Resume Tables, Attachment II-C, as a separate file, in Microsoft Word. • <u>And the Cost Worksheet, Attachment II-K, as a separate file, in Microsoft Excel.</u> 	
15.	<p>Attachment II-H CMAS/GSA Agreement Per procedure utilized by CWDS during the Technology Platform 2 and Platform 4 procurements, we respectfully request that we be allowed to submit our CMAS/GSA Agreement only in electronic format?</p>	Yes, that is acceptable.
16.	<p>Attachment II-E Understanding and Approach Please clarify the following. The RFO does not list Attachment III-S Tech Stack in the list of required submission attachments. However, the instructions for Attachment II-E Understanding and Approach narrative indicates vendors are to <i>Describe each additional software tool required to support and enhance the Agile Software Development services being provided to support the scope of work identified in Statement of Work, Section 5, Scope of Services, its purpose, and why the tool was proposed in Attachment III-E – CWDS Tech Stack</i>. These instructions imply that we are to update Attachment III-E CWDS Tech Stack with proposed tools and include it in our submission.</p>	The CWDS Tech Stack attachment and the Understanding and Approach attachment have been updated and clarified in Addendum 1. Submission of Attachment II-R CWDS Tech Stack is not required; however, Vendors may use it to propose tools as indicated in the RFO.
17.	Are there any guidelines on how much longer a CMAS contract should be valid for at the time of proposal submission for an ADPO opportunity?	The vendor's CMAS must be valid at the time of contract execution and completion of the services may be provided after expiration of the CMAS.
18.	We are currently in the process of renewing our CMAS which ends at the end of January. When we submit the proposal, should we map our key personnel to roles in the original GSA schedule we used or to the new GSA schedule we are renewing with?	Vendor Offers must include their current CMAS and related GSA schedule.
19.	Is Ruby on Rails being used for Licensing and Case Management development projects?	Yes
20.	May bidders submit references, to meet the	Yes; however, references from staff associated with

#	Vendor Question	State Response
	<p>qualifications requested in Attachments II-C (Staff Resume Table), II-D (Staff References) and II-F (CMAS/GSA Classification Qualifications), from former or current State of California clients (CWDS/OSI/CDSS)?</p>	<p>an OSI project must comply with the OSI's policy regarding vendor references. Vendors may submit their Staff Reference Forms, Attachment II-D, with their Initial Administrative Submission for State review.</p>
21.	<p>We request that Interview questions will be provided 1-day in advance of the scheduled interview</p>	<p>If the State elects to conduct interviews, they will be conducted in accordance with the RFO, Section 1, item 4.e., RFO Best Value Response Assessment and Selection Process, Interview (Optional).</p>
22.	<p>Section 18 of the CWS-NS General Provisions would require a 1-year warranty for all Services and Deliverables. Given that the State is looking for Agile development services, would the State consider a more appropriate warranty for such services in the SOW? One year warranty is more appropriate for waterfall projects with pre-defined Deliverables and would be cost prohibitive for this Project. We would propose that the warranty be for our services as the agile approach already requires on-going State approvals of any stints: Services will be performed in a good and workmanlike manner consistent with the specifications of the SOW. The Contractor will re-perform any work not materially in compliance with this warranty brought to its attention within thirty (30) days after that work is performed.</p>	<p>No, it is not in the State's best interest to make this change.</p>