

## MSC eWIC Quality Assurance Contractor RFP 16-02

### Responses to Bidder Questions

#### General Questions

- 1. Can a vendor bid on both the PM and QA RFP, or must they select one over the other?**  
*Bidders may bid on both RFPs and may be awarded both RFPs, however, if a bidder bids on both RFPs, the bidder must demonstrate in the proposal how the duties and responsibilities of quality assurance and project management will be carried out in an objective manner and how potential conflict of interest will be mitigated.*
- 2. Can you provide the ITCA Bidder Information Form. It is not downloadable on your website – it creates an error.**  
*The link has been corrected and the document opens with no errors.*
- 3. Are there any other Terms and Conditions related to this RFP? It is noted that the eWIC Project Management RFP included Appendix A for New Hampshire Specific Provisions as well as New Hampshire Exceptions to Terms and Conditions Form. Do these also apply to the eWIC QA contractor RFP?**  
*Yes, there will be other Terms and Conditions. Any additional Terms and Conditions will be discussed and agreed upon during contract negotiations. The eWIC QA Contract will be with ITCA and therefore the New Hampshire Specific Provisions and the New Hampshire Exceptions to Terms and Conditions Form do not apply to the QA RFP.*
- 4. Page 1. Minimum Qualifications: Is #2 referring to only the key staff person, all project team members, or the company as a whole?**  
*The minimum qualifications refer to the company as a whole.*
- 5. Schedule, pg. 2. The schedule indicates an anticipated start date of August 22, 2016 while pg. 9 indicates that the eWIC processor contracts are anticipated to begin June through August 2016. Do the states intend to have the eWIC and MIS contractors working before the QA Contractor begins work?**  
*No, if the eWIC Service Providers contracts start first, work will not begin until the QA Contractor is on board. In order to keep the projects moving forward, the MSC has elected to negotiate the eWIC processor contracts in advance of finalizing the QA contract. eWIC processor contracts are expected to be in place prior to the QA contract so discussions and paperwork may start prior to the QA contractor being on the project. The MSC is using their operations and maintenance contractor for MIS changes. MIS enhancement work will begin once the funds have been awarded. Some MIS work was completed by the MIS contractor prior to this project starting. Requirements for the other MIS changes needed have been completed.*
- 6. Definitions. Page 6. We do not see any schedule entries concerning letters of intent. Is a separate letter of intent to bid required and if so is it due before the proposal.**  
*Letters of intent are not required for this RFP.*
- 7. 1.2. Background, Project Team Roles and Responsibilities, pg. 8. Who is the “MSC Project Manager?”**  
*Sandi Fry is the MSC Project Manager.*
- 8. 1.2. Background, Project Team Roles and Responsibilities, pg. 8. Are we correct to assume that the line item Project Management Plan in the Task/Responsibility table should read QA Contractor for the “primary” and eWIC PM for the “secondary”?**  
*Yes, that assumption is correct. The first Task/Responsibility should not be blank, it should have QA Contractor for Primary and eWIC PM for the Secondary.*

**9. 2.1. RFP Coordinator, pg. 10. For shipping purposes only please provide the telephone number of the RFP Coordinator.**

*The ITCA phone number may be used- 602-258-4822.*

**10. For shipping purposes only, please provide a phone number for Ms. Monenerkit.**

*The ITCA phone number may be used- 602-258-4822.*

**11. Section 2.7. Page 12. Is it correct to say that certain pages of our cost proposal can be marked proprietary without being disqualified (e.g. the costs themselves)?**

*Cost proposals may not be marked as proprietary.*

**12. 3. Proposal Contents, Response to Exhibit C, pg. 13 and 6.1 and 6.2.2-6.2.3, pg. 16. Section 3.7 refers to “Management and Technical proposal, section 6.1 refers to “(Technical, Management and Cost),” sections 6.2.2 and 6.2.3 refer to “Management (Exhibit C), while Exhibit C is labeled “Management Proposal” and incorporates both the Draft QA Statement of Work (Exhibit B) and Qualifications/Experience. Please clarify if there is a response requirement for a Technical Proposal and if so what it should contain.**

*There is no separate Technical Proposal. There is only a Management Proposal and Cost Proposal. Sections 3.7, 4.4, 4.5 and 6.1 have been updated to remove references to the technical proposal.*

**13. 4. Proposal Format, pg. 13, item 2. Should the originals and each copy of the Technical Proposal, Management Proposal and Cost Proposal be bound separately?**

*Each complete original or copy of the entire proposal should be should be bound together.*

**14. 4. Proposal Format, pg. 13, item 3. Would ITCA accept a labeled Flash Drive in lieu of a CD?**

*Yes, that would be acceptable.*

**15. Section 4, Item 4. Page 14. Please confirm that the cost and technical volumes are not to be separated – they are all to be bound together with the other information in one volume for each original/copy of the proposal.**

*Each complete original/copy of the entire proposal should be bound together. Please note that reference to the Technical Proposal has been removed. Sections 3.7, 4.4, 4.5 and 6.1 have been updated to remove references to the Technical Proposal.*

**16. Section 4.1. Page 13. Can tables/graphics be smaller than 11 point font?**

*Tables and graphics may be smaller than 11 point when required but bidders should ensure that the font is reasonably readable.*

**17. Section 4, Item 3. Page 14. How shall the three identical copies be marked? Copy 1 of 3, 2 of 3, etc.? Or simply “Copy”?**

*Copies should be marked 1 of 3, 2 of 3, etc.*

**18. 6.3.2. Cost Points, pg. 17. First sentence says cost score is “computed by dividing the lowest total cost for both states...” What is meant by “both states”?**

*This is a typo and “for both states” should be deleted. Section 6.3.2 Cost Points has been updated to reflect this correction.*

## Exhibit B

**19. Exhibit B, 1st paragraph. Page 23. This paragraph states, “For example, the Readiness Assessment will be one (1) document that includes ITCA, Kansas, and New Hampshire.” Since each state agency may have differing schedules, providing each with an individual readiness report might be more efficient and provide**

**for more timely information. If the readiness assessment also considers the readiness of the shared MIS, that component could be a single assessment for all three agencies. Would that be acceptable?**

*Yes, that would be acceptable.*

- 20. Exhibit B, Deliverable No. 5, Subsection b & Exhibit D. Page 24. Does this task include onsite attendance of vendor certifications? If possible, we would recommend that the cost of this task be broken out into a cost per certification since the number of certifications may be unknown at this time.**

*That would be an acceptable proposal for this deliverable.*

- 21. Exhibit B, Deliverable No. 9 & Exhibit D. Page 26. Since the additional efforts are unknown, it would be difficult to provide a fixed price for this item. What type of pricing is expected on the cost sheet for this task?**

*Please provide an hourly rate on the cost sheet for this task. The cost sheet has been revised to reflect this change.*

- 22. Exhibit C, B.2. Page 27. Will a statement in the proposal suffice to give ITCA the permission to contact our references?**

*Yes, a statement is adequate.*

- 23. Exhibit B, Item 1a. Page 23. How many days will each kickoff meeting be?**

*Each kickoff meeting will be two days.*

- 24. Deliverable 1 – Project Monitoring Plan, b) integrated project schedule, pg. 22. Does the MSC intend to have one integrated schedule for all three states or one for each state?**

*There will be one schedule for each state.*

- 25. Exhibit B, Item 1.b. Page 23. Will the QA contractor also be responsible for creating draft and final versions of the project schedules themselves and communicating them to the stakeholders, or will that be the responsibility of the WIC SA PMs with review and support from the QA contractor? Or, is the integrated project schedule developed by the QA Contractor intended to be a compilation of all ongoing project schedules managed by the SA PMs along with the QA tasks?**

*Each state's project schedule will be developed by the QA Contractor and is expected to be a compilation of information provided by the eWIC Service Provider, MIS contractor and PM.*

- 26. Exhibit B, Item 1.c. Page 23. Will the QA contractor also be responsible for creating draft and final versions of the communications themselves and communicating them to the stakeholders, or will that be the responsibility of the WIC PMs with review and support from the QA contractor?**

*The WIC PMs will create draft and final versions of the communication and send the communications. The QA contractor will review them and provide input.*

- 27. Deliverable 1 – Project Monitoring Plan, e) QA Contractor participation, pg. 22. Which state will instruct the QA contractor on meeting participation or will all three states provide instruction?**

*The Communication Plan, which will address meeting participation, will be developed with input from all three states.*

- 28. Exhibit B, Item 1.e. Page 23. How many of each type of these meetings are anticipated and how long are they expected to be (hours, days, etc.)?**

- *Status meetings will be a weekly conference call with all MSC states on the same call, lasting approximately one hour.*

- *Strategy meetings will most likely be bi-weekly conference calls and held separately with each State Agency the first two months of the project, lasting approximately one hour. As the project progresses, these meetings may be held on an as needed basis.*
- *Design sessions will occur during the first two-three months of the project and have historically been weekly. The frequency may change once we have the Readiness Assessment document. These meetings may have an online meeting component (i.e. GoToMeeting) as well as the conference line.*
- *Project Planning Meetings will be weekly conference calls, lasting approximately one hour.*
- *System Definition Activities and Test Plan Development meetings will be held on an as needed basis but as Design sessions drop off, these other meetings will replace the regularly scheduled Strategy or Design sessions.*

**29. Exhibit B, Item 1.f. Page 23. Have the implementation and operational performance standards been defined. If so, can you provide the specific metrics/expectations?**

*Each state's agreed upon eWIC Processor Statement of Work outlines both implementation and operational performance standards for the eWIC Processor. The MSC has a Quality Assurance document that has been used for all other projects. These documents will be provided to the successful bidder after a contract has been executed.*

**30. Exhibit B, Item 2.d. Page 24. Can you clarify the specific activities expected to "assist" the MSC in MIS enhancements?**

*Specific activities for Item 2,d include reviewing the MIS requirements documents already drafted by the MSC to ensure they account for MIS changes needed for eWIC implementation, answering questions, providing suggestions and input from what other states may have done in their MIS.*

**31. Exhibit B, Item 2.d. Page 24. Please confirm that there is a single set of requirements and project plan for the update of the cQuest MIS on behalf of the (3) MSC members - i.e., is there a single project plan and task order to manage the cQuest MIS system enhancements?**

*Yes, there is a single task order for MIS enhancement work.*

**32. Exhibit B, Item 2.d. Page 24. What documents will be available to support this activity: JAD Session notes, SRD, FRD, Business rules, RTM, etc.?**

*The MSC has created several requirements documents based on application within the MSC MIS. CQuest has begun drafting system specification and functional documents.*

**33. Exhibit B, Item 2.d. Page 24. Is the MIS Task Order complete, or will the QA contractor be assisting with requirements and subsequent Task order review prior to SA approval?**

*The requirement gathering is complete for the most part. As CQuest is drafting the specification and functional documents, there are clarifications being made to the requirements document. The MSC and CQuest are expecting updates to take place as contractors come onto the project and provide their input.*

**34. Deliverable 3 – Documentation Reviews, pg. 23, item c. This requirement lists seven (7) eWIC Processor Plans (a total of 21 plans across the 3 states) but indicates that the review is not limited to these plans. What other plans are anticipated? How would the QA Contractor receive additional compensation if additional plan reviews are added?**

*At this time there are no other plans anticipated by the MSC. Bidder should provide an hourly rate for these services. A Contract Amendment will be executed if additional plan reviews are needed and additional funds are required for payment. Exhibit D has been updated to reflect this change in documenting costs for this deliverable.*

- 35. Deliverable 3 – Documentation Reviews, pg. 23, item d. This requirement lists four (4) technical design interface specifications (a total of 12 plans across the 3 states) but indicates that the review is not limited to these specifications. What other specifications are anticipated? How would the QA Contractor receive additional compensation if additional specification reviews are added?**  
*At this time, there are no other design interface specifications anticipated by the MSC. Bidder should provide hourly rate for services. A Contract Amendment will be executed if additional specification reviews are needed and additional funds are required for payment. Exhibit D has been updated to reflect this change in documenting costs for this deliverable.*
- 36. Exhibit B, Item 3.a. Page 24. Is it anticipated that FIS/CDP will provide one plan for both of the SAs with whom they have contracted? If not, are they expected to be significantly different from one another?**  
*It is anticipated each MSC State Agency will receive a separate plan. It is unknown if the plans will be significantly different, but due to ITCA and Kansas using the same MIS, there should be similarities.*
- 37. Exhibit B, Item 3.d. Page 24. Does cQuest provide M&E services for all three SAs and is there a single core baseline of the MIS system or does each SA have a different baseline/version of the system?**  
*CQuest does provide M&E services for all three states and there is a single core baseline of the MIS. Each state has the same version of the system with minimal configurable options.*
- 38. Exhibit B, Item 3.f. Page 24. Is it correct to assume the intent of this requirements is for the QA contractor to review the capacity management plans provided by the eWIC processors?**  
*Yes.*
- 39. Exhibit B, Item 4. Page 24. Should we assume that our deliverable is a single report or a separate report for each MSC member covering requirements “a” thru “c” under testing activities?**  
*A separate report covering requirements a thru c in this item (Testing Activities).*
- 40. Exhibit B, Item 4. Page 24. Based on the requirements provided, we believe the QA contractor will be engaged in UAT to monitor progress, gather testing metrics and produce an overall assessment report of UAT based on the testing results. Is that correct, and if there are additional requirements please clarify? In addition, what are the planned number of UAT sessions and the duration for each?**  
*Yes, that is correct and there are no other requirements. At this time, neither the number of UAT sessions nor their duration is known.*
- 41. Exhibit B, Item 4.b. Page 24. Please confirm that tools refers to templates, job aids, and similar tools and not to software.**  
*This is correct.*
- 42. Exhibit B – Item 5.a and b. Page 25. Please confirm that the QA contractor is responsible for scheduling retailer certification and reporting on the process and results and making recommendations, but that the eWIC contractor is responsible for enablement and certification of the retailers.**  
*This is correct.*
- 43. Exhibit B, Item 5.b. Page 25. Please provide the number of expected certifications by State agency. If that is not possible, please provide for each State agency a count (or if easier a list) of distinct grocery chains (not individual stores, but chains), and distinct integrated vendors.**  
*There is a summary of the vendor readiness study in the IAPD that is posted on the ITCA website. The data was collected during the MSC Planning Phase and provides an estimate on the number of stores that are highly likely to integrate, potential candidates for integration and those that will most likely have a stand-aside.*

**44. Deliverable 6a – Pilot Oversight, pg. 24, item ii. Please identify the number and location of pilot clinic sites in each state.**

*For Kansas, there is one local agency with a single location identified for pilot.*

*For ITCA, there is one local agency with at least five travel locations identified for pilot.*

*For New Hampshire, there is one local agency with eight travel locations identified for pilot.*

**45. Exhibit B, Item 6.a.iii. Page 25. We are assuming the EBT processor is responsible for conducting retail certification, and the role of the QA contractor will be scheduling and oversight. Is that correct? If not, please clarify.**

*This is correct.*

**46. Exhibit B, Item 6.a.iii. Page 25. What are the anticipated number of retail certifications for each SA?**

*The number of retail certifications is unknown at this time. There is a summary of the vendor readiness study in the IAPD that is posted on the ITCA website. The data was collected during the MSC Planning Phase and provides an estimate on the number of stores that are highly likely to integrate, potential candidates for integration and those that will most likely have a stand-beside.*

**47. Deliverable 6a – Pilot Oversight, pg. 24, item iii. Please provide some definition as to what is expected for providing “oversight” for retailers.**

*Oversight includes:*

- *Ensuring all integrated vendors are certified to conduct eWIC transaction*
- *Ensuring all non-integrated vendors are set up to conduct eWIC transactions.*

**48. Exhibit B, Item 6.b.i. Page 26. For the Kansas pilot, are the clinics involved each under 1 local agency, or are there more than one local agencies involved? If more than one, how many?**

**In addition, we are assuming ITCA and New Hampshire pilots will be for a single local agency. Is this correct?**

*For Kansas, there is one local agency with a single location identified for pilot.*

*For ITCA, there is one local agency with at least five travel locations identified for pilot.*

*For New Hampshire, there is one local agency with eight travel locations identified for pilot.*

**49. Deliverable 6b – Pilot Oversight, pg. 24, item ii. Are these monitoring tasks included in the two (2) week on-site period?**

*No. The Pilot Readiness report is due at least one month before pilot.*

**50. Deliverable 6b – Pilot Oversight, pg. 24, item i. Does the two weeks on-site support at each state program refer to the staff member required to monitor each local agency? Is the local agency monitoring also two (2) weeks? Can one (1) QA staffer monitor more than one (1) pilot local agency?**

*Yes, the two weeks on-site support refers to the QA staff member required to monitor the pilot site. Yes, Local and State agency staff will be monitoring as well. Yes, one QA staffer may monitor more than one site.*

**51. Deliverable 6b – Pilot Oversight, pg. 24, item i. The states are reserving the right to extend the QA on-site presence requirement. How will the QA Contractor be compensated for the additional on-site work if needed?**

*Bidder should provide hourly rate for services. A Contract Amendment will be executed if additional on-site work is needed and additional funds are required for payment. Exhibit D has been updated to reflect this change in documenting costs for this deliverable.*

**52. Exhibit B, Item 7.b. Page 27. For the Kansas rollout, will rollout oversight activities and status reporting stop or continue during the 4 month holiday pause? Will ITCA or New Hampshire incorporate a holiday pause?**

*Depending on the final schedule, if a holiday pause is put in place for any state, rollout activities and status reporting may continue in a diminished frequency, as determined by the SA.*

**53. Exhibit B, Item 7.b.i. Page 26. What technical challenges would the QA contractor be required to resolve that the MIS or EBT systems contractors would not be responsible for?**

*The QA Contractor will be responsible for managing and facilitating the resolution of a technical challenges identified, having resources available that may have addressed identified similar challenges in other states and know the resolution or having the experience to see a challenge that others may not.*

**54. Exhibit B, Item 7.b.ii. Page 26. Will the SA rollouts occur simultaneously? (Question is to determine if we should plan on additional staff members to cover multiple sites.)**

*Yes, the MSC plans to have staggered Pilot dates but the statewide rollouts most likely occur simultaneously. There is a preliminary high level schedule included in the IAPD on the ITCA website.*

**55. Exhibit B, Item 7.b.ii. Page 26. How many rollouts will each SA have?**

*As described in the IAPD posted on the ITCA website:*

- *ITCA will have 4 rollouts*
- *Kansas will have 6 rollouts*
- *New Hampshire will have 3 rollouts*

## **EXHIBIT D**

**56. Exhibit D - Cost Proposal Sheet, pg. 29, item h. Deliverable 1 indicates the MSC may require additional reports and/or increased reporting. How will the QA Contractor be compensated for the additional work if needed?**

*Bidder should provide hourly rate for services. A Contract Amendment will be executed if additional reports or increased reporting is needed and additional funds are required for payment. Exhibit D has been updated to reflect this change in documenting costs for this deliverable.*

**57. Exhibit D - Cost Proposal Sheet, pg. 29. Deliverable 4 is related to evaluating test plans, but on the Cost Sheet it is labeled as “Monitoring Project Progress.” Monitoring Project Progress is an on-going activity under Deliverable 1 involving meeting attendance, contractor performance monitoring and IAPDUs, which will be documented in the Monthly Status Reports, but the Cost Proposal Sheet only lists the Kick-off Meeting and Project Plan, providing no line item for Monthly Status Reports. Please clarify where on the Cost Sheet Bidders should account for this cost.**

*Exhibit D has been corrected to reflect the correct Deliverable Descriptions. The cost of Monthly Status Reports should be included in the cost for Deliverable 1.*

**58. Exhibit D, Instructions. Page 29. Should travel be listed separately from labor costs for each deliverable or simply included in the total cost for a deliverable?**

*You may list travel separately from labor costs but it is not required.*

**59. Exhibit D, Instructions. Page 29. Should this read Deliverable #1 Project Monitoring Plan, which is an on-going activity throughout the life of the contract versus Deliverable #3 eWIC Processor Documentation Reviews which would occur at specific point(s) in time during the contract? Or should this apply to deliverables 1 and 3?**

*Yes, Deliverable 1 in Exhibit D should read Project Monitoring Plan. Exhibit D has been updated to reflect this correction. This is revised in the Deliverables 1 and 3 are ongoing throughout the life of the project.*

**60. Exhibit D - Cost Proposal Sheet, pg. 29. Deliverables 3 and 7 have multiple deliverables spread out over months. Will the QA Contractor be permitted to invoice each deliverable separately at the time it is delivered?**

*Exhibit D has been corrected to reflect the correct Deliverable Descriptions.*

**61. Exhibit D - Cost Proposal Sheet, pg. 29. Deliverable 9 is for Additional Efforts if needed. Since the level-of-effort is unknown is ITCA asking for an hourly rate?**

*Yes, please provide an hourly rate. Exhibit D has been updated to reflect this change in documenting costs for this deliverable.*

**62. Exhibit D, Cost Proposal Sheet. Page 29. Deliverable Number 4 Monitor Project Progress: Since this is an ongoing task similar to eWIC Processor Document Reviews, could it also be divided into equal monthly payments over the term of the contract?**

*Yes, that is acceptable.*