**Department of Human Resources**

**Request for Proposals for**

**State Disbursement Unit Services**

**CSEA/SDU/14-001-S**

**QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES SERIES #2**

1. **Question**: After the Transition-In period, will the state provide a regular payor file (or validation file) after the transition-in period? If so, how often will the file be provided? Is the file layout the same as found in Attachment R? (RFP Section 3.3C – State Supplied Services)

**Response**: Yes, the State will provide the regular payor file daily. Attachment R will be revised.

1. **Question**: Provide the current vendor’s monthly invoice for the past 12 months. This

Historical data will be used to accurately size the SDU. (RFP Attachment A)

**Response**: The total overall invoice amount for the past twelve months is $1,568,095.03.

1. **Question**: RFP states that the SDLC is due within 10 days after the NTP, and no software

development or changes can begin until the State approves the SDLC. Will the state clarify that the SDLC Plan is the roadmap of templates for accomplishing the implementation? (RFP Section 3.5.7.B & 3.5.7.C, p 51)

**Response**: No. For more information regarding the SDLC Plan, please refer to the link in Section 3.5.7.B, page 51.

1. **Question**: RFP states “a. Access to operating systems for training during normal working

Hours (8:00a.m. until 6:00p.m.)” As this is a services-based contract with contractors using proprietary software to provide the service, would the State please clarify which operating systems are included in this requirement? (RFP Section 3.8.B.11.a, p 84)

**Response**: This section has been revised to include subject matter experts, instead of the operating systems. See Amendment #1.

1. **Question**: As this is a service-based contract using proprietary software to provide the

service, would the State consider allowing contractors to put source code in escrow rather than turning it over at the end of the contract? (RFP Section 3.8.B.3, p 83)

**Response:** This section has been revised to remove references to source code and object code. See Amendment #1.

1. **Question**: Since this is services-based contract using proprietary software to provide the

service, would the State consider limiting access to source code by means of an escrow account that may be opened in the event of contractor breach, bankruptcy, or end of business? (RFP Section 3.8 B 3)

**Response**: The State has removed references to source codes in Section 3.8.B.3. See Amendment #1.

1. **Question**: Surety Bid Bond & Payment bond: Even though the following paragraph

references the words bid and payment bonds within the performance bond paragraph, please confirm that such bid and payment bonds are not required for this deal as there was no specific requirement outlined within this RFP. Are there any bid payment bonds required? If so, what are the actual requirements and the amounts? (RFP Section 2.44 Performance Bond, p 34)

**Response**: Offerors are not required to possess bid or payment bonds. The second paragraph in Section 2.44 provides information to small businesses who are seeking assistance in obtaining those types of bonds through the Maryland Small Business Development Financing Authority.

1. **Question**: What is the current contract price per each transaction type?

**Response**: This information is confidential and cannot be disclosed.

1. **Question**: As the incumbent contractor, Xerox prevented over $200,000 of NSF check

returns last year by placing a “hold” on payments over $1,000 that did not match the support obligation amount until the item cleared at the bank. To prevent similar losses, would the State consider it acceptable for the contractor to arrange for third party guarantee on these items? If the guarantor refuses to provide a guarantee due to the remitter’s NSF history or known funds unavailability would the State consider that acceptable cause to reject the payment and require the remitter to use certified funds? (RFP Section 3.5.3.I.2, p 46)

**Response**: It is up to the Offeror to propose solutions for handling payors with a history of NSF that complies with the requirements of the RFP.  Please note that the Department will finally determine which payor's payments may be rejected.  Also, a payor shall not be placed on the bad check list for the first NSF.

1. **Question:** Based on RFP Sections 3.5.17 and 3.6 which states the “Contractor” not the “Offeror” must provide draft plans, would the State please confirm that draft plans other than the Security Plan and Staffing Management Plan are to be submitted after NTP rather than with the proposal? If this interpretation is not correct, please provide a list of any other draft plans that are expected with the Offeror’s proposal response?

**Response**: The only draft plan that Offerors need to provide with their technical proposals is the initial Staffing Plan. See RFP Section 3.7.B.3.

1. **Question**: In Section 4.1 and 4.2, the RFP states price is to be in a separate envelope from

the technical proposal. In Sections 3.10 Task Orders, the RFP states “To establish rates for TO Services, the Offeror shall provide in their proposal fully loaded maximum hourly rates for the Offeror’s Key Personnel and all other personnel assigned to the SDU project.”

**Response**: Offerors should not include any pricing information in their technical proposals. All pricing information should be in the financial proposal per Section 4.1. Section 3.10 of the RFP requests pricing for the Key Personnel for Task Orders. The price proposal, Attachment A, identifies the Key Personnel and Offerors have to provide the fully loaded hourly rates for each.

 **47. Question:** In this section of the RFP, there is a Section 3.5 Requirements followed by items

 found in RFP Section 3.5 followed by Section 3.5 Scope. Should the first

 reference to Section 3.5 be Scope instead of Requirements? Should 3.4

 Requirements be associated with 4.2.E? (RFP Section 4.2.D – Proposed Services)

 **Response**: In 4.2.D, the first reference to Section 3.5 lists an incorrect title, Section 3.5

refers to the Scope of the Project, not Requirements. (See Amendment #1)

The requirements listed in Section 3.4 should be associated with Section 4.2.E.

1. **Question**: Item N repeats text from Item F, can N be deleted? If not, please clarify (RFP

Section 3.5.14, p 57-58)

**Response**: This section was revised to delete item N. Please see Amendment #1.

1. **Question**: It C, “Service Levels and Performance Standards” points to section 3.5.27.J.

There is no section 3.5.27. Should this be 3.5.26.J? (RFP Section 4.2.D, p 89)

**Response**: Yes, the referenced section should be 3.5.26.J. RFP Section 4.2.D.C has been revised to reflect this. Please see Amendment #1.

1. **Question**: RFP states: “….the Contractor shall: 1, implement its transition plan to ensure

Implementation of all payment processing functions within ninety (90) calendar days after the contract start date. The Contractor shall implement the transition milestone within the number of days specified in Section 3.5, Reports.” The list of deliverables in section 3.5 does not list a Transition in Plan, just two Transition Plans due in advance of the Transition Out. Does the State have an existing Transition In Plan that we are required to use, or are we required to produce the Transition In Plan? If we are required to produce the Plan, when is it due to the State? (RFP Section 3.7, p 79)

**Response**: Offerors are required to develop a Transition-In Plan and submit it with their proposals. (See Amendment #1)

1. **Question:** In order to have accurate and consistent pricing, the following corrections are

Requesting on the Excel pricing template. The formula for total maximum contract amount in cell L43 on the “Year 1” tab and the “2-Year OPT” tab should be corrected to include I40 instead of J40. The hourly rates on the “2-Year OPT” tab in cells H36, H37, and H38 should be unprotected to allow entry. Section III total price column (cells I36, I37, and I38) on the “2-Year OPT” tab should include a formula to calculate the totals. (Attachment A-Pricing Proposal)

**Response:** Revised Attachment A – Pricing Proposal has been revised. (See Amendment #1)