

## SACWIS QA/IV&V RFP Questions and Answers

No.	RFP Reference	Vendor Question	State Answer
1.	General	Have any contractors assisted the State in project planning or RFP development on the SACWIS project? If so, will they be allowed to submit a proposal in response to the MC RFP?	No contractors assisted in project planning or RFP development on the SACWIS project.
2.	General	The instructions require responses to provide a point-by-point response to Sections 3&4. Is it ok to include an Executive Summary in Section 1 or 2?	Vendors are encouraged to provide an executive summary but not as a substitute for any required responses.
3.	General	Was there a specific reason why the deadlines for submission of Letter of Intent & Vendor Questions are extended?	This action was determined to be in the State's best interest.
4.	General	<p>Now that the State has reached a decision in this regard, would the State share the following information with Vendors interested in bidding for the QA/IV&amp;V RFP –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) What is the technology platform &amp; what tools are going to be used in the proposed solution? i.e. Mainframe, Unix, Linux, Windows; IBM Mainframe, J2EE, .Net; COBOL, Java, C#; configuration tools; etc.</li> <li>(2) What are the approximate timelines for the proposed implementation?</li> </ol>	<p>The following specifications apply to the solution proposed by the State's IC. Please be aware that while the State intends to enter into a contract with Deloitte Consulting (see question 5) for the design, development, and implementation of a SACWIS system, this process is ongoing and a contract has not yet been signed and approved.</p> <p><b>Database</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AllFusion Erwin Data Modeler</li> <li>• IBM DB2 Universal Developer's Edition (development)</li> <li>• IBM DB2 OS/390 (production)</li> <li>• DB2 Connect</li> <li>• MS SQL Server Standard 2005</li> <li>• Golden – DB/SQL tool</li> </ul> <p><b>Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MS Visual Studio .NET 2005 Professional + MSDN Professional</li> <li>• Visual Source Safe</li> <li>• Toad</li> <li>• SQL Plus</li> </ul>
5.	General	Please confirm the announcement on the DHS website that states Deloitte Consulting is the intended awardee for the SACWIS RFP.	The Alabama Department of Human Resources has entered into contract negotiations with Deloitte Consulting. If these negotiations are successful, the Department intends to award a contract to Deloitte for the SACWIS project.

No.	RFP Reference	Vendor Question	State Answer
6.	Schedule of Events	The disclaimer at the bottom of the page indicates that the Legislative Oversight Committee may hold a contract for up to 45 days. Is the contractor at risk for performing services prior to the Legislative Oversight Committee approving the contract?	<p>State law requires that all contracts be submitted to the Legislative Contract Review Oversight Committee (LCROC) for review. The Committee, which meets monthly, can endorse a contract or hold it for up to 45 days. If held, the Governor may sign the contract after the 45-day period. If this occurs, the contract is considered to be fully executed. A contract is considered fully executed or approved only after the LCROC has reviewed it and the Governor has signed it. Vendors should be aware of possible delays because of these requirements. No work will be performed until the contract is fully executed as evidenced by the Governor's signature. All references in the RFP to contract signing or contract approval should be read as meaning after the Governor has signed the contract.</p> <p>LCROC meetings are open to the public. If necessary, the Vendor will be informed by the Department of the Committee's action.</p> <p>The finalization of the start dates depend on timely action by Federal and State oversight entities. If subsequent developments indicate that the start dates shown in the RFP are to be changed, the appropriate Vendors will be notified as soon as possible.</p> <p>The MC will provide ACF with the same reports which it provides to the State. There are no additional reporting requirements for ACF beyond what is being required for the State.</p>
7.	Schedule of Events	The calendar suggests that the State and contractor both sign the contract before Legislative Oversight Committee approval of the contract. How is the Legislative Oversight Committee's approval/disapproval of the contract announced and made available to the contractor?	
8.	Schedule of Events	Is the Legislative Oversight Committee's approval/disapproval action the final and definitive action evidencing that contract performance can commence?	
9.	Schedule of Events	On Page 19 of the RFP the Governor's Office is identified as having review and approval rights for the contract. Please explain the review and approval process and identify what events must happen for a contract to be deemed 'approved?'	
10.	Section 1.4	The RFP states that the State expects the IV&V vendor will have appropriate staff on-site within 30 calendar days of contract signing. Please refer to the question regarding Schedule of Events. Should this requirement be that the selected IV&V vendor must have appropriate staff on-site within 30 days of contract approval by the Legislative Oversight Committee?	
11.	Section 1.2	Section 1.2 states that the State hopes to have the MC on board in advance of the start date of the IC. The expected start date for the MC is 16-Oct. Is the expected start date of the IC still 23-Oct?	
12.	Section 1.2	<p>The RFP states, '...the MC will report jointly to the federal oversight agency – the US Department of Health &amp; Human Services Administration ... (ACF) and ...'</p> <p>Could you please elaborate on the nature of the reporting to ACF i.e. would it involve periodic status meetings with them &amp; if so what would be the frequency &amp; location of such meetings?</p>	

No.	RFP Reference	Vendor Question	State Answer
13.	Section 1.2	In Paragraph 1 the text states that the selected firm is to provide regular and periodic assessments of the Project as it progresses through the system development lifecycle. Please confirm whether the IV&V vendor's scope of work also include associated project activities such as training, implementation, et al.	The MC's scope of work includes all project activities from the beginning of the project through statewide implementation. Per Section 1.2: "The objective of the MC procurement is to secure a qualified firm to provide independent and objective project oversight and to improve the outcome of this critical information technology project by providing regular and periodic assessments of the Project as it progresses through the system development lifecycle."
14.	Section 1.2	The objective states the MC Contractor will report jointly to ACF and the State's Executive Committee. Is the State also providing an ASSIST Project Director and/or ASSIST Program Manager for day-to-day interaction with the MC?	State staff, including a project manager, have been assigned to the project. See related question number 44.
15.	Section 1.2	When will the winning SACWIS Project RFP response and other related information be made ready for review?	This material will be made available to the winning MC vendor upon contract execution. This is projected to occur in September.
16.	Section 1.4	For the period between MC contract start and the IC securing space, it states that the State will provide temporary quarters for up to three (3) MC staff. How many MC staff accommodations will be provided by the IC vendor at the IC Project site?	Per Section 3.4.2 of the SACWIS RFP, the IC will house up to six MC staff at the project site.
17.	Section 1.4	With the space to be provide by the IC, will the MC be provided access to utilize the State network or IC network with Internet access, access to printers, and access to copiers?	The MC will be provided access to the project's network that will be established at the project site by the IC. The MC will be given access to printers, copiers and the Internet.
18.	Section 1.4	For the period between MC contract start and the IC securing space, does the access to the State network provide internet access?	The State will provide MC staff access to the Internet for the period of time MC staff are housed in a State facility.
19.	Section 1.4	The RFP states that the MC will be responsible for all equipment and supplies for its staff, except for the network, printers, and copiers. Does this include furniture, such as desks/cubicles?	Per Section 1.4, the IC will provide office space, including cubicle, desk, chair, etc., for MC staff. The MC is responsible for providing PCs and office supplies for its staff.
20.	Section 1.5	The RFP states that a contract term 'significantly' longer or shorter than 30 months will be considered grounds for renegotiation of the contract. Please clarify how large a variance from 30 months does the State consider 'significant'?	The State considers a contract term of 29, 30, or 31 months to be governed by this section and not enough of a variance to give rise to renegotiation. Any contract term outside this three-month parameter are grounds for either party to request renegotiation.
21.	Section 1.5	The RFP states that a contract term significantly shorter or longer than thirty (30) months will be considered grounds for renegotiation of the payment terms and schedule. Since this will be a fixed price contract, please clarify what variance will be considered significant.	

22.	Section 1.5	Given that the contract term for the DDI contract is 36 months, can the State provide information/insight into its expectation for how long the systems development and implementation period will be?	The State anticipates that the systems design and development will take roughly 14 months with another 8 months until full statewide implementation.
23.	Section 1.8	Will the State provide the list of companies that submitted a Letter of Intent to Propose?	Yes. The State will post the list of companies submitting a Letter of Intent to Propose to the State's website ( <a href="http://www.dhr.state.al.us">www.dhr.state.al.us</a> ).
24.	Section 1.8	Will the State publish the identity of vendors who have submitted Letters of Intent?	
25.	Section 1.9.5	Will the State post a list of companies submitting a LOI on the SACWIS QA/IV&V RFP?	
26.	Section 1.9	Will the State consider engaging in good faith contract negotiations with the successful vendor on certain issues such as possible limitations on liability and clarification of Intellectual Property rights?	Refer to RFP Section 1.9.1 which states that by submitting a proposal, the Vendor agrees to the acceptance of the terms and conditions. If the State considers it to be in its best interest, it may consider negotiation on some items where it is not bound by State law.
27.	Section 1.9.5	Can a subcontractor that has been bid unsuccessfully by a potential prime IC on the SACWIS Project RFP be eligible for consideration as a subcontractor for the SACWIS QA/IV&V RFP by a different prime MC?	There is no prohibition against a subcontractor who was bid unsuccessfully on the SACWIS project being bid as a subcontractor for the QA/IV&V RFP. The prohibition applies to the prime vendor who bid unsuccessfully on the SACWIS project.
28.	Section 1.9.5	Is the statement referring to Section 5.1.3.2 (Subcontractor Profile) in the original SACWIS Project RFP?	The reference should be to Section 5.2.3.2 of the QA/IV&V RFP.
29.	Section 2.2	The last sentence in this section appears to be in error. Is it supposed to be "...vendor agrees that it will not be a candidate for the SACWIS Contract"?	No. In the context used in Section 2.2, the sentence in question is actually a quote from the SACWIS RFP where it is appropriate.
30.	Section 2.2	Vendors are prohibited from submitting proposals for both the IV&V and systems implementation services as either a prime or subcontractor. Does this prohibition extend to individuals who act as independent contractors?	The prohibition against parallel services does not extend to individuals who were bid as independent contractors in response to the SACWIS RFP.
31.	Section 2.4	Is Appendix E to be completed once MC services awarded or is it to be completed by proposed staff and included in the proposal?	An Immigration Status Form (Appendix E), must be completed and submitted with vendor proposals in response to this RFP.
32.	Section 2.5.2	Should the reference in the first paragraph be Section 2.5.1 instead of Section 2.3.1?	Yes. The reference should be to Section 2.5.1.
33.	Section 3	Is it correct to assume that with regard to Testing, the State is not expecting the selected MC to provide a full-fledged 'Test Team'? Our understanding is that for 'Testing', the expectation from the MC is to provide all the necessary support to the State QA team to ensure that 'Testing' is thorough & comprehensive – i.e., help in setting up the process, evaluate test plans and acceptance criteria, assist with issue tracking & resolution, etc. Is this understanding correct?	The State does not expect the MC to conduct testing. Our expectation is that the MC will evaluate all testing activities to provide the State with the assurance that testing is thorough and accurate and that a quality product is delivered.

34.	Section 3.2	The IV&V contractor is required to include a QA work plan in its proposal, which plan is to include start and completion dates, task hours, resources, predecessors and successor tasks, et al. Given that the implementation contractor's schedule and work plan is unavailable for use as a reference and given the wide latitude the implementation RFP gives to proposers, does the State agree that the IV&V contractor's initial QA work plan can only be completed at a very high and generic level?	The State understands that without access to the winning IC proposal, vendors responding to the QA/IV&V RFP must necessarily submit QA work plans that are high level and generic.
35.	Section 3.4	The RFP defines several tasks involving the winning IC proposal that must be completed within 45 days of the MC's start date (tasks 3.4.6, 3.4.7, and 3.4.8). Will this due date be extended to 45 days after the selection of the winning IC if it has not been selected by the MC start date?	The State will make available all materials necessary for the MC to complete the tasks in question when the MC contract is executed. The MC will have a full 45 days from that point to complete these tasks.
36.	Section 3.4.1	The RFP calls for the Contractor to participate in State-facilitated county office visits. Can the State provide information on the number and location of such site visits and when such visits will be scheduled within the 45 day performance window specified?	The intent is for the MC to become at least minimally familiar with county child welfare operations. This will involve limited visits to approximately three counties. These counties will be selected after discussion with the MC and the visits are not expected to involve overnight travel. Any associated costs, which should be minimal, should be reflected in the vendor's fixed price.
37.	Section 3.4.1	Are IV&V contractor out of pocket costs for such site visits to be reimbursed by the State?	
38.	Section 3.4.1	"State-facilitated county office visits". Are there types of county offices which would differ in how they do business? Are there offices which do not provide a full range of services? Approximately, how many county office visits would the State recommend be priced in the proposal?	
39.	Section 3.4.1	The RFP states, 'The MC must familiarize .....through state-facilitated county office visits.....' Has the state identified participating county offices for such visits? How many of the 67 county offices does the State anticipate would need to be visited during the Planning & Initiation (and through out the project)?	
40.	Section 3.4.2	The MC is charged with reviewing all appropriate ACF-provided materials, including but not limited to the SACWIS Review and Assessment Guide (SARGe), ACF Program Instruction (PI), Action Transmittals (AT), and Information Memoranda (IM). Will the State provide representative examples of these documents?	
41.	Section 3.4.2	Review of ACF Material - The RFP refers to SARGe. Could you please explain the purpose and content on SARGe and elaborate on what is expected of the MC with respect to this document? Also, could you please tell us where to get this document?	SARGe is the assessment guide used by ACF to determine if a state SACWIS system complies with all pertinent requirements. A copy of the assessment guide as well as other SACWIS related Federal material can be found on the web site below: <a href="http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/cb/systems/index.htm#sacwis">http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/cb/systems/index.htm#sacwis</a>
42.	Section 3.4.2	"The MC must review all appropriate ACF-provided materials, including but not limited to ..." Please advise regarding the expected quantity of ACF Program instructions, Action Transmittals, and Information Memoranda, as well as known items not listed in 3.4.2.	

43.	Section 3.4.4	“The MC must review and evaluate the overall project structure and assess the State’s ability to perform and meet the goals and objectives as set out in the SACWIS RFP.” Is this a full evaluation of the project management, IT technical, and business domain expertise, including recommendations for organizational re-structuring, etc.? Or is this task just evaluating (and extending?) the Gap Analysis, which is already planned, without recommendations for restructuring, training, etc.?	This review is not expected to be a full organizational evaluation. The State expects the MC to review the project structure and processes to ensure that they are sound and serve to further the project’s goals and objectives. The MC is also expected to evaluate the Gap Analysis and provide an assessment on the adequacy of its conclusions and recommendations. The Gap Analysis will be provided to the MC upon contract execution.
44.	Section 3.4.4	Page 22 of 43, Section 3.4.4: This section discusses an evaluation of State staff assigned to the project. Has the State identified and committed staff to this project. Please identify these resources and their roles and responsibilities in this project.	Please refer to the State’s Organizational Chart attached as Appendix L to the SACWIS RFP.
45.	Section 3.4.9	Since this task involves a dependency on the IC (the foundation system must be installed and configured), will the State consider modifying the due date for this item to be based on completion of the predecessor IC task?	The MC will not be expected to complete this task prior to the completion of the predecessor IC task.
46.	Section 3.5.1	If additional deliverables are proposed by the IC and agreed to by the State, potentially increasing the MC scope, will there be an opportunity to negotiate a change to the MC cost?	The MC cost proposal should be based on the deliverables contained in the QA/IV&V RFP as well as those set out in the SACWIS RFP. The State does not anticipate any further IC deliverables that would increase the scope of the MC.
47.	Section 3.5.2	Does the State have an existing dispute resolution process for any issues among the State, IC, and MC?	No.
48.	Section 3.5.9	This section discusses the MC’s responsibilities for submissions of annual APDUs and As-Needed APDs. Will the current Implementation APD be made available to vendors in preparing their proposals?	The State is awaiting Federal approval of its Advance Planning Document. Upon approval, this document will be provided to the MC. Annual and/or As Needed updates to this document will take the form of narrative information on the progress of the project, updated schedule information and details on any major project changes. In addition, an updated project budget will be required annually. The State will generate this budget information. As the base APD document will already be in place, the required updates are not expected to be major tasks for the MC. Please refer to the following ACF website for more information on the content and scope of these annual APDs.
49.	Section 3.5.9	“The MC must prepare and submit to ACF annual Advanced Planning Document Updates (APDU) and any needed As-Needed APDs for the SACWIS Implementation for the duration of the contract period.”  Is there a current APD available for review at this time? If yes, can you please provide a copy?	<a href="http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/systems/sacwis/apdguide/chapterfour.htm">http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/systems/sacwis/apdguide/chapterfour.htm</a>
50.	Section 3.6	To assist with achieving these tasks and deliverables, will the MC have authority to request that the IC provide evidence of successful completion of unit testing and other developer-level QA activities? Will any unit, integration, or load/performance test scripts be automated?	The IC will provide evidence of successful completion of unit testing, and this information will be made available to the MC. The selected IC, Deloitte Consulting, will use Mercury test tools to automate load/performance testing tasks.

51.	Section 3.6.4, 3.6.8	The MC is charged with assessing impact of changes proposed to the IC scope of work as well as prioritizing fixes and enhancements for software defects and other issues that arise during the life of the project. Is it anticipated that this work will be in association with an overall Change Control Board (CCB) and, if so, who are the members of this CCB?	The expectation of the State is for the MC to provide recommendations on proposed changes to be presented to a Change Control Board (CCB) for review and approval. The members of the CCB have not yet been designated.
52.	Section 3.4.9	“The MC must review and evaluate the installation and configuring of the IC’s foundation system (if a foundation system exists).” Please advise if this task would include some type of benchmark testing?	The State does not expect the MC to conduct benchmark testing.
53.	Section 3.5.3	Does the State currently have a preferred tool for tracking requirements?	<p>The State currently uses MS Project 98 for project planning but is planning to upgrade to Microsoft Office Enterprise Project Management (EPM) within the next year.</p> <p>The State has not identified specific project support tools or methodologies. It is our expectation that specific tools and methodologies, and an explanation of how those tools will meet the State’s objectives, will be included in each vendor’s proposal.</p>
54.	Section 3.4.8	Does the state have a preferred methodology or a ‘short list’ of acceptable methodologies?	
55.	Section 3.4.8	Does the State have a preference or standard for project planning tools, e.g., MS Project?	
56.	Section 3.4.8	Does the State have a preference or standard for other project management tools, for example issue management, change management, configuration management, risk management, et al.	
57.	Section 3.5.3	Please advise as to what tool or tools are currently used for the State’s Requirements Traceability Matrix maintenance.	
58.	Section 3.5.5	“...MC must document any deficiencies identified by ACF and ensure they are addressed prior to implementation.” What tool or tools does the State prefer for recording and tracking deficiencies?	
59.	Section 3.5.6.5	Does the state currently use a tool for documenting and tracking action items?	
60.	Section 3.5.6.6	Does the state have a preferred risk management tool or do we need to provide one?	
61.	Section 3.2, 3.4.3, 3.6.4	Are any specific toolsets preferred for tracking work plans, requirements, discrepancies, action items/issues, and other engagement artifacts?	
62.	Section 3	Has the State used (or does it intend to use) any specific tool (such as IBM Rational RequisitePro) to document and manage the ‘requirements specifications’ (and Requirements Traceability Matrix) for ASSIST? As also for issue reporting & tracking?	

63.	Section 3.5.6	Please clarify whether the weekly status report referenced in this paragraph is intended to address the overall project (e.g. IC staffing, action items, issues, risks) or just MC tasks.	The MC weekly status report should contain the items mentioned in Section 3.5.6 as they pertain to the MC and its area of responsibility within the project. Further, the MC must provide critical analysis and perspective on the IC and its performance during the reporting week without merely repeating the contents of the IC weekly status report. The MC will be provided with a copy of the IC's weekly status report at least two days prior to the MC weekly status report due date.
64.	Section 3.5.8	Is it the State's intent that the summary reports are due two days after the MC is made aware of a circumstance requiring a report (in some cases, the issue may not be known until more than two days have elapsed)?	The intent of summary reports is that is the MC report within two days of becoming aware of issues which, in the judgement of the MC, are of sufficient magnitude that they should not wait until the issuance of the weekly report before being brought to the attention of the State.
65.	Section 3.6	The RFP states that the MC "...must assist the State in verifying and validating that all development, testing, and installation of software is done...meets all the functional and technical requirements of the system and is compliant with any relevant Federal requirements." Please confirm that the State will be principally responsible for any user acceptance testing activity, including test plan preparation, test data & test script preparation, acceptance criteria definition, staffing, and actual performance of user acceptance testing; and that the IV&V vendor's responsibility is limited to assessment of those activities to determine if they are sufficient to meet the objectives set out in Section 3.6.	The State does not expect the selected MC to conduct testing. Our expectation is that the MC will evaluate all testing activities to provide us with the assurance that testing is thorough and accurate and that a quality product is delivered.
66.	Section 4.1	The RFP states that not all work needs to be done onsite. Will the necessary VPN connectivity, access rights, etc. be provided for the MC to access the project repository/environment when working offsite?	The MC will have access to the materials necessary to perform its duties related to this project.
67.	Section 4.1	Can a part of the MC team attend weekly status meetings over the telephone (in instances where it would be more cost-effective for some members of the MC team to be offsite)?	The State is not opposed in principle to some MC staff participating in weekly staff meetings via telephone. However, there should routinely be on site MC representation at required meetings. The State reserves the right to reject any offsite working arrangements if it feels that such an arrangement is not in its best interest.
68.	Section 4.1	The RFP states that the MC staff shall be available after hours on an as-needed basis. As the MC's fixed price proposal would be based on efforts estimates associated with deliverables articulated in the MC proposal, does this statement imply that the State requires the MC to anticipate, & include in its fixed price estimates, a certain percentage of after-hours work throughout the engagement? Or should this after hours work (since it is only on 'as & when basis') be treated separately as a 'time & material' component to be billed at agreed upon rates?	The nature of large automated system implementation projects dictates that some work take place after hours. This is especially true in the case of the IC and may, to a lesser extent, apply to the MC. However, the State feels that any after hours work required of the MC will be so infrequent that it doesn't warrant consideration in vendor cost proposals. The State will not enter into a 'time & material' contract for this or any services rendered by the MC.

69.	Section 4.2	Please confirm that all proposed staff members must be knowledgeable in system design.	The State requirement is that the MC team have relevant system design experience, but there is no requirement that each individual member of the MC's proposed team have system design experience.
70.	Section 4.3	Can the requirement for experience in large-scale government system implementations be met with experience obtained in a QA role, or is it the state's intent that the experience be obtained as an implementation contractor?	The State requires that at least one senior member of the proposed project team (i.e. QA Project Manager or Senior Analyst) have relevant experience as an implementation contractor.
71.	Section 4.6 & 5.2.4.2	Staff Resumes are mentioned in Section 4.6 and 5.2.4.2. Please indicate in which section the resumes should be included.	Resumes should be included with Section 5.2.4.2.
72.	Section 4.6 & 5.2.4.2	Section 4.6 asks for "names, positions, and current telephone numbers of three (3) individuals who can provide information on the proposed staff member's experience and competence" and Section 5.2.4.2 g) asks for "Two references, listing project description, individual role, dates of assignment, and primary and secondary contact email and phone."  Are five different references required for each proposed staff person? If not, please clarify how many references are required for each staff person and the associated information needed for each.	Three references are required for each proposed staff member. The information needs for the references are contained in Section 5.2.4.2 (g).
73.	Section 4.7 & 5.2.4.2	Section 4.7 and Section 5.2.4.2 both call for an organization chart. Please indicate in which section the chart should be included.	Organizational charts should be included with Section 5.2.4.2.
74.	Section 5.2.2.1	Requires references to be for projects for which the Vendor served as the prime QA contractor. Could projects for which the vendor served as the prime IV&V contractor be used as references?	The State encourages vendors to submit relevant references related to either QA or IV&V experience, with the preference being for experience that most closely aligns with the requirements in this RFP.
75.	Section 5.2.3	We plan to submit a proposal using the same numbering scheme as presented in the RFP. Please clarify the numbering on these RFP sections found on pages 30 to 31: 5.2.3.2 Subcontractor(s) <i>Is followed by</i> 5.2.4.2 Project Organization and Staffing <i>Is followed by</i> 5.2.4.5 Vendor Financial Stability	Please change the numbering for these sections as follows: 5.2.3.2 Subcontractor(s) 5.2.3.3 Project Organization and Staffing 5.2.3.4 Vendor Financial Stability
76.	Section 5.2.3.2	If the prime vendor is subcontracting with an individual and not a firm, is the same information required in this section of response?	The MC must submit a resume for the individual subcontractor including the items listed in Section 4.6.
77.	Section 5.2.4.2	What should the percentage of time assigned to State of Alabama SACWIS project be based on, full-time-equivalent for 30 months considering 2080 hours annually or other?	A full-time equivalent should be based on 2080 hours annually.

78.	Section 5.2.4.2	What should the percentage of time spent in Montgomery, AL be based on, full-time-equivalent for 30 months considering 2080 hours annually; total number of hours assigned to project; or other?	A full-time equivalent should be based on 2080 hours annually. The vendor should state what percentage of hours the staff member will spend onsite in Montgomery, AL, out of the total hours the staff member is assigned to the Alabama QA/IV&V project.
79.	Section 5.2.4.2	Should this be Section 5.2.3.3?	Section 5.2.4.2 is incorrectly numbered. The section should be numbered as 5.2.3.3.
80.	Section 5.2.4.5	Should this be Section 5.2.3.4?	Section 5.2.4.5 is incorrectly numbered. The section should be numbered as 5.2.3.4..
81.	Section 6	The RFP states that prices quoted must be effective through the end of 2009. The RFP does not contain a statement declaring how long a Cost Proposal itself must be valid, e.g., 90 days, 180 days, etc. How long from the RFP submission due date of August 7 <sup>th</sup> must the Cost Proposal itself be valid?	Please refer to QA/IV&V RFP Section 1.9.7: “A proposal may not be modified, withdrawn or canceled by the vendor for a 180-day period following the deadline for proposal submission as defined in the Schedule of Events, or receipt of best and final offer, if required, and vendor so agrees in submitting the proposal.”
82.	Section 6.1	Will the State release the budget amount available for this contract?	No.
83.	Section 6.2	Is the State’s intent for vendors to propose a payment schedule based on proposed deliverables? If this is not the intent, how does the State envision the invoicing structure and schedule? Is the payment term Net 30?	The MC will be paid on a monthly basis with the monthly amount due being 1/30 <sup>th</sup> (assuming a 30 month contract) of the contract amount.
84.	Section 6.3	Is a Price Sheet, Part II, Hourly Rates for each year (2006 – 2009) to be included or just one Price Sheet, Part II, Hourly Rates with a blended hourly rate covering all years to be included?	This is at the discretion of the vendor. If the hourly rates remain static for the duration of the engagement, then one completed Part II is appropriate. If the rates change from year to year, then vendors must so state in their proposals by submitting separate Part II forms or adding this detail within a single Part II form.
85.	Appendix B	Is Appendix B to be completed once MC services awarded or is it to be completed by proposed staff and included in the proposal?	A Taxpayer Identification Number Form (Appendix B), must be completed and submitted with vendor proposals in response to this RFP.
86.	Appendix D	Is your required format for the costs submitted with our bid. Is it acceptable to include a replicated version of this placed in-line into our proposal?	A Vendor Price Sheet (Appendix D) must be completed by each vendor submitting a proposal in response to this RFP. Per Section 1.10.4, the Cost Proposal must be submitted under separate cover from technical proposals.