

ADDENDUM ONE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Date: December 15, 2020

To: All Bidders

From: Keith Roland and Jennifer Crouse, Buyers
Department of Health and Human Services

RE: Addendum for iServe Nebraska Portal Request for Qualifications

Questions and Answers

Following are the questions submitted and answers provided for the above mentioned Request for Qualifications. The questions and answers are to be considered as part of the Request for Qualifications. It is the Bidder's responsibility to check the project information page for all addenda or amendments.

| <u>Question Number</u> | <u>RFQ Section Reference</u> | <u>RFQ Page Number</u> | <u>Question</u> | <u>DHHS Response</u> |
|------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| 1. | | | Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada) | Yes. |
| 2. | | | Whether we need to come over there for meetings? | During the implementation bidders who win the Work Order(s) will be required to work onsite if stipulated in the Work Order. |
| 3. | | | Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada) | Yes, but work location may be subject to conditions stipulated in the Work Order(s). |
| 4. | | | Can we submit the proposals via email? | No, DHHS will not accept proposals via email. See Section I.I for acceptable submission methods. |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|--|
| 5. | Schedule | | Please indicate if the state will also hold a virtual bidders conference, before the questions are due? It would be very helpful for us, as an out of state vendor, to attend, see who else may be bidding, and further understand the state's intent with the program. Thank you. | No, there will not be a pre-proposal conference for the RFQ. Individual Task Orders may have pre-proposal conferences. |
| 6. | | | What is the budget that DHHS has allocated to this contract? | Bidders should provide a response that best meets the requirements of the RFQ. |
| 7. | | | ██████████ we work with Reseller partners to sell directly to our end users. We are looking to have ██████████ which is one of our top partners here at ██████████ participate in the bid on our Behalf. Is that something that is doable and is there any special steps that we need to take on our Partners behalf? | The bidder, who would be the prime contractor, must meet all the requirements of the RFQ. Per Section III.A of the RFQ, the prime contractor is responsible for ensuring its subcontractors are qualified to perform the work. |
| 8. | L. REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION/ QUALIFICATIONS REQUIREMENTS | 14 | The requirement states "must provide copy of active U.S. Federal Government GSA contract". Is the requirement that the bidder just have a GSA contract, or does the bidder have to be on a particular schedule. If it is the latter, which schedule must the bidder be on to meet the requirement? | The requirement is that the bidder have a GSA contract. There is no requirement to a specific GSA schedule. |
| 9. | RFQ Scope of Service | 1 | Will use of this pool be limited to the iServe Nebraska Portal MVP or will the State consider using this pool for the iServe Initiative as well? | The pool will be limited to the iServe Nebraska Portal. |
| 10. | RFQ Scope of Service | 1 | How many vendors does the State anticipate for the pool? | There is no set number of vendors for the pool. All bidders who meet the qualifications set forth in Section I.N will be admitted into the pool. |
| 11. | RFQ Section V & Appendices C-F | 36 | The Work Order options are broken down into potentially very small scopes of work, including per Sprint and service type. | The State is still analyzing and developing work orders and cannot answer this question at this time. |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | <p>a. Will the State provide more detail on the rough order of magnitude for upcoming Work Orders or any representative services/product that could be procured with initial Orders? For example, how many Work Orders are anticipated for the MVP and on what timeline/duration?</p> <p>Does the State anticipate awarding multiple orders for different services within the same PI or Sprint? For example, one vendor for user research services and one vendor for agile development services within the same PI or Sprint?</p> | <p>Yes, it is possible that the State could award multiple orders for different services within the same PI or Sprint.</p> |
| 12. | Appendix I, Section 10 | 7 | <p>This requires key personnel and staffing approach for the project overall, but the Work Order type and scope is not specified. Given the requirement for resumes as well as the named staffing restrictions in RFQ Section III.I, how should vendors propose staffing for multiple types and levels of potential granularity on a Work Order basis? For example, a staffing approach for a legacy modernization module Work Order may be distinct from a staffing approach for a user research by Program Increment or Sprint Work Order. Will the State provide more context on the scope anticipated for initial Work Orders or provide more flexibility for naming staff on a Work Order basis (vs. Pool basis)?</p> | <p>Resumes should be submitted for all known personnel that will provide the services, including but not limited to leadership team that will be critical for the project's success.</p> |
| 13. | Appendix I | 1 | <p>Does the State have a maximum or target page count for Appendix I?</p> | <p>No, there is no maximum page count for responses to Appendix I.</p> |
| 14. | | | <p>When describing the assistance that the staff and the community providers provide; would you say that assistance includes the physical act of completing of forms and pre-screenings (on behalf of), or is they expected to "view only" walk applicants through the process? If so, does "view only" include access to client information that is enabled/de-enabled based on authorization?)</p> | <p>This will be defined in the sprinting process.</p> <p>Community Partners, Contracted Call Center, and staff currently assist Nebraskans with the completion of forms in person and via telephone. No access to</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|------------------|---|---|
| | | | | information is given once the application or form is submitted. The current website allows for draft applications to be kept for one week if not submitted. |
| 15. | | | Do Authorized Representatives require any specialized views that allow them “toggle” access of multiple clients (unrelated)? | This will be defined in the sprinting process. DHHS does have representatives who represent multiple clients and use the system to view information. This will need to be considered and accommodated in iServe. |
| 16. | | | Can you provide some examples for how you envision including technologies such as augmented reality, wearable IoT or Immersive apps into your solution? | The architecture must be resilient and modular so it can adapt to future technology needs. AR, wearable IoT and immersive apps are just examples to provide contextual understanding that architecture should be resilient to adapt to currently unknown or unforeseen application without needing replacement. |
| 17. | iServe Nebraska Cover Letter | RFQ Requirements | Asking the state to confirm, that an active US Federal Government GSA Contract is a requirement in order to be awarded a contract for the iServe Nebraska Proposal. If so please explain the state’s position behind this requirement. Thank You. | Yes, a current GSA contract is a requirement. |
| 18. | | | In section I (1.) "Procurement Procedure", L. REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION/QUALIFICATIONS REQUIREMENT , on page 16, the RFQ states “Proposals not meeting the requirements may be rejected as non-responsive “ , and it then states in a | |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|----|---|---|
| | | | <p>subsequent point “1. Must provide copy of active U.S. Federal Government GSA contract;”</p> <p>Does that mean if a vendor does not have an active Federal Government GSA Contract, the vendor’s proposal will be rejected?</p> <p>Depending on the answer above, can a vendor use another vendor’s GSA contract as a reference, including its rates, and structure it’s proposal accordingly? This practice has been used in other states successfully.</p> | <p>See answer to question #17.</p> <p>No, a bidder must have its own GSA contract.</p> |
| 19. | I.L.1. | 16 | <p>In Section I.L. there is a list of requirements listed for RFQ qualification, the first of them being that the proposer “Must provide copy of active U.S. Federal Government GSA contract”. Will a proposer be disqualified from award if they do not have a U.S. Federal Government GSA Contract? If not disqualified, what effect will not having a GSA Contract in place have on the state’s consideration of that proposer’s proposal?</p> | <p>See answer to question #17.</p> |
| 20. | RFQ Section 3.a. SERVICE 1: USER RESEARCH AND HUMAN- CENTERED DESIGN | 40 | <p>The RFQ states, “As such, DHHS seeks a vendor experienced with”.</p> <p>Does the state intend to select one vendor in this category or multiple vendors?</p> | <p>See answer to question #10.</p> |
| 21. | RFQ Section 3.b. Service2: Agile Application Development Services (AADS) | 41 | <p>The RFQ states, “DHHS requires one or more qualified vendors to provide Agile Application Development Services (AADS) addressing the following agile planning and development areas”.</p> | <p>1) The state will attempt to award work in a way that will allow each vendor to be accountable for their own deliverables, to the maximum extent possible. This could be achieved by</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|----|---|--|
| | | | <p>1.) Can the state clarify how the work will be allocated to multiple vendors? Will it be based on program or functionality – one functionality/ program awarded to one vendor or multiple vendors may be working on the same program/ functionality?</p> <p>2.) If multiple vendors work on one program/ functionality, how are the warranty services envisioned to work as described in section 3.c.?</p> <p>3.) Also, since warranty services is a different service than the AADS how is the state envisioning to structure its Work Order? Will there be different Work Orders for a feature as part of AADS and the warranty?</p> | <p>awarding work along feature or service boundaries, but details will be determined as each work order is written.</p> <p>2) The expectation is that each vendor will supply warranty services for their own deliverables, unless otherwise defined in a given work order.</p> <p>3) The structure of the work orders is not yet finalized, but the state expects to include AADS and warranty work together in a work order as needed.</p> |
| 22. | RFQ Section I Procurement Procedure, L. REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION/ QUALIFICATIONS REQUIREMENT | 16 | <p>The RFQ states “, 1. Must provide copy of active U.S. Federal Government GSA contract;”</p> <p>1.) Is it a requirement of this RFQ that the vendor have an active GSA contract for its proposal to be accepted?</p> <p>2.) If the GSA requirement is mandatory, can a vendor use another company’s GSA schedule as a reference, including its rates, and structure it’s proposal accordingly? This practice has been used in federal and other state contracts extensively.</p> <p>Can a vendor use its subcontractor’s active GSA contract for these purposes?</p> | <p>See answer to question #17.</p> <p>See answer to question #18.</p> <p>No, but the subcontractor may submit a response to the RFQ.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|--|
| 23. | RFQ Section B. Services, 1. In Scope Services, c. | 39 | <p>The RFQ states “SERVICE 3: Agile Application Warranty Services — Activities associated with repairing errors/defects identified in production during the warranty period, for vendor-developed functionality delivered through AADS.”.</p> <p>1.) Since warranty provided by the vendor is at no charge to the state, and is a mandatory component for work delivered under “SERVICE 2: Agile Application Development Services (AADS)”, should the SERVICE 3 category be treated as part of “SERVICE 2 Agile Application Development Services (AADS)”?</p> <p>2.) In what situations will a company who has performed SERVICE 2 services not perform SERVICE 3 warranty services?</p> <p>3.) If there are such situations where SERVICE 2 is performed by vendor 1 and SERVICE 3 warranty for those services are performed by vendor 2, will vendor 2 be paid for the SERVICE 3 warranty services?</p> | <p>1) See answers to question #21.</p> <p>2) See answers to question #21.</p> <p>3) See answers to question #21.</p> |
| 24. | RFQ Section 1.N. Evaluation of RFQ proposals | 16 | <p>The RFQ States, “Neb. Rev. Stat. §73-107 allows for a preference for a resident disabled veteran or business located in a designated enterprise zone. When a state contract is to be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder, a resident disabled veteran or a business located in a designated enterprise zone under the Enterprise Zone Act shall be allowed a preference over any other resident or nonresident bidder, if all other factors are equal.”</p> <p>Does this preference apply only when the prime vendor is a disabled veteran or can it be extended to</p> | <p>This preference applies to the prime contractor.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|---|
| | | | any disabled veteran subcontractors that are part of the RFQ response? | |
| 25. | RFQ Section 1.P. Establishment of Contractor Pool | 17 | <p>The RFQ states, “The RFQ does not commit the State to award a contract to perform any services but only serves notice as a desire to be considered for requests for quotes.”</p> <p>1.) Can the state share how many Work Orders are planned to be issued? 2.) Can the state share how many Work Orders per service areas? Will there be more than one service area in a Work Order?</p> | <p>1. The number of Work Orders is not yet determined. 2. The number of Work Orders per service area is not yet determined. Yes, it is possible that there could be more than one service area in a Work Order. (For example, see answers to question #21.)</p> |
| 26. | RFQ Section 1.P. Establishment of Contractor Pool | 17 | <p>The RFQ states, “The RFQ does not commit the State to award a contract to perform any services but only serves notice as a desire to be considered for requests for quotes.”</p> <p>How many days will the vendors have to respond to a Work Order?</p> | Each Work Order will have its own Schedule of Events, which will be dependent on factors such as the procurement method and complexity of services. |
| 27. | INTEGRATED BENEFITS ELIGIBILITY & ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT (IBEEM) SCOPE General | 39 | <p>The RFQ states “The execution of the full IBEEM platform and services procurement and vendor selection is expected to extend through September 2021.”.</p> <p>Will there be another RFQ for IBEEM scope of work or will the vendors selected in this RFQ will be providing these services via work orders?</p> | A separate procurement for the IBEEM scope of work is anticipated. |
| 28. | OUT OF SCOPE SERVICES Item c | 40 | The RFQ states “Application Maintenance and Support Services”. | 1) The parties responsible for, and details of support beyond post warranty have not been determined. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>1.) Who will perform M&O services for the new iServe and IBEEM post warranty services?</p> <p>2.) Does the State plan a separate RFP for M&O services?</p> | <p>2) No</p> |
| 29. | Appendix B final clean.docx - User Experience Tier | 5 | <p>The document states “Nebraska DHHS has selected the Microsoft Multiexperience Development Platform (MXDP) made up of a number of key Microsoft offerings such as Microsoft Azure, LogicApps, PowerApps as well as the Dynamics 365 Customer Engagement platform”</p> <p>1.) Has DHHS licensed all required licenses and software to meet DHHS vision for this RFQ and also for required IBEEM components?</p> <p>2.) How many Microsoft licenses and Azure licenses have DHHS acquired?</p> <p>3.) Can the vendor propose an alternate MXDP platform to meet all DHHS requirements?</p> <p>4.) Microsoft has scored lower than other MXDP players as per Gartner Magic Quadrant for MXDP players.</p> <p>5.) Has DHHS done any POC, before selecting Microsoft?</p> <p>Has DHHS acquired required licenses for IBM Cloud Integration suite?</p> | <p>1) DHHS is committed to procuring licenses for its use, either by Work Order or through its own processes; vendor(s) will be responsible for procuring licenses they need for their own development and implementation activities.</p> <p>2) See #1, immediately above</p> <p>3) DHHS has selected Microsoft Dynamics 365 as its MXDP platform. The winning bidder(s) may propose alternative solution(s) that extend upon, or substitute for, the use of the Dynamics 365 MXDP. However, this should not include the use of any MXDP that is not Microsoft Dynamics 365.</p> <p>4) No question to be answered</p> <p>5) This is outside the scope of RFQ</p> <p>DHHS is committed to procuring licenses for its use, either by Work Order or through its own</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|----|--|--|
| | | | | processes; vendor(s) will be responsible for procuring licenses they need for their own development and implementation activities. |
| 30. | Appendix I final clean | 2 | <p>The document states, “Given the DHHS leadership concerns about the potential limitations of relying exclusively on the Multi-Experience Development Platforms (MXDP) for development of optimal user experiences”.</p> <p>Can DHHS share the concerns of DHHS leadership?</p> | DHHS understands the possibility that a low-code/no-code MXDP may be insufficient to meet the full end customer experience required, and thus, may require customization, extension or an alternative solution that integrates with the MXDP. |
| 31. | RFQ Section VI – Scope of work | 38 | <p>The document states, “With this RFQ, the State seeks to procure the technology and key subject matter expertise needed to implement iServe Nebraska Portal minimum viable product (MVP) capabilities by April 2022.”.</p> <p>Reviewing the scope and vision for “iServe Nebraska Platform”, our understanding is that a number of initial components will be required to implement the scope of this MVP for the IBEEM scope of work such as API, Medication, Integration Engine Enterprise Service Bus components, etc. Are these components part of this RFQ scope?</p> | API management and service bus/messaging functionality are within the scope of this RFQ. The State plans to leverage its existing IBM API Connect and IBM ACE infrastructure investments where appropriate. The State anticipates the use of additional API and service mesh offerings in the Azure cloud space. Bidder(s) should provide a response that best meets the requirements of this RFQ. |
| 32. | General | | Can the state share your vision of the organization structure for the iServe initiative? | For the Portal MVP work, the State is establishing a core team which will provide leadership and guidance around technology, architecture, and Agile process. |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|----|---|---|
| | | | | This core team will also establish the baseline Azure landing zone, potentially with vendor assistance. During implementation, this core team will work closely and collaboratively with winning bidder(s) in an Agile fashion. The State may also retain certain work increments that it will develop using internal development resources, while letting other work via Work Orders to bidders in the RFQ pool. |
| 33. | RFQ Section VI – Scope of Work | 38 | <p>The RFQ states that “With this RFQ, the State seeks to procure the technology and key subject matter expertise needed to implement iServe Nebraska Portal minimum viable product (MVP) capabilities by April 2022”.</p> <p>What Technology Stack does the State have in mind that will be used to implement iServe Nebraska Portal minimum viable product (MVP) capabilities?</p> | Bidder(s) should provide a response that best meets the requirements of this RFQ. |
| 34. | RFQ Section I – Procurement Procedure, Para L – Request for Qualification / Qualifications Requirements | 16 | <p>The RFQ states that “The proposals will first be examined to determine if all requirements listed below have been addressed and whether further evaluation is warranted. Proposals not meeting the requirements may be rejected as non-responsive.”</p> <p>Do these requirements need to be met by the Prime Vendor only or can the Subcontractor qualifications be used to meet some of these requirements?</p> | The bidder’s proposal must meet the requirements of the RFQ, which may include prime contractor and subcontractor qualifications. |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|----|--|--|
| 35. | Section VI – Scope of Work, Para f Service 6 – Legacy Modernization and Modularization Services | 48 | <p>The RFQ states that “Target will be MS Azure Power Apps, Logic Apps, and Dynamics 365. Custom software development approaches may also be considered if the complexity of the solution exceeds the capabilities of these platforms.”</p> <p>Will the state be willing to consider alternate technologies for Legacy Modernization and Modularization Services?</p> | <p>Bidder(s) should provide a response that best meets the requirements of this RFQ.</p> <p>For additional context, see answer #3 of question 29.</p> |
| 36. | RFQ Section VI – Scope of Work – A. General Information | 38 | <p>The RFQ states “With this RFQ, the State seeks to procure the technology and key subject matter expertise ...”</p> <p>Does this mean that the Microsoft technologies, e.g. “Dynamics 365 Customer Engagement platform”, named in this RFQ and associated documents are to be procured through a future Work Order?</p> | <p>DHHS is committed to procuring licenses for its use, either by Work Order or through its own processes; vendor(s) will be responsible for procuring licenses they need for their own development and implementation activities.</p> |
| 37. | Appendix I - Questions for RFQ Respondents | 5 | <p>RFQ Appendix I states that “The vendor’s office location responsible for performance pursuant to an award of a contract with the State of Nebraska should be identified.”</p> <p>1.) Can work be performed offshore? 2.) Can work be performed off site? 3.) Is it required to have an office location in the State of Nebraska?</p> <p>If the answer to the above question is “yes”, can the vendors establish a office location after the contract award?</p> | <p>See responses to questions 1-3.</p> |
| 38. | Appendix I – Questions for RFQ Respondents | 6 | <p>RFQ Appendix I states that “Vendor should demonstrate that it has at least two (2) years’</p> | |

| | | | | |
|-----|---|----|--|---|
| | | | <p>experience working on MS Azure Dynamics 365 and LogicApps technology projects which have been completed.”</p> <p>1.) Is this a mandatory requirement? 2.) Can this requirement be met by a Sub Contractor?</p> | <p>This is not a mandatory requirement, but will be evaluated.</p> <p>See answer to question #34.</p> |
| 39. | Appendix I – Questions for RFQ Respondents | 7 | <p>RFQ Appendix I states that “The vendor should identify the specific professionals who will work on the State’s project if their company is awarded an Agreement resulting from a Work Order. The names and titles of the team proposed for assignment to the State project should be identified in full, with a description of the team leadership, interface and support functions, and reporting relationships. The primary work assigned to each person should also be identified.”</p> <p>Does the State have any specific resource roles in mind for which resumes should be submitted? Without the word orders, it would be difficult for vendors to provide specific names and titles of resources for the assignment. Please provide further clarification.</p> | See answer to question #12. |
| 40. | I Procurement Procedure, L. REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION/ QUALIFICATIONS REQUIREMENT | 16 | <p>The RFQ states “, 1. Must provide copy of active U.S. Federal Government GSA contract;”</p> <p>Most established vendors who have State contracts do not have GSA schedule as it is required usually for Federal Contracts and it is rarely used for State contracts. Making GSA schedule a requirement to bid</p> | |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|---|
| | | | <p>on this RFQ will not only place a burden on these qualified vendors who have a track record of success on other State contracts but will also severely and unfairly limit the competition.</p> <p>1.) Will the State consider relaxing this mandatory requirement and verify vendor qualifications through other methods so as to promote competition between qualified vendors in the best interest of the State?</p> | See answer to question #17. |
| 41. | Scope of Service; Proprietary Information | 1 | <p>If the Bidder wishes to withhold proprietary or other commercial information from disclosure, the Bidder must identify the proprietary information, mark the proprietary information according to state law, and submit only the proprietary information in a separate file named conspicuously the words "PROPRIETARY INFORMATION" or if submitting the proposal or response electronically, as a separate electronic file that is named "PROPRIETARY INFORMATION".</p> <p>If certain parts of the bidder's response/proposal contain proprietary information that would be relevant only if included in main response file and not in a separate file, should the bidder go ahead and include them and also separately submit a redacted version of their proposal?</p> | See Addendum 2. |
| 42. | Appendix F: Work Order Cost Template; Costs Section | 6 | <p>Costs are based on referenced RFQ MSA.</p> <p>1.) We are unable to find the Cost referenced in the RFQ MSA. Can you please clarify?</p> | <p>Appendix F is revised to remove the following wording:</p> <p>Costs are based on referenced RFQ MSA.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|-----|--|---|
| 43. | General | | Will the award based on this RFQ require CMS approval? | Acceptance into the pool will not require CMS approval. Awards resulting from Work Orders may require CMS approval. |
| 44. | C. SCHEDULE OF EVENTS | 13 | The RFP states "Initial Proposal Opening" is January 5, 2020. Considering the holidays approaching and the best interests of the state to obtain quality proposals, would the state consider extending the date for the Proposal Opening date by three weeks? | The initial bid opening will be January 5, 2021, but the State will accept proposals throughout the term of the RFQ. |
| 45. | | | The RFQ requires each respondent to "provide copy of active U.S. Federal Government GSA contract" Could DHHS please clarify the intent of this requirement? | DHHS determined that it is in the best interest of the State to require bidders have a GSA contract. |
| 46. | | | Are there any other contracts outside of the federal GSA Contract that can be used in lieu of the GSA contract? | No. |
| 47. | Appendix I | all | Is there a preferred limit to the length of answers to each of the questions? | No, there is not a preferred length to answers. |
| 48. | B.1.c. | 39 | How will the State determine/deal with error/defect in a multi-vendor environment where code interdependencies may obfuscate source of the error/defect? | See answer to question #21. |
| 49. | B.2.c | 40 | Out of Scope Services: Application maintenance and support services description includes repairing defects and related services. Please clarify how this relates to the warranty services described? | Warranty services are expected to be provided by the vendor that was responsible for the capability/feature development work in question at no additional cost to the state. Post warranty application Maintenance and Operations support after release |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|----|--|--|
| | | | | into the Production environment will either be provided by the Vendor responsible for enhancing or extending the capability/feature, or will be procured through a work order or by the State. |
| 50. | 3.c | 46 | Warranty Periods: Please consider adding a 30-day period to the PSI warranty similar to that stated for the MVP Warranty. | See Addendum 2. |
| 51. | 3.c | 46 | In our experience working with Customers using agile practices to develop incremental software releases includes a close partnership between the customer, the vendor, and possibly other vendors. In this type of agile development partnership, any bugs/issues identified in production are added to the backlog as user stories as part of the normal (non-warranty) items. Has the State used the model described in the RFQ successfully on other similar large agile projects? Would the State consider alternative approaches to dealing with bugs/issues in production? | No. However, Bidder(s) should provide a response that best meets the requirements of this RFQ. |
| 52. | Appendix I; Q11 | 7 | Given that the performance hours will be specified at the Task Order level – please clarify what information is needed at the Vendor Pool Qualification level? | Refer to Addendum 2. |
| 53. | Appendix I; Q10 | 7 | Given that personnel will be assigned at the task order level – please clarify what resumes will be required at the Vendor Pool Qualification level? | See answer to question #12. |
| 54. | Appendix I; Q9 | 6 | This question requires corporate experience for projects that have been “completed”. Many large and complex projects using the agile and lean principles of MVP are placed into production iteratively and may continue for longer periods of time for adaptive maintenance and operations. May we submit projects that are ongoing? | Yes. |

| | | | | |
|-----|--|------------------------------|---|--|
| 55. | Appendix I; Section 7 Question 4 | 5 | Office Location. What are the expectations for onsite versus remote work locations? | Refer to questions 1-3 |
| 56. | General | | Can the state provide information regarding the number and size of task orders under each of the six task areas? | The State is still analyzing and developing work orders and cannot answer this question at this time. |
| 57. | General | | Will all qualified bidders be awarded a contract or is there a limit to the number of awards? | See answer to question #10. |
| 58. | Appendix I; S2 Q4 | 1 | Where in the maturity-cycle is Nebraska's SAFe practice and what implementation of SAFe? | DHHS is just starting its work with the SAFe and it is not mature. |
| 59. | Appendix I; S3 Q2 | 2 | Will there be predefined service-level objectives, to base quality and productivity measures on? (Does SLO & SLI also fall on vendor to set agreements based on discussions w/ Neb stakeholders etc.?) | Service-levels will be finalized during contract negotiations, and may also be defined in the work order(s), as appropriate. |
| 60. | Evaluation Criteria #10 | Eval. Criteria, Page 7 | Will the use of Nearshore resources be acceptable for this engagement? | Please see answers to Question 1-3 |
| 61. | Evaluation Criteria #10 | Eval. Criteria, Page 7 | Will the use of Offshore resources be acceptable for this engagement? | Please see answers to Question 1-3 |
| 62. | RFQ, Section VI.A | General, Page 38 | How many team members from DHHS will be involved in this engagement? What roles will they perform? Will they be dedicated to this effort? Will they work within the Agile model established for this project? | The size of the DHHS team is not yet known. DHHS envisions an integrated State and vendor team with division of labor to be specified in Work Orders. DHHS will work within the established Agile model. |
| 63. | RFQ, Section VI.A | General, Page 38 | Will DHHS provide a Product Owner(s) who is empowered to make decisions on the product development and backlog? | Yes, where possible. Any decisions the Product owner cannot commit to will be resolved through Program governance mechanisms. |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| 64. | RFQ, Section VI.A | General, Page 38 | Will DHHS provide Product Manager(s) / Feature Owners to define and accept Features? | DHHS will provide analogous staffing. |
| 65. | RFQ, Section VI.A | General, Page 39 | Will DHHS provide SMEs to support the development and verification of business requirements? | Yes |
| 66. | RFQ, Section VI.A | General, Page 38 | Will the Implementation Partner be expected to deliver regular updates to the Executive team? | Yes, where appropriate, and as specified by the State Program Manager. |
| 67. | RFQ, Section VI.A | General, Page 38 | Does DHHS have any dedicated solution environments/clients that are used today to test and validate new system capabilities? | The State expects to establish the necessary test environments. The State is identifying test tools and appropriate licenses for its use. |
| 68. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Services (Agile), Page 39 | Please describe the Agile Maturity of the current DHHS teams including the roles of RTE, Product Owner, and Product Manager. | See question #58. |
| 69. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Services (Agile), Page 39 | Does DHHS expect the partner to train their team members on Agile? | No |
| 70. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Services (Agile), Page 39 | Does DHHS expect the partner to train the Product Owners, Product Managers, and Executive teams on Agile? | No |
| 71. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Services (Agile), Page 39 | How many Agile Release Trains (ART) are currently running at DHHS today? | This is outside the scope of the RFQ. |
| 72. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Services (Agile), Page 39 | Will this project be part of an existing ART or a new ART? | New ART |
| 73. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Services (Agile), Page 39 | Does DHHS expect incremental release of the MVP to production between now and April 2022? | Yes |
| 74. | RFQ, Section V.G | Change Management, Page 36 | Please clarify the DHHS guidance on governance and change control and level of decision authority by key roles. | The DHHS point of contact for each Work Order will be responsible for approving any change control requests. |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 75. | RFQ, Section V.G | Change Management, Page 36 | Please clarify the DHHS process for how technical debt will be handled from a scoping and prioritization perspective in regards to change management. | Each Work Order will have a clearly defined scope with exceptions to be handled via the Change Control process. Winning Bidder(s) are expected to complete the work without technical debt. |
| 76. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Warrenty Services, Page 46 | How are production defects triaged today and classified as escaped defects (what criteria is used)? | This will be defined during implementation of the project. |
| 77. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Warrenty <u>S</u> ervices, Page 46 | What is the DHHS process for determining if a production defect should be under warranty (and the Partner has to fix it free of charge)? | All defects found during the warranty period must be resolved by the vendor responsible for the defect at no additional cost to the State. The process for identifying defects covered under warranty will be defined during contract negotiations, and will leverage existing Incident Management process and the Help Desk. |
| 78. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Warrenty Services, Page 46 | What are the expected SLA's for warrenty services? | Warranty defect resolution SLA Targets will be finalized during contract negotiations. |
| 79. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Warrenty Services, Page 46 | How long would the warrenty services be in effect for past MVPs delivered to production? | Warranty Services obligations will be in effect for four weeks from the date of release into production. |
| 80. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Warrenty Services, Page 46 | Does DHHS envision a dedicated support team addressing support requests or does DHHS expect production issues to be supported by the development teams? | DHHS envisions that a DHHS development team(s) will provide support for features that have been released into Production. |
| 81. | RFQ, Section VI.B | AADS [Security], Page 46 | Will there be team members from DHHS that will be involved in this engagement that have the necessary | Yes, or additional expertise will be acquired by work order. |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | security background and knowledge for the government sector? | |
| 82. | RFQ, Section VI.B | AADS [Security], Page 46 | How many team members from the DHHS security team will be dedicated to this engagement? | The size of the DHHS team is not yet known, but it will be appropriately staffed. See answer to question #81. |
| 83. | RFQ, Section VI.B | AADS [Security], Page 46 | What are the DHHS processes and guidance for implementing the appropriate security controls into new software applications? | Application security is part of the SDLC of all applications and will be developed as required. Application security includes adherence to a set of defined administrative controls as well as an evaluation of the security of the application configuration. |
| 84. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Multiple [Compliance Testing] | How are compliance verifications and audits performed today? | Compliance verification and audits are based on the requirements for the application and include assessment of compliance with administrative controls as well as an evaluation of the security of the application configuration. This may include the use of software tools as well as an independent third party assessment. |
| 85. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Multiple [Compliance Testing] | What are the formalized processes and guidance for implementing the appropriate compliance controls into new software applications? | See answers to 83 and 84. Additionally, the Agency follows a NIST based security regimen. An application security assessment should be completed prior to an application moving into a production status. |
| 86. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Legacy Modernization | Does Dynamics 365 have to be used as part of this implementation? If yes, what capabilities are needing to be leveraged and why? | The State has selected Microsoft Dynamics 365 as its preferred |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|--|--|---|
| | | (Architecture), Page 48 | | MXDP platform, and is not considering other MXDP platforms at this point. However, the State is not stipulating that Dynamics 365 is a mandatory solution for the requirements in this RFQ. Bidder(s) should provide a response that best meets the requirements of this RFQ. |
| 87. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Legacy Modernization (Architecture), Page 48 | There was mention of both AR and VR support for the development efforts, please provide any known features that this will be used with? | No current features are envisioned to use AR and VR. See question 16. |
| 88. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Legacy Modernization (Architecture), Page 48 | There was mention of both ML and AI support for the development efforts, please provide any known features that this will be used with? | No current features are planned to use ML and AI. See question 16. |
| 89. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Legacy Modernization (Architecture), Page 48 | Will DHHS support the use of Azure API Management for applications and API management of solutions deployed to Azure? | Architecture and technology choices are not yet finalized. Bidder(s) should provide a response that best meets the requirements of this RFQ. See also the answer to question #31. |
| 90. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Services (Development), Page 47 | Will DHHS support the development of this portal using the following technologies: .NET Core, C#, Angular - Front end UI, React - Front end UI, Power Platform - Low Code / No Code, React Native - cross platform mobile development, Xamarin - cross platform mobile development, Azure DevOps for Code Repositories, Azure SQL Database, Cosmos | Architecture and technology choices are not yet finalized. However, the state's goal is to build a modern, cloud-native system utilizing services in the Azure cloud. |

| | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | DB, Azure Synapse, Azure Functions, Azure Event Grid, Azure Service Bus, Azure App Insights, and Azure API Management. | |
| 91. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Multiple [Testing] | Can Selenium be used for UI and API test automation? | Architecture and technology choices are not yet finalized. Bidder(s) should provide a response that <u>response that</u> best meets the requirements of this RFQ. |
| 92. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Multiple [Testing] | Can C#, Ready API, and Postman be used for API testing? | Architecture and technology choices are not yet finalized. Bidder(s) should provide a response that <u>response that</u> best meets the requirements of this RFQ. |
| 93. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Multiple [Testing] | Can Xunit, MSTest V2, Moq, and Autofac be used for unit testing? | Architecture and technology choices are not yet finalized. Bidder(s) should provide a response that <u>response that</u> best meets the requirements of this RFQ. |
| 94. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Services (DevOps) [Infrastructure], Page 47 | Please provide information about the process for populating data for development, test, staging, and Production environments? Is the DHHS repeatable? | This process will be determined by DHHS as part of the project. DHHS does envision this process to be repeatable. |
| 95. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Services (DevOps) [Infrastructure], Page 47 | Does DHHS currently use the IBM Cloud Integration Suite for all of the on-premises applications and infrastructure? | No |
| 96. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Services (DevOps) [Infrastructure] | Does DHHS already have applications and infrastructure deployed to Azure? If yes, does DHHS already have governance and policies defined that will be used for this project? | No. |

| | | | | |
|------|-------------------|---|---|--|
| | | ure], Page 47 | | |
| 97. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Services (DevOps) [Infrastructure], Page 47 | Will the partner be required to train the DHHS team members on Azure setup, configuration, deployment, governance, and support? | Vendors may present their qualifications in this area, but there is no firm requirement for this. With regard to Azure set-up, configuration, deployment, governance and support, should knowledge transfer from vendor(s) to DHHS be necessary, this will be defined in work order(s). |
| 98. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Services (DevOps) [Infrastructure], Page 47 | Will DHHS support building out new Azure environments to support the development and implementation of this new project (vs. combined with other DHHS apps in Azure)? | The Azure environment will be new for this effort. |
| 99. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Services (DevOps) [Agile PM], Page 47 | Will DHHS support the use of Azure DevOps for Agile project management? | DHHS is planning to use JIRA for managing the Agile backlog. We will likely utilize Azure DevOps for CD/CD pipelines, although architecture and technology choices are not yet final. |
| 100. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Services (DevOps) [Agile PM], Page 47 | Will DHHS support the use of Azure DevOps for Software Delivery Pipelines (CI/CD)? | DHHS is planning to use JIRA for managing the Agile backlog. We will likely utilize Azure DevOps for CD/CD pipelines, although architecture and technology choices are not yet final. |
| 101. | RFQ, Section V.G | Change Management, Page 36 | Does DHHS use any tools today for ADA and 508 compliance testing? If so, what tools are used by DHHS? | Yes, Wave from wave.webaim.org |

| | | | | |
|------|------------------|----------------------------|--|---|
| 102. | RFQ, Section V.G | Change Management, Page 36 | What Agile Lifecycle Management tools/software does DHHS use today (e.g., Jira, Jira Align, VersionOne, etc.) | See answer to question #99. |
| 103. | RFQ, Section V.G | Change Management, Page 36 | What help desk and software defect tracking tools does DHHS use today? | DHHS has used different tools in the past, but DHHS intends to use the Atlassian Jira tool to keep and manage defects. For Help Desk, DHHS is using Service Now. |
| 104. | RFQ, Section V.G | Change Management, Page 36 | What application and infrastructure performance monitoring tools are today? | Dynatrace is used for on-prem application and infrastructure monitoring today, and the same will be considered for monitoring cloud resources. However, architecture and technology choices are not yet final. |
| 105. | Attachment H | Process Flows, Page 21 | The current documentation outlines several process flows on how the system works. Do these represent the current state? If yes, then will the Partner be expected to design the "future state" process flows along with DHHS? | The process flows are representative of future state direction designed only to a level necessary for procurement purposes and should be collaboratively refined as the solution evolves through sprints and releases |
| 106. | Attachment H | Portal, Page 22 | There were additional workshops conducted in the fall of 2020, is the output from those sessions represented in these documents? If no, can you share the relevant information associated to this project? If no, can you share the relevant information associated to this project? | The IBEM sessions are outside the scope of this RFQ. |
| 107. | Attachment H | Portal, Page 22 | Has DHHS done any user experience / customer experience design for the new portals? If yes, can those design be shared? | No UI/UX design has been completed. |
| 108. | Attachment H | Portal, Page 22 | Does DHHS have any methods or processes that are used today to measure customer satisfaction that can be used for the development of the new portals? | DHHS will develop KPI and measures for customer satisfaction. |

| | | | | |
|------|-------------------|--|---|--|
| 109. | Attachment H | Enabling Capabilities, Page 55 | Will DHHS be providing the translation services and validation or does the Partner need to provide this for content? | DHHS is open to solution(s) that can provide this capability, but presently uses a third party service to complete this work. |
| 110. | Attachment H | Stakeholder Analysis, Page 15 | Can you verify that DHHS will be responsible for all content creation across the portals? Ensuring it is at the right reading level for the users. | DHHS will not be responsible for all content creation across portals. DHHS will prefer winning bidder(s) to provide a solution. |
| 111. | Attachment H | MVP Requirements, Page 59 | Does DHHS have separate and consistent development, testing, staging, production, and DR environments for the current applications and infrastructure that would be need for this new modernization engagement? | These environments will be newly created to support the Portal MVP work. Assignment of this work between vendor and state resources will be determined as each Work Order is written. |
| 112. | Attachment H | MVP Requirements, Page 59 | Does DHHS have test plans for each of the applications that will be leveraged during the development of the new portals? | The creation of these test plans is part of the scope of the Portal MVP work. Assignment of this work between vendor and state resources will be determined as each Work Order is written. |
| 113. | Attachment H | MVP Requirements, Page 59 | Does DHHS have automated tests that can be executed against the applications that will be leveraged during the development of the new portals? | The creation of automated tests is part of the scope of the Portal MVP work. Assignment of this work between vendor and state resources will be determined as each Work Order is written. |
| 114. | RFQ, Section VI.B | Legacy Modernization (Architecture), Page 48 | How many team member from the N-FOCUS team will be dedicated to this new portal development effort? How many business team members? How many technical team members? | The size of the DHHS team is not yet determined. |
| 115. | Attachment I | Part 7, Question 7, Page 5 | Did DHHS engage with a vendor to support the preparation and planning of this RFP? If so, who is the vendor? If so, will this vendor be considered a | Yes, Gartner, Inc. assisted DHHS with the preparation of this RFQ. |

| | | | | |
|------|---------------------|------------------------|---|---|
| | | | conflict of interest and precluded from submitting a response to this RFP? | Per Section 7.7 of Appendix I, bidders should describe any previous dealings with Gartner, Inc. within the past five (5) years. If no such previous dealings exist, so declare. Gartner, Inc. is not eligible to submit a response to the RFQ. |
| 116. | Evaluation Criteria | Eval. Criteria, Page 1 | The evaluation criteria states that the mandatory requirement items include a Corporate Overview and a Technical Approach; however, neither of these items appear in Section L, RFQ Qualification Requirements, Appendix I, or Sections II, III, and IV. Does Nebraska expect to evaluate the scores from answers/responses given in the Appendix I document, or is additional material required (i.e. a technical and a corporate volume)? | The responses provided in Appendix I, Sections 1 through 6 will comprise the Technical Approach. The responses provided in Appendix I, Section 7 will comprise the Corporate Overview. |
| 117. | | | When is the final bid due? I see questions are posted on the 15th with opening on the 3rd. | See answer to question #44. |
| 118. | | | Is there a consultant already engaged in the discovery work shown in the RFP? And/or a preferred vendor for the work? | See answer to question #115. No, there is not a preferred vendor for this work. |
| 119. | | | Are we able to utilize our workforce that resides outside of the United States for the Dev work? | See answers to questions 1-3. |
| 120. | I.L.1. | 16 | In Section I.L. there is a list of requirements listed for RFQ qualification, the first of them being that the proposer "Must provide copy of active U.S. Federal Government GSA contract". Is it acceptable to provide our rates on our partners' active US Federal Government GSA contract? Is it acceptable to provide other existing, pre-negotiated State contract vehicles | See answer to question #17. |

| | | | | |
|------|---|--------------------|--|---|
| | | | in lieu of an active US Federal Government GSA contract | |
| 121. | General | | Q:Please confirm that pricing for services will be at the SOW level, and required post vendor pool award? | Yes. |
| 122. | General | | Q: Is there a minimum financial size the state requires from vendors? Ie >\$1M, >\$5M, >\$25M or >\$100M? Please provide desired minimum financial level of companies submitting for the pool of vendors | No. |
| 123. | General | | Q: Please confirm that any third parties used to develop the RFQ documents will be precluded from submitting an RFQ response to this solicitation | See answer to question #115. |
| 124. | General | | Q: Can a contractor bid on multiple rfp submittals? Ie: can a vendor bid as prime on one submittal and subk on another primes submittal? | Yes. |
| 125. | App I | Page 6, 9.b | Q: Please confirm that 3 project descriptions required for both a Prime and also three for a Subcontractor/s which would be a total of 6 or more, depending on subcontractors on the team? | The work to be performed by a bidder, which may include subcontractors, should be included in its response. |
| 126. | App I References | P. 8, 12. | Q:Please confirm Prime Subcontractor and Individual references can be submitted | References should be for the Prime Contractor/bidder, not Subcontractors or Individuals. |
| 127. | Evaluation Criteria | | Q: If a vendor is responding to more than 1 service category, can the same corporate overview be used in each service category? | Yes, bidders only need to submit one response to the Corporate Overview. |
| 128. | Evaluation Criteria | Service Categories | Q:Please confirm the subcontractor experience be included as part of the Corporate Overview | Subcontractor experience should be included in the response to question 7.9.b of Appendix I. |
| 129. | Evaluation Criteria | Service Categories | Q: Please confirm that the prior experience of an individual can be counted as corporate overview for a new company started by that individual. | An individual's prior experience should be included in response to question 7.10 of Appendix I. |
| 130. | Request for Qualification I.L.1 (as well as Cover Letter) | Page 16 | Is evidence of <i>subcontractor role</i> as part of active Federal Government GSA contract sufficient to comply with requirement to provide copy of active US Federal Government GSA contract? | See answer to question #18. |

| | | | | |
|------|---|----|---|--|
| 131. | Section L. Requirement 1. Must provide copy of active U.S. Federal Government GSA contract. | 16 | Are vendors that do not have a current GSA contract prohibited from responding? | See answer to question #17. |
| 132. | | | How critical is: “b.Vendor should demonstrate that it has at least two (2) years’ experience of previous agile efforts in the Public Sector which have been completed.” | This is not a mandatory requirement, but will be evaluated. |
| 133. | | | Is the agency willing to extend the deadline/opening past January 5? | See answer to question #44. |
| 134. | | | Is the agency willing to relax the requirement that respondents have an active U.S. Federal Government GSA contract? | See answer to question #17. |
| 135. | | | would you envision there being any possibility of an extension to the Jan 5 th due date | See answer to question #44. |
| 136. | | | In Section I.L “REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATION/QUALIFICATIONS REQUIREMENTS” on page 16 of the RFQ, the state requires that vendors provide a copy of an active U.S. Federal Government GSA contract. If a vendor does not have an active GSA contract, are they disqualified from bidding on this RFQ? | See answer to question #17. |
| 137. | | | And if they are disqualified, can you provide explanation/justification for limiting participation in this bid to vendors holding active GSA contracts (the requirement on page 16 is the only place where a GSA contract is indicated as necessary, so we are unsure as to the reason for this requirement)? | See answer to question #45. |
| 138. | | | “Bidders may submit a response for any or all service types (see section VI.B.3). Scoring will be based on responses to questions provided in Appendix I. The | Yes, bidders may submit to one or all six of the services. Responding to just one of the services does |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>State reserves the right to lower the scoring thresholds listed in 4.a and 4.b immediately above if it determines doing so is in the best interest of the State.” (Section I - Procurement Procedures, N – Evaluation of RFQ Proposals)</p> <p>If our understanding of the language above is correct, vendors are able to respond to just one of the services and still be eligible to qualify if scoring results as such correct? In other words, responding to just one of the services would not disqualify a vendor from the RFQ right?</p> | not disqualify the bidder from the RFQ. |
| | | | <p>I am looking to get confirmation on the closing date of this RFQ? We see an opening date of January 5, 2021 but it also appears that could be the closing date as well. Can you please confirm?</p> | See answer to question #44. |
| | | | <p>Given the holidays with a large percentage of folks taking time off would the State consider an extension.</p> | See answer to question #44. |

This addendum will become part of the proposal and should be acknowledged with the Request for Qualifications response.