

CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator

SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|--|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 1 | N/A - General | Would it be possible to get Microsoft Word versions of the exhibits for the CARS RFO #17-025? | SOS is unable to provide the exhibits in any other format, other than what has been provided in the RFO. |
| 2 | N/A - General | Will the EFS system need to be supported by the CARS system for either submission or extraction of form data? | The functionality currently performed by the Electronic File System (SOS' current Cal-Online tool) will be replaced by CARS. At this time, SOS plans to migrate at least 10 years of the current CAL-ACCESS data to CARS. Please refer to page 20 of 198 for the description of the sub-systems which currently makeup the CAL-ACCESS system. |
| 3 | N/A - General | Does SOS have a preference for a specific payment processing vendor? | <p>The system shall interface with a Secretary of State selected, State approved payment processing vendor.</p> <p>The current DGS Electronic Payment Acceptance Services (EPAY) MSA contracts are designated as mandatory for State of California agencies that seek to acquire credit and debit card payment acceptance services. The vendor solution should not be specific to a single payment processor.</p> <p>Currently, the SOS EPAY contract payment processor is ELAVON.</p> |
| 4 | N/A - General | Will SOS consider commercial cloud offerings provided on platforms such as AWS? | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. Please refer to the RFO, Section IV - Proposed System and Business Processes, Infrastructure for Development and Deployment, page 25 of 198. |
| 5 | N/A - General | Does SOS have a preference towards either a cloud hosted or on-premise solution? | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. Please refer to the RFO, Section IV - Proposed System and Business Processes, Infrastructure for Development and Deployment, page 25 of 198. |
| 6 | N/A - General | What is the requirement for data retention in the transactional database for online filing? | SOS is required to retain the data for a period of 20 years, after which the data may be archived. |
| 7 | N/A - General | Will the Contractor be responsible for developing reports for public disclosure? | Yes, the Contractor will be responsible for developing reports for public disclosure. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 8 | N/A - General | It is unclear from the RFO whether this project is intended to be a new, custom developed solution or a COTS implementation leveraging an existing product/solution. Will CA SOS consider either approach if it meets the RFP [sic] requirements? Does CA SOS have a preference? | SOS will review all approaches in response to this Request for Offer, based on Section VIII - Offer Review and Selection. |
| 9 | N/A - General | Does CA SOS plan on adding Confidential Discussions to the procurement schedule? | At this time the SOS does not anticipate adding Confidential Discussions to the procurement schedule. |
| 10 | N/A - General | Does SOS have a solution that they have already architected or have created high-level design? Please describe the platform, technology and whether that it is custom-built or COTS implementation. | No, SOS does not have a solution that they have already architected or for which they have created a high-level design. |
| 11 | N/A - General | Are there budget limitations for providing these services in the RFO? | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |
| 12 | N/A - General | Please describe where is SOS in their Agile adoption and how has it been implemented – Scrum, XP, etc. and what tools are being used? | SOS follows an incremental/iterative development approach; please refer to the RFO, Section IV - Proposed System and Business Processes, Application Development Tools, pages 25 and 26 of 198. |
| 13 | N/A - General | The deliverables list the RFO appear to be appropriate for the Waterfall SDLC methodology, how do you expect them to be produced in Agile methodology as suggested in the RFO? | SOS follows an incremental/iterative development approach; please refer to the RFO, Section IV - Proposed System and Business Processes, Incremental/Iterative Development Project Approach, page 28 of 198. |
| 14 | N/A - General | Please confirm that this is fixed-fee contract? | Please refer to the RFO, Section VII - Statement of Work, Exhibit VII.3 Deliverable Cost Table, page 178 of 198, for all cost structures related to this contract. |
| 15 | Section I – General Information; Page 2 | Please expand on the roles of separate consultants/contractors and the work/tasks they will perform on the project. Of particular interest are Data Migration, Test Management, and Business Systems Analysts. As there are significant requirements for the Vendor in these areas, we want to ensure that we do not duplicate effort and understand the delineation of roles. | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. Please refer to Section VII - Statement of Work, Exhibit VII.2 Software Development Lifecycle Roles and Responsibilities, page 175 of 198. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 16 | Section I - General Information, A. Purpose of the RFO; Page 2 | Please explain how the roles and responsibilities of the contractors referenced in this section of the RFO (e.g., Enterprise Architect, Organizational Change Management Business Systems Analysts (other business systems analysis tasks, Data Migration and Test Management)) differ from the role and responsibilities of the vendor as set forth in the this RFO and its Statement of Work. Will the vendor be responsible for the management or oversight or coordination of any of the activities or work products of the contractors identified in this section? | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. Please refer to Section VII - Statement of Work, Exhibit VII.2 Software Development Lifecycle Roles and Responsibilities, page 175 of 198. Vendor is not responsible for management and oversight of other contractors. SOS does expect the Contractor to work and coordinate with all stakeholders as required to successfully complete the CARS project. |
| 17 | Section I – General Information, F. RFO Response Requirements; Page 5 | The RFP [sic] states the electronic version is to be searchable format (Non-PDF). Many of the state forms are in PDF format (e.g., Payee Data Record, Bidder Declaration), and any signed forms are scanned images of the signed document and will be in PDF format. Please confirm that PDF files are acceptable for signed forms, and those forms that have a native PDF format. | Any standard State of California forms (i.e. Std. 204, GSPD 05-105, Std. 843) which are required to be submitted pursuant to this RFO, may be completed, signed and scanned images included with the electronic version of the response. |
| 18 | Section I – General Information, F. RFO Response Requirements; Page 5 | Will the State please provide Word versions of the administrative exhibits and the management, functional, and technical matrices to facilitate completion? This will also allow the bidder to submit these materials in non-PDF format. | SOS is unable to provide the exhibits in any other format, other than what has been provided in the RFO. |
| 19 | Section I - General Information, A. Purpose of the RFO; Page 2 AND Section VII - Statement of Work, #2 Term of Contract; Page 138 | Can SOS confirm that the maximum contract term is 34 months, inclusive of the one year maintenance and operations in Phase IV? | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 20 | Section I - General Information, A. Purpose of the RFO; Page 2 | <p>This section indicates that SOS will engage separate consultants/contractors for 9 different areas, including Organizational Change Management (OCM). We are familiar with multiple models of incorporating OCM in large-scale system development efforts.</p> <p>Are Deliverables II.1 and II.4 dependent on any outputs/deliverables from the OCM vendor? For example, will the system design be required to align with business processes defined by the OCM?</p> | <p>At this time, SOS does not anticipate any dependency for Deliverable II.1 and II.4 on completion of OCM vendor Deliverables. However SOS does expect that the Contractor will work closely with the OCM vendor.</p> |
| 21 | Section I - General Information, A. Purpose of the RFO; Page 2 | <p>This section indicates that SOS will engage separate consultants/contractors for 9 different areas, including Organizational Change Management (OCM). We are familiar with multiple models of incorporating OCM in large-scale system development efforts.</p> <p>Are Deliverables 0.9, I.8, and III.4 (and VII.10.i) OCM consultant/contract efforts?</p> <p>Exhibit VII.2 indicates Business Process Training (VII.2.17) and CARS System Training (VII.2.18) are separate activities and separate owners. For example, will the CARS Training under this solicitation be required to align with OCM deliverables and/or schedules? For example, will CARS training aids, manuals, guides, etc. under Deliverable III.4 be required to align with work products produced by the OCM vendor?</p> | <p>At this time, SOS anticipates that the Business Process Training and CARS System Training will be closely coordinated since the recipients of training are the same stakeholders.</p> |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 22 | Section I - General Information, A. Purpose of the RFO; Page 2 | <p>This section indicates that SOS will engage separate consultants/contractors for 9 different areas, including Data Migration. We are familiar with multiple models of aligning Data Migration efforts, with our experience indicating that separating data migration work from the primary system development work can be very beneficial.</p> <p>Deliverable I.7 indicates that the vendor will provide a Data Integration Approach and that “SOS will incorporate this information in the SOS CARS Data Migration and Integration Plan” and that the CARS Data Migration Vendor (DM vendor) is the owner. Can SOS clarify the scope of the CARS Data Migration and Integration Plan vs Deliverable I.7?</p> | <p>Please refer to Section VII - Statement of Work, Exhibit VII.2 Software Development Lifecycle Roles and Responsibilities, Items 5, 6, 7 and 8 for clarification, pages 175 and 176 of 198.</p> |
| 23 | Section I - General Information, A. Purpose of the RFO; Page 2 | <p>This section indicates that SOS will engage separate consultants/contractors for 9 different areas, including Data Migration. We are familiar with multiple models of aligning Data Migration efforts, with our experience indicating that separating data migration work from the primary system development work can be very beneficial.</p> <p>Deliverable III.3 indicates that the vendor “shall integrate the historical data with the CARS system, validate the data and conduct necessary testing...” Can SOS clarify if Deliverable III.3 is dependent on the CARS Data Migration and Integration Plan?</p> | <p>SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO.</p> |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 24 | Section I - General Information, A. Purpose of the RFO; Page 2 | <p>This section indicates that SOS will engage separate consultants/contractors for 9 different areas, including Data Migration. We are familiar with multiple models of aligning Data Migration efforts, with our experience indicating that separating data migration work from the primary system development work can be very beneficial.</p> <p>Exhibit VII.2.6 indicates the DM vendor owns and executes data clean-up.</p> <p>Does this mean that the design, development and testing of data cleansing processes and tools is only the DM vendor?</p> | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. Please refer to Section VII - Statement of Work, Exhibit VII.2 Software Development Lifecycle Roles and Responsibilities, Items 5, 6, 7 and 8, pages 175 and 176 of 198. |
| 25 | Section I - General Information, A. Purpose of the RFO; Page 2 | <p>This section indicates that SOS will engage separate consultants/contractors for 9 different areas, including Data Migration. We are familiar with multiple models of aligning Data Migration efforts, with our experience indicating that separating data migration work from the primary system development work can be very beneficial.</p> <p>Exhibit VII.7 indicates the DM vendor owns and executes data migration, with the CARS SI providing schema-related classifications and troubleshooting support. Does this mean that the design, development and testing of conversion scripts (i.e., load jobs, exception reporting) is only the DM vendor?</p> | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. Please refer to Section VII - Statement of Work, Exhibit VII.2 Software Development Lifecycle Roles and Responsibilities, Items 5, 6, 7 and 8, pages 175 and 176 of 198. |
| 26 | Section IV - Proposed System and Business Processes, Incremental / Iterative Development Approach; Page 28 | Will CA SOS support an Agile Development Approach? | SOS follows an incremental/iterative development approach; please refer to the RFO, Section IV - Proposed System and Business Processes, Incremental/Iterative Development Project Approach, page 28 of 198. |
| 27 | Section IV – Proposed System and Business Processes; Page 24 | Please expand on requirements and expectations for the Vendor Help Desk (Hours of Operation, Level(s) of Support, Current Call Volumes, etc.) | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. Please refer to Section VII - Statement of Work, Exhibit VII.1 Tasks and Deliverables, Deliverable IV.1 Monthly Operations Support and Performance Reports, page 168 of 198. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 28 | Section IV - Proposed System and Business Processes, Assumptions; Page 28 | Under the MSA, the maximum award value is \$10M. The RFO states that "Adequate funding will be available when needed to contract for project management support, project planning and procurement, and project development and implementation". Is there a cap on CA SOS' delegation authority for this procurement and/or a maximum contract award amount? | Pursuant to Section I - General Information, Sub-section A - Purpose of the RFO, the information technology procurement requirements described in Chapter 5.6 (commencing with Section 11545) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of this code, and in Section 12100 of the Public Contract Code, do not apply to development of the online filing and disclosure system. |
| 29 | Section IV – Proposed System and Business Processes, Incremental/Iterative Development Project Approach; Page 28 AND Section VI – Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Requirement P2 NOTE; Page 67 AND Section VII – Statement of Work, General (d) and Contractor Responsibilities (b); Pages 138 and 139 | <p>The Proposed System and Business Process narrative requires that an incremental/iterative development approach is to be employed and that the contractor must be highly responsible to changes. The Project Management requirements, however, resemble a traditional "Waterfall" project wherein a detailed design and execution schedule and budget are approved at the start of the project.</p> <p>Additionally, Section VI, Requirement 2, and the "Note" contained therein, cautions vendors that this solution is to be paid for by a fixed-priced contract with the "primary assumption is there will be no change orders."</p> <p>Similarly, SECTION VII – STATEMENT OF WORK, 3. Contractor Responsibilities (b) General (d), also confirms that this is a fixed-price contract tied to specified deliverables that are characteristic of a "Waterfall" development approach.</p> <p>Please elaborate on the System Development approach the State expects to be utilized and explain how the State will manage the PROJECT MANAGEMENT, FUNCTIONAL AND NON- FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS and payment schedule to support the vision.</p> | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. Please refer to the Project Management Plans in the RFO Resource Library. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 30 | Section IV - Proposed System and Business Processes, Incremental / Iterative Development Approach; Page 28 | <p>This section indicates the "Contractor shall follow an incremental/iterative development approach on this project..."</p> <p>Our initial review of deliverables in design and build Phase II and III, the DM vendor converting into a blank CARS SI database and the payment schedule structure indicate a more traditional waterfall orientation with one pay point for each deliverable. In an incremental/iterative approach with working software modules iteratively delivered, our experience is that there would be iterations of supporting deliverables (System Requirements Specification v1, v2, v3, etc) and pay points for each iteration of working software.</p> <p>Can SOS clarify the anticipated iterations or working software modules expected?</p> | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |
| 31 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A6; Pages 32-33 | Would providing the most current abridged financial statements suffice for companies that are not publicly traded or required to have audited financial statements or SEC 10k filings? | No, audited financial statements or SEC 10K filings are required. |
| 32 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A6, Pages 32-33 | Requirement A6 states that the offeror must have "average annual gross revenue of \$150,000,000 or more for each of the last three fiscal years". We understand the State's desire to have a vendor demonstrate financial capability to deliver this project, but this requirement eliminates all but the largest Tier III ITMSA vendors from consideration. However, all of approved vendors have already demonstrated the capability to deliver services up to the MSA cap of \$10M. In an effort to allow for a more competitive bid process, would the State consider eliminating this requirement in favor of a performance bond? | An addendum will be forthcoming to adjust this requirement. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 33 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A9; Page 36 | Requirement A9 states that the offeror "must have been a prime contractor for at least two IT implementations of greater than \$20 million project budget each.." We understand this requirement is meant to demonstrate past qualifications in delivering projects of a similar scale, but this threshold would likely exclude many of the ITMSA vendors who have already qualified capabilities to deliver projects up to \$10M. Would the State consider revising the project budget total down to \$10M, and/or making this a desirable scored requirement? | An addendum will be forthcoming to adjust this requirement. |
| 34 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A9; Page 36 | <p>The mandatory qualifications for the firm seem very stringent and very specific. There are many States which have implemented Filing systems and having State of CA in the qualification appears to limiting the solution and competition. We would like to request that the minimum qualification 2 listed below be revised to say:</p> <p>ORIGINAL – Requirement A9: At least one (1) of the two (2) IT implementation projects was for the State of California with similar size, scope and complexity;</p> <p>REVISED: At least one (1) of the two (2) IT implementation projects was for the a public center agency/department with similar size, scope and complexity</p> | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |
| 35 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A9; Page 36 | Can we meet the qualifications through a sub-contracting vendor? | No, requirement A9 applies to the IT MSA Contractor. |
| 36 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A12; Page 40 | Can the key staff be met through the subcontracting vendors? | Yes, please refer to the RFO, Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A12, page 42 of 198. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 37 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A11; Page 39 | Please confirm that beyond the key staff, all other resources needed on the project will be at the discretion of the system integration vendor – when and how they bring the other resource on board for producing the deliverables during the course of the project? | Yes, however SOS expects that any changes to resource levels and personnel will be closely coordinated with SOS to ensure roll on and roll off activities are well planned and executed. |
| 38 | Section I - General Information, A. Purpose of the RFO; Page 2 AND Section V – Administrative Requirements, #12.Proposed Key Staff Qualifications (Mandatory) – Pass/Fail; Page 40 | Requirements for several key staff include the provision “required as full-time key personnel.” Must the contractor staff these positions until the end of the contract, even if development of the solution is completed earlier? | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. Please refer to Section V - Administrative Requirements, #12, page 40 of 198. |
| 39 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A10; Page 37 and 38 | What is meant by “with a bottom-up approach”? | An addendum will be forthcoming to adjust this requirement. |
| 40 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A10; Page 37 and 38 | May a prime contractor use a subcontractor’s qualifications or client references to satisfy any of the Offeror Qualifications and References (Desirable)? | SOS will review all approaches in response to this Request for Offer, based on Section VIII - Offer Review and Selection. |
| 41 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A11; Page 39 | Will the State consider only requiring identification of and providing resumes for Key Staff? | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |
| 42 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Exhibit V.6 (1 – 5), Administrative Requirements A12 & A13, Key Staff Experience Matrix Templates and Instructions; Page 55 | The RFO describes how part time roles are to be prorated for determining the number of months of experience for a key staff member. Will SOS further clarify how the number of months is determined given the start and end dates? Is it acceptable to use the Days function in Excel, divide by 365, and multiple by 12 to estimate the number of months? | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 43 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Exhibit V.6 (5) Key Staff Experience Matrix – Lead Security Architect (SA); Page 61 | The Lead Security Architect role is to have 10 years of security related experience. The references used to demonstrate this experience must be within the 10 years prior to the release date of the RFO. To comply with this requirement, the Security Lead had to have focused exclusively on security requirements for 10 years, and performed no other role. Very few staff in technical roles have a singular focus. As written, this requirement significantly limits the pool of qualified candidates that can provide references for this period, particularly when considering private sector companies often will not provide signed references. We request this requirement be changed to 7 years of security related experience out of 10 years so the best candidates for the role can be bid. | An addendum will be forthcoming to adjust this requirement. |
| 44 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A9; Page 36 | Our understanding is that the \$20M project requirement is for the Vendor to demonstrate its ability to perform large, complex systems integration projects with the State of CA and therefore this requirement is applicable and mandatory, irrespective of whether the project budget for the CARS project is above or below \$20M. Please confirm that our understanding is correct. | An addendum will be forthcoming to adjust this requirement. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 45 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A9; Page 36 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This mandatory requirement is significantly higher than the total contract value even allowed under the IT-MSA and establishes a qualification that most IT MSA Tier III vendors cannot meet. • The RFO and IT MSA provisions clearly signal that SOS expects fixed-price bids for all requirements can be addressed for under \$10M • RFO indicates the underlying contract vehicle is the IT MSA (Page 2 Introduction, Page 30 Requirement A1.d, Page 138 Section VII.1.b), but does not require a specific Tier • DGS rules for the highest IT MSA Tier 3 require the total contract value be below \$10M and the RFO Requirement P2 NOTE on Page 67 indicates a “primary assumption is that there will be no change orders.” • For a term of 34 months and a total contract value under \$10M, the monthly average invoice would be approximately \$294k, or \$3.5M annualized. • We recommend SOS align corporate qualifications for IT implementation projects 1) under \$10M in total contract value as well as 2) under the maximum annualized contract value of \$3.5M as anticipated by the 34 month term. <p>Will SOS consider modifying the corporate qualifications in Requirement A9 to be commensurate with IT-MSA thresholds and enable greater competition from successful Tier III vendors?</p> | An addendum will be forthcoming to adjust this requirement. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 46 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A9; Page 36 | <p>• According to the California Department of Technology, there are 13 IT Implementation Projects active in the State of California with a value greater than \$20M being tracked for Independent Project Oversight. Contracts individually worth more than \$20M on these engagements are concentrated with fewer than six (6) vendors. In concert with the maximum spending cap of \$10M on the IT-MSA contract vehicle, the requirement for at least one (1) project conducted for the State of California with a value of \$20M appears to significantly narrow the vendor pool to only extremely large-scale organizations with active engagements with the State.</p> <p>Would SOS consider amending the requirement for at least one project for the State of California OR Federal government entity?</p> | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |
| 47 | Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A9; Page 36 | Requirement A9 - fourth bullet states "... with twelve (12) months ...". Should the "with" in this sentence be "within"? Please clarify. | An addendum will be forthcoming to adjust this requirement. |
| 48 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Req. #CARS-RQ-UN-0811; Page 104 | Will User Notifications be sent to a state worker or the lobbying / campaign finance agency or both? | User notifications will be generated based on the users' roles and responsibilities in the system / process. |
| 49 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Req. #CARS-RQ-UN-0811; Page 104 | Is the CARS system required to generate paper notices? | Yes, CARS users should be able to print notices from the system. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 50 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Req. #CARS-RQ-US-0711; Page 118 | Requirement is for the help screens to have English/Spanish option, does the dual language requirement apply to the entire application? | All screens that are available to the public must be available in English and Spanish. |
| 51 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Req. #CARS-RQ-SA-0599; Page 120 | Requirement is to retain history, is there an expected retention period or purge process to remove records? | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |
| 52 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, (Multiple requirements) | Can the State identify the specific fields that are considered Personally Identifiable Information? | Please refer to the California Business and Professions Code, Division 8 – Special Business Regulations, Chapter 22. Internet Privacy Requirements. Additional fields, if any, will be identified as the project progresses. |
| 53 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Req. #'s CARS-RQ-FR-0122, 23, 24; Pages 86 and 87 | Can the State identify the rules for Lobbyist revocation? They have not been included in the Cal-Access Business Rules document. | The legacy CAL-ACCESS Business Rules document has been included in the RFO Resource Library only as a reference for the current system. Government Code Sections 86103(d)(1) and (2) identify the rules for lobbyist revocation. http://www.fppc.ca.gov/content/dam/fppc/NS-Documents/LegalDiv/The%20Political%20Reform%20Act/2017_Act_Highlighted.pdf |
| 54 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Req. #'s CARS-RQ-FT-0338, 0340, 59, 60 and CARS-RQ-UN-0564; Pages 97, 99, and 102 | Does the State have an existing third party payment processor that they wish to work with? Or should the proposing vendor supply an option? | The system shall interface with a Secretary of State selected, State approved payment processing vendor. The current DGS Electronic Payment Acceptance Services (EPAY) MSA contracts are designated as mandatory for State of California agencies that seek to acquire credit and debit card payment acceptance services. The vendor solution should not be specific to single payment processor. Currently, the SOS EPAY contract payment processor is ELAVON. |

CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator

SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 55 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Req. #'s CARS-RQ-SA-0588, 592, 609,650, 651; Pages 119, 121, and 125 | Please confirm that "public facing correspondence" is only sent to registered users of the system, and not displayed for the general public. | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |
| 56 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Req. #CARS-RQ-SA-0632; Page 123 | Can the State identify the current rules for Filer Inquiry Escalation? They have not been included in the Cal-Access Business Rules Document. | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. The legacy CAL-ACCESS Business Rules document has been included in the RFO Resource Library only as a reference for the current system. |
| 57 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Req. #CARS RQ GL-0005; Page 75 | Please explain what PRD Staff should be able to override. | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |
| 58 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Req. #CARS-RQ-PE-0703; Page 128 | Can this requirement be limited to the interfaces provided to filers and members of the public? If administrators and staff primarily work on desktops, significant cost savings can be provided by limiting mobile device support for staff and administrative interfaces. | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |
| 59 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Req. #CARS-RQ-PE-0699 and Exhibit VI.2, Req. #CARS-NF-5.7; Pages 127 and 133 | <p>Microsoft has discontinued support for Internet Explorer versions 9 and 10 and therefore security and stability updates are outside of the CARS vendor's control. See https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/windowsforbusiness/end-of-ie-support for Microsoft's end-of-lifecycle announcement for these browsers.</p> <p>Can this requirement (CARS-NF-5.7) therefore be clarified to require support of the latest version of Microsoft Internet Explorer that is supported by Microsoft, at the time of CARS system acceptance?</p> | An addendum will be forthcoming to adjust this requirement. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 60 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Req. #CARS-RQ-PE-0696; Page 127 | Please provide the State's estimate of the number of reports and average size of reports for each period that could be expected as a result of this requirement. This information will facilitate the architecture and storage design needs required to support the extensibility requirement. | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1 Functional Requirements, Req. #CARS-RQ-PE-0696, page 127 of 198 relates to the extensibility of the system for local filings. There is nothing in this requirement regarding reports. |
| 61 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.2, Req. #'s CARS-NF-1.2, CARS-NF-1.11, CARS-NF-1.14, CARS-NF-2.3; Pages 129 - 131 | Can SOS confirm the current state of non-functional requirements to assist with level of effort planning on organizational transition – ie is SOS currently compliant with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAM 5300/NIST 800.53 (CARS-NF-1.2) • Data Transfers at TLSv1.2 or higher (CARS-NF-1.11) • PCI (CARS-NF-1.14) • RESTful web services secured with a combination of Oauth2 and JSON (CARS-NF-2.3) | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |
| 62 | Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.2, Req. #'s CARS-NF-1.2, CARS-NF-1.11, CARS-NF-1.14, CARS-NF-2.3; Pages 129 - 131 | Can SOS confirm that external trading partners are, or will be, compliant with the referenced SOS standards? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAM 5300/NIST 800.53 (CARS-NF-1.2) • Data Transfers at TLSv1.2 or higher (CARS-NF-1.11) • PCI (CARS-NF-1.14) • RESTful web services secured with a combination of Oauth2 and JSON (CARS-NF-2.3) | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |
| 63 | Section VII - Statement of Work, Exhibit VII-1, sub-section D – Deliverables, Del I.8 Training Plan; Page 161 | What is the estimated number of personnel that will require training? Are all personnel centrally located or geographically disbursed across the state? | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |
| 64 | Section VII - Statement of Work, Exhibit VII-1, sub-section D – Deliverables, Del 1.8 Training Plan; Page 161 | Please specify the number of staff that need to be trained by program and responsibility. | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 65 | Section VII - Statement of Work, Exhibit VII.1, Deliverable IV.1 – Monthly Operations Support and Performance Reports Maintenance and Operations D. Responding to Deficiencies Table 1 – Severity Levels; Page 170 AND D. Responding to Deficiencies, #3.; Page 170 | Section D, Responses to Deficiencies, defines the term “workaround”. Workarounds can provide an important interim means to address a defect until a deficiency can be permanently corrected. Table 1—Severity Levels permits the use of workarounds to address Moderate and Minimal deficiencies. The definitions for Critical and Serious deficiencies, however, do not expressly provide for authorized workarounds. Workarounds can be even more beneficial in dealing with critical or serious defects. They often can provide the means for a rapid return to service within the timeframes the state is seeking, whereas permanent corrections can take longer. Will the State change the RFO requirement to expressly permit SOS-approved workarounds until a deficiency can be fully resolved in the case of Critical and Serious deficiencies? | SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 66 | Section VII - Statement of Work, #4. Contractor Personnel | <p>Would the State be willing to modify the RFO so that work by the five key staff roles still takes place in Sacramento County, but other work on the project may be conducted in any location within the State of California?</p> <p>The RFO specifies that all analysis, design, development, testing, and training development activities be performed exclusively within Sacramento County, with exceptions to the work location potentially granted after the contract is awarded. The scope of this project will require a large team of software developers, business analysts, and other highly skilled professionals, in addition to the five key staff roles. Requiring all this work to be conducted in Sacramento County will substantially increase costs for the project, and correspondingly increase the bid amounts for the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Even though there is a process to waive the requirement that work take place in Sacramento County, bid amounts will need to assume that exceptions might not be granted, leading to substantially higher bids for the state.</p> | <p>An addendum will be forthcoming to adjust this requirement.</p> |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 67 | Section VII - Statement of Work, #12 Software and Provisions; Page 152 and 153 | <p>Paragraph 37(a) of the IT General Provisions (GSPD 401-IT 9/5/14) states that “all inventions, discoveries, intellectual property...relating to this Contract (collectively, the ‘Work Product’) shall be the Contractor’s exclusive property.” Paragraphs 37 and 38 then give the SOS a license to use the “Work Product” for any specified government purpose, and additionally give the SOS a “perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free, non-exclusive, license” to the software itself.</p> <p>By contrast, Paragraph 12 of the Statement of Work contained in the RFO appears to contemplate the full transfer of all intellectual property rights pertaining to the software (excluding Pre-Existing Materials and Third Party Software as stated in Section 12(a)(1)) to the SOS, with no retention of any such rights by the Contractor.</p> <p>Please explain how these provisions interrelate with one another, giving particular attention to whether the Contractor retains any of the rights specified in Paragraph 37(a) of the IT General Provisions.</p> | <p>Consistent with Paragraph 37(a) of the IT General Provisions (GSPD 401-IT 9/5/14), the language in the Statement of Work supercedes the IT General Provisions to the extent they are inconsistent.</p> |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 68 | Section VII - Statement of Work, Exhibit VII-1, sub-section D – Deliverables, Del I.3 Integrated Project Schedule; Page 159 | <p>This section indicates that the vendor under this solicitation will create the Integrated Project Schedule (IPS), which “shall include a work decomposition that includes resource loading of all contractors (including the SI Contractor, other state departments, independent verification and validation, quality assurance, etc.) as well as SOS staff...” For purposes of level of effort estimation, can SOS confirm the scope of the Deliverable I.3 IPS.</p> <p>Will the vendor be required to work with external project managers to build and maintain their schedules or will other externa [sic] project managers contribute directly to a master schedule, such as on a Microsoft Project Server environment?</p> | An addendum will be forthcoming to adjust this requirement. |
| 69 | Section VII - Statement of Work, Exhibit VII-1, sub-section D – Deliverables, Del I.3 Integrated Project Schedule; Page 159 | <p>This section indicates that the vendor under this solicitation will create the Integrated Project Schedule (IPS), which “shall include a work decomposition that includes resource loading of all contractors (including the SI Contractor, other state departments, independent verification and validation, quality assurance, etc.) as well as SOS staff...” For purposes of level of effort estimation, can SOS confirm the scope of the Deliverable I.3 IPS.</p> <p>Will the vendor be required to substantiate, conduct quality assurance, or administer change control on the activity attributes, work performance data and work performance information provided by external project managers?</p> | An addendum will be forthcoming to adjust this requirement. |

**CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions**

| Round #1 - Question(s) and Response(s) | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| # | RFO Reference; Pg #(s) | Question | Secretary of State (SOS) Response |
| 70 | Section VII - Statement of Work, Exhibit VII-1, sub-section D – Deliverables, Del I.9 Requirements Traceability Matrix Plan; Page 162 | <p>This section requires a Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM) Plan and then continuing management of the RTM. We are familiar with multiple models of requirements management, such as an integrated RTM for all contractors/consultants or an RTM for one vendor. A single vendor RTM would indicate that expectations for dependencies or assumptions across consultants/contractors would be tracked in multiple RTMs.</p> <p>Can SOS clarify whether the RTM contemplated in this solicitation is only for the vendor or whether other contractors/consultants will be integrating their requirements into the same RTM?</p> | <p>The CARS Project has a single set of functional and non-functional requirements that have been included in this solicitation. The vendor RTM Plan and the subsequent RTM shall cater to these requirements and any approved changes through the CARS Change Request process at any later stages.</p> |
| | | | |