RFO #17-025
CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #2 Questions

December 13, 2017

**Round #2 - Question(s) and Response(s)**			

#	RFO Reference; Pg #(s)	Question	Secretary of State (SOS) Response
1	N/A - General	Would the State consider converting only the committee entity and officer information from the legacy system without bringing over the detailed transaction? The historical data could be viewed through a separate weblink.	SOS will not consider this request. SOS plans to migrate at least 10 years of the current CAL-ACCESS data to CARS.
2	N/A - General	Could you confirm if it is the preference of the State to meet the February 2019 date for when the new system will be available for use as dictated by Senate Bill 1349?	At this time, SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO.
3	N/A - General	Would the State consider a warranty of 60 days and then transitioning to maintenance after the 60 days?	SOS will not consider changing this requirement.
4	N/A - General	The State mentions the preference for an iterative approach to development, and we agree that may be the only way to affectively meet the goal of an 11 month Implementation under the current statute (extension not withstanding). Please confirm that you would consider plans that allow for iterations of logical functional modules to be analyzed, documented and approved, and immediately enter the configuration/customization phase while analysis and development of subsequent requirements continues in this manner until we reach System testing where all integrated code will be testing prior to the State testing the complete system in UAT. Again, we don't intend to do development on anything until requirements are approved in Phase II, but chunking out those approvals to allow approved requirements to get to development sooner, in an iterative way. Waiting to start any development until all requirements are approved, as seems to be indicated in *[sic]* table x on page x, may significantly lengthen the proposed schedule.	SOS will review all approaches in response to this Request for Offer, based on Section VIII - Offer Review and Selection.

#	RFO Reference; Pg #(s)	Question	Secretary of State (SOS) Response
		Round #2 - Question(s) and Response(s)	
5	N/A - General	Since we have delay in the publishing of Addendum and given the Holiday season, would SOS consider extending the deadline to Feb 28th ?	SOS will consider extending the offer response due date. An addendum will be forthcoming to adjust this requirement.
6	N/A - General	Would SOS consider additional 3rd software as part of the solution and if so does that license cost need to fit into the $10M limit of IT MSA Tier 3?	At this time, SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. Please refer to the RFO, Section V - Administrative Requirements, Sub-section 14. CARS Additional Products List on pages 46 and 47 of 198 and Exhibit V.7 - Administrative Requirement A14 - CARS Additional Product List and Instructions on pages 62 and 63 of 198.
7	N/A - General	Can you please provide description of all integrations from old systems namely - their type – real-time/batch, frequency, technical design, etc?	SOS plans to replace all current campaign finance production systems with CARS. No integration with current systems is planned.
8	N/A - General	Will SOS consider Agile-based continuous delivery SDLC methodology to ensure the working software gets in users hands early in the project?	SOS will review all approaches in response to this Request for Offer, based on Section VIII - Offer Review and Selection.
9	N/A - General	Can SOS list the IT and Business Staff available to perform work on the project from State side?	At this time, SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO. Please refer to the RFO, Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-functional Requirements, Sub-section B. Project Management Requirements.
10	N/A - General	How would you rate the maturity of SDLC and Project Management processes within SOS on a CMMi scale ?	SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO.
11	N/A - General	Many important questions were not directly answered in the first round, one of them was can the mandatory quals be met through a subcontractor?	Responses were provided to all of the questions submitted in Round #1. Please refer to the SOS responses to the Round #1 Question #35 and 36.

	Round #2 - Question(s) and Response(s)		
#	RFO Reference; Pg #(s)	Question	Secretary of State (SOS) Response
12	Section IV - Proposed System and Business Processes, Infrastructure for Development and Deployment; Pages 25 & 26	The RFO lists the current SOS development standards. If SaaS solutions/managed solutions are proposed as a part of the solution do those solutions also need to be deployed on the SOS ITD Standards? i.e leveraging a SaaS solution for public access to this data that is not based of Microsoft stack.	SOS will review all approaches in response to this Request for Offer, based on Section VIII - Offer Review and Selection.
13	Section V - Administrative Requirements, Requirement A6; Page 33	Can we request SOS to revise the Requirement A6 on page 33 to include mid-size vendors, in other words adjust the revenue to be $75million / year? Or can the requirement be met through a sub-contractor?	An addendum will be forthcoming to reduce this requirement.
14	Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Functional Requirements (R1), Req. #CARS-RQ-PE- 0701 and CARS-RQ-PE- 0702; Pages 127 & 128	CARS-RQ-PE- 0701 and CARS-RQ-PE- 0702 seem to ask for the same thing. Can the SOS office elaborate those two requirements further?	Requirement CARS-RQ-PR-0702 is being removed, an addendum will be forthcoming. For details on CARS-RQ-PE-0701, please refer to https://www.data.ca.gov as the System shall conform to California's open data repository standards with respect to data formatting, encoding, metadata, and data dictionary elements as described on the California Open Data Portal.
15	Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Functional Requirements (R1), Req. #CARS-RQ-US-0204; Page116	A part of requirement CARS-RQ-US-0204 is incomplete, can SOS confirm the full requirement?	An addendum will be forthcoming to revise this requirement.

		Round #2 - Question(s) and Response(s)	
#	RFO Reference; Pg #(s)	Question	Secretary of State (SOS) Response
16	Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Functional Requirements (R1), Req. #CARS-RQ-US-0201; Page116	A part of requirement CARS-RQ-US-0201 is incomplete, can SOS confirm the full requirement? Are there any additional accessibility standards that the System should conform to?	Requirement CARS-RQ-US-0201 is being removed, an addendum will be forthcoming. Please refer to requirement CARS-NF-5.23 for User Experience/Usability requirements.
17	Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Functional Requirements (R1), Req. #CARS-RQ-SR-0720 and CARS-RQ-SR-0724; Page115	What is the difference between an "official" activity report and a "certified" activity report?	An "official" activity report is a non-alterable summary of the transactions submitted by a filing entity during one or more sessions. A "Certified" activity report is a non-alterable summary of the transactions submitted by a filing entity during one or more sessions. The summary shall be gernerated only by authorized PRD staff and shall include verbiage similar to "True and Certified Copy". The Glossary in the CARS RFO Reference Library will be updated to reflect these terms.
18	Section VI - Project Management, Functional and Non-Functional Requirements, Exhibit VI.1, Req. #CARS-RQ-US-0711; Page 118	Please confirm that the State will provide the Spanish translation and the vendor will provide the media to display the translated text.	Where translations are required, SOS will provide the translated text(s).

RFO #17-025
CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #2 Questions

December 13, 2017

	Round #2 - Question(s) and Response(s)		
#	**RFO Reference; Pg #(s)**	**Question**	**Secretary of State (SOS) Response**
19	Section VII - Statement of Work, #12 Software and Provisions; Page 152 and 153	In SOS Response(s) to Round #1 Questions, Question 67, the SOS responded as follows: "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." For several reasons, we request clarification/amplification of this response. First, Paragraph 37(a) of the IT General Provisions does not contain the referenced language, and says nothing about supersession or a resolution of inconsistencies. Second, Paragraph 11 of the IT General Provisions ("Order of Precedence") indicates the opposite of what is presented in the SOS's response. Specifically, Paragraph 11 explicitly gives the first order of precedence to the IT General Provisions, relegating the Statement of Work to the fourth order of precedence. Third, and perhaps most importantly, the SOS's existing response does not fully address the thrust of Question No. 67. That question does not merely seek an explanation of which provisions (Paragraphs 37 and 38 of the IT General Provisions, on the one hand, or Paragraph 12 of the Statement of Work, on the other) govern in the case of conflict/inconsistency, but how those provisions actually interrelate, if at all. In light of the above, we have the following supplemental questions: (continued in next cell)	If Section VII - Statement of Work, Section 12. Software and Provisions, (a) CARS System Software addresses an issue, then it controls. If it is silent on an issue, Paragraphs 37 and38 of the IT General Provisions control. Also, see IT General Provisions Paragraph 11 a). As stated in the RFO, Section VII - Statement of Work, Section 12. Software and Provisions, (a) CARS System Software 1. "The definition of CARS System Software includes any Application Software that is developed or modified by the Contractor to meet the requirements and other Specifications of this Contract for the CARS System. This provision does not apply to Pre-Existing Materials or Third Party Software."

RFO #17-025
CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #2 Questions

December 13, 2017

Round #2 - Question(s) and Response(s)			
#	RFO Reference; Pg #(s)	Question	Secretary of State (SOS) Response
19		(a) Is the SOS—through Paragraph 12 of the Statement of Work—attempting to alter the intellectual property-related rights/obligations memorialized in Paragraphs 37 and 38 of the IT General Provisions? Or, is Paragraph 12 referencing a different series of rights/obligations than what are memorialized within Paragraphs 37 and 38? (b) In the SOS's opinion, do these provisions (that is, Paragraphs 37 and 38 of the IT General Provisions, on the one hand, and Paragraph 12 of the Statement of Work, on the other) actually conflict? (c) In light of the terms of Paragraph 12 of the Statement of Work, does the Contractor retain any rights to preexisting "Work Product" that is utilized in the course of the Project? (By "preexisting," we mean Work Product that predated the Contractor's work on the Project, but is ultimately included within one or more Deliverables provided by the Contractor.) (d) In addition to the above, please provide as detailed an explanation as possible as to how these identified provisions (that is, Paragraphs 37 and 38 of the IT General Provisions, on the one hand, and Paragraph 12 of the Statement of Work, on the other) 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.	

RFO #17-025
CAL-ACCESS Replacement System (CARS) Project - System Integrator
SOS Response(s) to Round #2 Questions

December 13, 2017

Round #2 - Question(s) and Response(s)			
#	RFO Reference; Pg #(s)	Question	Secretary of State (SOS) Response
20	Section VII - Statement of Work,Exhibit VII-1 Tasks And Deliverables, Sub-section E Payment Milestones; Page 172	The payment milestones reflect a waterfall approach to systems development. Would SOS be amenable to an alternative milestone schedule, for example breaking up the Phase 3 milestone payments for Unit Testing (Phase III.1) into multiple payments for iterations where an iteration included a subset of the total required functionality? For example, if Phase III.1 was divided into four (4) iterations where each iteration included approximately 25% of functionality, the vendor would invoice for each iteration after Unit Test and Code review was completed.	At this time, SOS is unable to provide any further information other than what has been provided in the RFO.
21	Section VII-Statement of Work, #4. Contractor Personnel; Page 140	Would the State consider a reasonable on-site presence of the key personnel? For example, during critical phases of the project, like gap analysis, UAT, and training.	An addendum will be forthcoming to clarify this requirement.