

ADDENDUM TWO

DATE: July 14, 2014

TO: All Vendors

FROM: Robert Thompson/Kristi Kling, Buyers
State Purchasing Bureau

RE: Questions and Answers for RFP Number 4743Z1
to be opened July 30, 2014 2:00 P.M. Central Time

Following are the questions submitted and answers provided for the above mentioned Request for Proposal. The questions and answers are to be considered as part of the Request for Proposal.

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>1. Page: 22</p> <p>Section: III.FF.</p> <p>Reference: Performance bond may be required</p> <p>Question/Comment: Can the state elaborate on the conditions which would require a performance bond?</p>	<p>The State will evaluate the technical proposal including the Corporate Overview, financial statements, and the Cost Sheet. Whether to require a performance bond is dependent upon the proposals submitted.</p> <p>Until the State has the opportunity to review the bids, the State will not be able to identify whether to opt for a Performance Bond or not.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>2. Page: 38</p> <p>Section: IV.A</p> <p>Reference: Subsequent to this effort, Nebraska WIC intends to transition the issuance of benefits to participants from the current check-based benefit system to Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT)</p> <p>Question/Comment: Are we correct in assuming that Nebraska intends to implement the new MIS as a voucher based system and then convert it to online EBT?</p>	<p>Nebraska will implement the new MIS as a check based system and then convert to an EBT benefit delivery.</p>
<p>3. Page: 38</p> <p>Section: IV.A</p> <p>Reference: D&IC Contractors</p> <p>Question/Comment: Has the D&IC contractor been selected? Has the project started? If so, can you provide the current schedule?</p>	<p>The D&IC contractor is Ciber. The project has started. Attached is the current MIS project schedule. It is hereby added to the RFP as Attachment B.</p>
<p>4. Page: 38</p> <p>Section: IV.A</p> <p>Reference: EC Contractor</p> <p>Question/Comment: Will the QA contractor play any role in the selection of the EC contractor? If so, please elaborate.</p>	<p>No, the QA contractor has no role in the selection of the EC and no tasks or deliverables related to the selection of the EC.</p>
<p>5. Page: 38</p> <p>Section: IV.A.3.c.</p> <p>Reference: Comment and review on documents</p> <p>Question/Comment: Is the QA contractor expected to review all work products or just deliverables? If more than deliverables, can the state provide any estimate of the number and size of documents to be reviewed?</p>	<p>The QA review requirements are specific to the discrete deliverables listed. These deliverables may be documents (e.g., review of Technical Specifications) or tasks (e.g., monitoring of pilot test).</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>6. Page: 39 Section: IV.A. Reference: 'convert the MPSC system to on-line EBT capability' Question/Comment: Is there an estimated time frame for this activity?</p>	<p>It is currently estimated that Nebraska EBT rollout will be completed in late 2017. It is expected that the system will be on-line EBT capable in advance of this timeline.</p>
<p>7. Page: 39 Section: IV.A.3. Reference: the User Group Enhancement Contractor, when approved by the UG, will convert the MPSC system to on-line EBT capability. Question/Comment: Please elaborate on the role the QA contractor will play in relation to this enhancement activity, if any.</p>	<p>The QA contractor will not have any role in converting the MPSC system to on-line EBT capability. The QA contractor will be responsible for the creation of test procedures (UAT script) that validate the functionality of on-line EBT in Nebraska during Nebraska's UAT.</p>
<p>8. Page: 39 Section: IV.A.3.g. Reference: Management and monitoring of UAT Question/Comment: Who will perform the UAT test steps and record the results?</p>	<p>Nebraska State and local staff will perform UAT tests and record results.</p>
<p>9. Page: 41-42 Section: IV.C.3.d.ii Reference: Reviews and comments on project deliverables Question/Comment: Can we assume the committee will resolve differences internally and produce a consolidated set of comments that do not contain conflicting opinions?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>10. Page: 42</p> <p>Section: IV.D</p> <p>Reference: Support successful on-time, on-budget MIS and EBT projects</p> <p>Question/Comment: According to the December 2013 WIC Status report, only 7 states have implemented WIC EBT. It appears that at least 1 vendor supported more than 1 of those states. Can the state identify the vendors it considers qualified to meet this requirement? This would benefit both the vendor community and the state by eliminating unnecessary proposals.</p>	<p>The State of Nebraska does not prequalify vendors for solicitations. Proposals are evaluated as per Section II. J. (page 5) of the RFP.</p>
<p>11. Page: 42</p> <p>Section: IV.E.</p> <p>Reference: General question</p> <p>Question/Comment: Will the project teams have access to web conference and/or video conference capability?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>12. Page: 43</p> <p>Section: IV.E.2.a</p> <p>Reference: QA Project Initiation</p> <p>Question/Comment: Will there be a single project initiation and planning phase, or separate for MIS vs. EBT?</p>	<p>There will not be a single project initiation and planning phase, as MIS and EBT will occur on different time frames.</p>
<p>13. Page: 45</p> <p>Section: IV.E.3</p> <p>Reference: [Note] at top of page</p> <p>Question/Comment: INTERNAL – says that tasks 2 and 3 of the MIS project are optional and will be executed at the discretion of NE DHHS. Guessing this is why they’re asking for itemized budget lines- so they can approve/deny the completion of individual tasks and deliverables for the MIS portion?</p>	<p>The tasks denoted as optional will be exercised at the State’s discretion.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>14. Page: 47</p> <p>Section: IV.E.3.b.i.</p> <p>Reference: Review and Evaluate D&IC and EC Project Plans</p> <p>Question/Comment: Will the D&IC and/or EC contractor be required to provide a requirements traceability matrix? If so, which listed deliverable(s) contain these matrices?</p>	<p>The D&IC will not be providing a traceability matrix. The MPSC system traceability matrix is maintained by the UG. It is not known if the EC will be required to produce a traceability matrix as a component of the documentation.</p>
<p>15. Page: 47</p> <p>Section: IV.E.3.b.i.b.</p> <p>Reference: EC Plans</p> <p>Question/Comment: A data conversion plan is not listed. Are we correct in assuming no legacy data will be converted as part of the EBT project?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>16. Page: 51</p> <p>Section: IV.E.3.e.iv</p> <p>Reference: 5.4 Monitor and Evaluate System Operations Support and Training</p> <p>Question/Comment: Can the state estimate the duration of training or can the bidder assume the duration to be the same as System Orientation Training as listed in E.3.c.i, which is one (1) week? Will there be any additional training to review, such as web-based training or webinars? If so, can the state estimate the duration of additional training?</p>	<p>It is expected that system training events will be one (1) week in duration. Note that there will be a number of training events (UAT, Pilot, Phased Rollout).</p>
<p>17. Page: 52</p> <p>Section: IV.E.3.e.vi</p> <p>Reference: Last paragraph on page, begins "During UAT..."</p> <p>Question/Comment: INTERNAL – can/should we ask if this work can be done offsite, or if VPN access will be provided?</p>	<p>The UAT support requirement requires on-site support for the duration of testing. The referenced requirement for evaluation of manuals and on-line help is expected to be accomplished through preparation of, observation of the conduct, and evaluation of results of specific test procedures during the UAT.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>18. Page: 55</p> <p>Section: IV.E.3.g.iii</p> <p>Reference: 7.3 Monitor and Evaluate Training</p> <p>Question/Comment: Can the state estimate the duration of training or can the bidder assume the duration to be the same as System Orientation Training as listed in E.3.c.i, which is one (1) week? Will there be any additional training to review, such as web-based training or webinars? If so, can the state estimate the duration of additional training?</p>	<p>Please see response to Question 16. There is no additional training considered in the scope of this RFP.</p>
<p>19. Page: 55</p> <p>Section: IV.E.3.g.iii</p> <p>Reference: 7.3 Monitor and Evaluate Training</p> <p>Question/Comment: INTERNAL – not sure what they mean by monitoring as no monitoring tasks are mentioned in this item. Ask for clarification?</p>	<p>Monitoring training refers to reviewing plans, materials and schedules, and tracking the conduct of the training events.</p>
<p>20. Page: 56</p> <p>Section: IV.E.3.h.ii</p> <p>Reference: 8.2 Monitor and Evaluate Training, Conversion, and Implementation</p> <p>Question/Comment: Can the state clarify which activities are meant in the statement “The QA Contractor must attend one (1) Rollout training event at the initiation of each of these activities...”? Or can the state quantify how many training sessions the QA Contractor must attend?</p>	<p>Both the MIS and EBT projects will have a phased rollout with multiple training events to support clinic training just prior to implementation. The requirement is for the QA contractor to attend one of the initial training events of rollout for both MIS and EBT. The training events are expected to be one week in duration. For MIS this will be clinic staff training only. For EBT this will include one day of clinic staff training and three days of vendor training. See also response to #16, above.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>21. Page: 56</p> <p>Section: IV.E.3.h.ii</p> <p>Reference: 8.2 Monitor and Evaluate Training, Conversion, and Implementation</p> <p>Question/Comment: Can the state estimate the duration of training or can the bidder assume the duration to be the same as System Orientation Training as listed in E.3.c.i, which is one (1) week? Will there be any additional training to review, such as web-based training or webinars? If so, can the state estimate the duration of additional training?</p>	<p>See response to #16, above.</p>
<p>22. Page: 56</p> <p>Section: IV.E.3.h.ii</p> <p>Reference: 8.2 Monitor and Evaluate Training, Conversion, and Implementation</p> <p>Question/Comment: Can the state confirm there is no deliverable associated with this task, given that results will be “reported verbally during Project Status Meetings and recorded and incorporated in the QA Monthly Status Reports”?</p>	<p>Correct, there is no deliverable associated with this task.</p>
<p>23. Page: 58</p> <p>Section: IV.F.</p> <p>Reference: The project schedule is difficult to read</p> <p>Question/Comment: Can the state provide the source file for this project plan or another more readable format?</p>	<p>Please see response to Question 3. The current MIS and draft EBT schedules are attached and are hereby added to the RFP as Attachments C and D respectively.</p>
<p>24. Page: 62</p> <p>Section: V.A.2.h</p> <p>Reference: The state will use no more than three ... project descriptions</p> <p>Question/Comment: Can any of the three be for the bidder’s subcontractors?</p>	<p>Yes, a subcontractor’s project may be submitted for consideration under this requirement, As stated in the referenced section, “Contractor and subcontractor(s) experience must be listed separately. Narrative descriptions submitted for subcontractors must be specifically identified as subcontractor projects.”</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>25. Page: 63</p> <p>Section: V.A.2.i</p> <p>Reference: Resumes shall include... understanding of the process</p> <p>Question/Comment: Can the state elaborate on how resumes should demonstrate an understanding? Would it be accomplished by showing experience on QA/IV&V and/or MIS/EBT projects?</p>	<p>The State cannot advise bidders on how to respond.</p>
<p>26. Page: 63</p> <p>Section: V.A.3.b</p> <p>Reference: Proposed development approach</p> <p>Question/Comment: Can we interpret this to mean proposed approach to delivering quality assurance services?</p>	<p>The State cannot advise bidders on how to respond.</p>
<p>27. Question #: 1</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: II, Procurement Procedures, B, Page 2</p> <p>Question: RFP Section II.B: It is our understanding that a binding Contract will not form upon award until such time as the Parties have agreed to mutually acceptable terms and conditions and the Contract has been executed by both Parties. Please confirm that this is accurate.</p>	<p>A contract will not be awarded until the parties have agreed to mutually acceptable terms and conditions. Rejection in whole or in part of the Terms and Conditions may be cause for rejection of a bidder's proposal.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>28. Question #: 2</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: III, Terms and Conditions, Pages 8-37</p> <p>Question: RFP Section III states that “a bidder may indicate any exceptions to the Terms and Conditions by (1) clearly identifying the term or condition by subsection, and (2) including an explanation for the bidder’s inability to comply with such term or condition which includes a statement recommending terms and conditions the bidder would find acceptable.” Given that the RFP was provided as a Word document, would the State accept a version of the Section with proposed changes tracked and red-lined, with accompanying explanations provided in the “NOTES/COMMENTS” box, or would the State prefer all proposed changes to be detailed in the “NOTES/COMMENTS” box alone?</p>	<p>The State will accept a version of the Section with proposed changes tracked.</p>
<p>29. Question #: 3</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: IV, Project Description and Scope, A, 3, Page 39</p> <p>Question: “Nebraska WIC views the QA requirements of this RFP as being continuous across the two efforts, MIS and EBT. It is anticipated that this will be a two-stage project; which would consist of implementation of the new MIS followed by completion and implementation of the EBT component.” Will the planning for MIS and EBT implementations occur at the same time?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>30. Question #: 4</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: Task 1, ii, Page 45</p> <p>Question: Deliverable 2 will occur throughout the project. We assume that this deliverable will be invoiced on a monthly basis. Is this a correct assumption?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>31. Question #: 5</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: Task 1.3.b, Page 47 and Task 6.2, Page 54</p> <p>Question: Task 1.3.b includes a QA review of the EBT Contractor's Integrated Vendor Certification Test Scripts. Task 6.2 includes the creation of the retailer certification test scripts. Please verify whether the EBT contractor will provide these for the QA Contractor's review or whether the QA Contractor is expected to create scripts and/or supplement the EBT Contractor's scripts.</p>	<p>The QA contractor is required to both review the EC scripts and create scripts and/or supplement the EC scripts as needed to ensure thorough testing.</p>
<p>32. Question #: 6</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: Task 4.2, Page 49</p> <p>Question: Monitor MIS and EBT System Transfer, Modification, and Technical Testing: This task is similar to task 5.4: "Monitor and Evaluate System Operations Support and Training" but unlike that task there is no associated deliverable. If this was your intent, please provide the deliverable associated with this task (for pricing purposes).</p>	<p>There is no discrete deliverable associated with this monitoring. As stated in the referenced task, "The findings of this ongoing monitoring must be reported verbally during Project Status Meetings and recorded and incorporated in the QA Monthly Status Reports."</p>
<p>33. Question #: 7</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: Task 5.6, Page 51</p> <p>Question: MPSC has been implemented by three states. Can NE WIC confirm that there is an existing, robust set of test scripts that can be used as the basis for completing this task?</p>	<p>There are existing MPSC test scripts available. However, the existing test scripts date from 2009 to 2012. Since then there have been numerous revisions to the system, both defect repairs and enhancements. The QA contractor may be able to use the existing test scripts as a starting point; however, the QA contractor should expect to prepare original test scripts.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>34. Question #: 8</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: Task 5.7, Page 53</p> <p>Question: Support UAT: This task states that the UAT will be conducted in two rounds and that there will be 10 weeks of on-site testing. The EBT (high-level) Schedule, WBS 2.5.7, provides a 28-day duration for the EBT UAT and we understand that the “formal” EBT UAT lasts about three days. Could NE WIC please provide the on-site expectations for the EBT UAT?</p>	<p>We cannot be certain of the EBT UAT onsite requirement until the EC’s scope of work is finalized. For bidding purposes the proposal shall assume three (3) weeks onsite.</p>
<p>35. Question #: 9</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: Task 6.3, Page 54</p> <p>Question: Attend and Evaluate System Pre-Test: Does NE WIC know where the pre-test for WIC vendor certification will take place?</p>	<p>NE WIC anticipates that the pre-test will take place in eastern Nebraska.</p>
<p>36. Question #: 10</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: Task 6.3, Page 54</p> <p>Question: Attend and Evaluate On-Site Certification Testing: This task states that there will be a minimum of three on-site certifications. For pricing purposes, can NE WIC provide a maximum number of on-site certifications?</p>	<p>The QA contractor must attend and evaluate a minimum of three certifications. There will be on-site certifications for all vendors (>400). The bidder may propose attending any number of certifications they believe necessary.</p>
<p>37. Question #: 11</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: Task 6.3, Page 54</p> <p>Question: Deliverables 22 will occur throughout the project. Will this deliverable be invoiced at the end of the project or incrementally as Pre-Tests occur</p>	<p>The bidder should refer to the requirement to provide an invoice schedule (IV.E.1 pg. 43). The deliverable(s) may be invoiced incrementally as the work is completed.</p>
<p>38. Question #: 12</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: Task 6.3 Page 54</p> <p>Question: Should the Task “Attend and Evaluate On-site Certification Testing” for Deliverable 23 be responded to as 6.4?</p>	<p>Yes. The RFP section IV.E.2. f.iv.6.3 (second entry) is amended to say 6.4</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>39. Question #: 13</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: Task 6.3 Page 54</p> <p>Question: Deliverables 23 occurs a minimum of three times in the project. We assume this deliverable will be invoiced incrementally as On-Site certifications occur. Is this a correct assumption?</p>	<p>The bidder should refer to the requirement to provide an invoice schedule (IV.E.1 pg. 43). The deliverable(s) may be invoiced incrementally as the work is completed.</p>
<p>40. Question #: 14</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: Task 7.4, Page 55</p> <p>Question: Monitor and Evaluate System Pilot Test: This task is similar to task 5.4: "Monitor and Evaluate System Operations Support and Training" but unlike that task there is no associated deliverable. If this was your intent, please provide the deliverable associated with this task (for pricing purposes).</p>	<p>There is no discrete deliverable associated with this monitoring. As stated in the referenced task, "The findings of this on-going monitoring must be reported verbally during Project Status Meetings and recorded and incorporated in the QA Monthly Status Reports."</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>41. Question #: 15</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: Task 7.4, Page 55</p> <p>Question: Monitor and Evaluate System Pilot Test: This task requires the QA Contractor to provide a technical memorandum of the monitoring activities conducted and incorporation of findings into the QA Monthly Monitoring Reports. Does NE WIC anticipate conducting an EBT pilot evaluation report to submit to FNS? If so, will NE WIC require the QA Contractor to prepare the report?</p>	<p>Yes, an EBT pilot evaluation report will need to be developed for FNS. The QA contractor will be involved in developing this report.</p> <p>Section IV.1.E.3.g.iv is hereby amended to read as follows: The QA Contractor must monitor and report on the Pilot Test results throughout the course of the tests (MIS and EBT). The QA contractor must carefully evaluate the Pilot results and note any concerns with an attendant plan for their remedy. The findings of this on-going monitoring must be reported verbally during Project Status Meetings and recorded and incorporated in the QA Monthly Status Reports. At the conclusion of the Pilot Tests, the QA Contractor must provide a technical memorandum documenting the monitoring activities conducted. At the completion of Pilot, the QA contractor must assess the cost of the pilot and make any salient recommendation for the statewide expansion. The QA contractor must also evaluate the pilot performance and make recommendations prior to the statewide expansion. Following review of the D&IC and EC reports and certifications, the QA Contractor must document the results of their evaluation and provide an independent assessment of the system's readiness for Rollout.</p> <p>Deliverable 27 is hereby amended to read as follows:</p> <p>Deliverable 27: Monitoring Activity Memorandum/Pilot Evaluation Report, Review and Evaluate D&IC and EC Pilot Reports and Rollout Readiness Certifications/Independent Certification of Readiness for Rollout</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>42. Question #: 16</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: Task 8.2, Page 56</p> <p>Question: Monitor and Evaluate User Training, Conversion, and Implementation: This task is similar to task 5.4: "Monitor and Evaluate System Operations Support and Training" but unlike that task there is no associated deliverable. If this was your intent, please provide the deliverable associated with this task (for pricing purposes).</p>	<p>There is no discrete deliverable associated with this monitoring. As stated in the referenced task, "The findings of this on-going monitoring must be reported verbally during Project Status Meetings and recorded and incorporated in the QA Monthly Status Reports."</p>
<p>43. Question #: 17</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: D&IC Schedule</p> <p>Question: Please note that the D&IC schedule begins on 6/2/2014. Is it acceptable to move the start forward to better coordinate with the start date of the QA Contractor, which is estimated to be 9/1/2014?</p>	<p>No, the D&IC project has been initiated.</p>
<p>44. Question #: 18</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: D&IC Schedule WBS 1.1.1</p> <p>Question: D&IC Project Initiation Meeting: This subtask is not called out in any of the QA Tasks or Deliverables. Is QA participation required at this meeting? Is there an on-site requirement for this meeting? Similarly, will there be a Project Initiation Meeting for the EBT implementation?</p>	<p>The D&IC initiation meeting has already occurred. There is not a requirement for the QA contractor to attend the EC initiation meeting.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>45. Question #: 19</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: D&IC Schedule WBS 1.1.4 QA Task 1.2</p> <p>Question: Project Status Reporting: This D&IC subtask is not defined as to whether it is a written report and/or a status call and whether the QA Contractor will be required to participate in these calls and review the D&IC status reports. The QA Task 1.2: Project Status Reporting only calls out the ESC calls, to be held monthly or bi-weekly, as necessary.</p>	<p>This is a statement. No question is asked.</p>
<p>46. Question #: 20</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: D&IC Schedule WBS 1.2.2</p> <p>Question: Traceability Matrix: This subtask is not called out in any of the QA Tasks or Deliverables. Is this a D&IC deliverable that requires QA Review? If so, please provide the deliverable associated with this review (for pricing purposes).</p>	<p>The D&IC will not be providing a traceability matrix. The MPSC system traceability matrix is maintained by the UG. There is no associated QA deliverable.</p>
<p>47. Question #: 21</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: D&IC Schedule WBS 1.4.4</p> <p>Question: Assessment of Disaster Recovery: This subtask is not called out in any of the QA Tasks or Deliverables. Is the QA Contractor responsible for this assessment or a review of the documentation provided by the D&IC Contractor?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>48. Question #: 22</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: EBT Schedule WBS 2.2.1</p> <p>Question: Initiation and Reporting: This subtask is not called out in any of the QA Tasks or Deliverables. Is QA participation required at this meeting? Is there an on-site requirement for this meeting?</p>	<p>No.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>49. Question #: 23</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: EBT Schedule WBS 2.2.4 and 2.2.5</p> <p>Question: These EBT subtasks call out Weekly Status Reports and Weekly Status Calls. Will the QA Contractor be required to participate in these calls and to review the EBT status reports? QA Task 1.2: Project Status Reporting only calls out the ESC calls, to be held monthly or bi-weekly, as necessary.</p>	<p>The QA Contractor is not required to participate in these calls or review the EBT status reports.</p>
<p>50. Question #: 24</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: D&IC and WIC Implementations</p> <p>Question: The SOW requires pilot statewide rollout monitoring but only indicates that the QA contractor interviews staff from two clinics. Does NE WIC anticipate that the QA Contractor will need to support clinics or retailers on-site during the rollout? For example, monitor/check the knowledge that retailers have of their stand-beside equipment?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>51. Question #: 25</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: Cost Proposal</p> <p>Question: Many of the deliverables will be completed in two parts. We assumed that each part of a two part deliverable will be invoiced separately at the time of acceptance. Is this a correct assumption?</p>	<p>Yes. Recurring deliverables may be billed on a monthly basis. Individual, non-recurring deliverables must be invoiced at final acceptance of the entire deliverable. Bidders must provide a cost for each individual deliverable as listed below. As specified on the Cost Sheet, one (1) or two (2) firm, fixed prices must be provided for each deliverable; a price for a standalone version of each deliverable specified for the MIS Project and the EBT Project respectively. Bidders must also provide an invoicing schedule for all deliverables per Section IV.E.1.</p>
<p>52. Question #: 26</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: General</p> <p>Question: Would NE WIC please provide the approach for rolling out the MIS and EBT? For example, "The MIS is rolled out in 3 geographic areas in one-month intervals".</p>	<p>The MIS rollout will consist of ten consecutive, rollout training events, each a week in duration. Clinics will go live the week immediately following their training event. The EBT rollout will be approximately eight weeks in duration.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>53. Question #: 27</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: General</p> <p>Question: Will the QA contractor be required to support the annual IAPDU for the MIS and the EBT implementations?</p>	<p>No.</p>
<p>54. Question #: 28</p> <p>RFP Section, page #: General</p> <p>Question: Will NE WIC please provide a copy of the combined IAPD or the IAPDs for the MIS and EBT implementations?</p>	<p>The EBT IAPD is not complete at this time. A copy of the MIS IAPD is attached and is hereby added to the RFP as Attachment D.</p>
<p>55. Question Number: 1</p> <p>RFP Section Reference: V.A.2.b Financials</p> <p>RFP Page Number: 60</p> <p>Question: Due to the large volume of our financial data (over 200 pages for each year), would the State accept our financial statements on a CD/USB in lieu of the printed version?</p>	<p>No, a printed version is required.</p>
<p>56. Question Number: 2</p> <p>RFP Section Reference: III.LLL. Public Counsel</p> <p>RFP Page Number: 37</p> <p>Question: This section indicates that the Contractor shall submit to the jurisdiction of the Public Counsel in the event the Contractor provides health and human services to individuals on behalf of DHHS under the terms of the contract. Can the State confirm that the services to be provided under this RFP do not involve providing health and human services to individuals on behalf of DHHS?</p>	<p>The quality assurance services for the management information system and for EBT food benefits delivery to be provided under this RFP do not directly involve providing health and human services to individuals on behalf of DHHS.</p>

QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
<p>57. Question Number: 3</p> <p>RFP Section Reference: V.A.2.d. Office Location</p> <p>RFP Page Number: 61</p> <p>Question: This section requires bidders to identify the location responsible for performance under the contract. In addition to the bidder's office location, will the State provide any equipment or facilities for Contractor's use in performance of the services? Also, how will the Contractor be given access to the State's systems for providing the proposed services?</p>	<p>The State will not provide any equipment or facilities for Contractor's use in performance of the services. It is unlikely the QA contractor will require access to the State's systems for providing the proposed services.</p>
<p>58. Question Number: 4</p> <p>RFP Section Reference: General</p> <p>RFP Page Number:</p> <p>Question: Has the program completed the procurement process for the MIS and EBT systems as well as the system integrator and if so who are they?</p>	<p>The MIS procurement is complete. The contractor is Ciber. The EBT procurement has not occurred.</p>
<p>59. Question Number: 5</p> <p>RFP Section Reference: General</p> <p>RFP Page Number:</p> <p>Question: Will the agency be supplying office space for the QA contractor to work along-side the rest of the team?</p>	<p>No.</p>