

#	Section/Attachment	Question	CDT Response
1	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach	What does the automated security test requirement entail?	Removed "o" of Section 2.
2	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach	What type of security must we enforce on the site?	Removed "o" of Section 2.
3	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach	Is this just testing for cross-site scripting and SQL injection attacks or is it deeper?	Removed "o" of Section 2.
4	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach	Will specifying the framework used, and the reports of the test be sufficient to address the requirement?	Removed "o" of Section 2.
5	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach	Can we have multiple repositories in GitHub, with the primary repository with our README file containing links to other repositories? For example, we have a REPO_A with the README file, Wiki, and documentation, and place the code in separate repositories?	The State prefers a single GitHub repository.
6	Play 6: Assign One Leader and Hold that Person Accountable	Can our Project Leader be the Product Owner and have both rolls or must the rolls be associated to separate individuals?	For the purposes of this RFI and prototype, the Product Owner and Project Leader can be the same staff person.
7	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach	It is unclear if the prototype criteria in Section 2 - Technical Approach listed (a) through (u) are mandatory requirements for the prototype. Certain criteria, specifically: [(l) use 5 modern, open-source technologies, (q) Setup configuration management, (s) deployed using Docker, (t) documentation to install on another machine, and (u) platforms are free] are oriented towards custom development architectures on an IaaS and not PaaS solutions such as Salesforce, Services Now, NetSuite, etc. Please provide more clarity on these requirements.	The Technical Approach is geared to an open-sourced architecture on IaaS or PaaS.
8	General Question	It appears that this RFI is oriented towards both an Agile Approach and a specific technical architecture (more IaaS oriented). Was this the intent?	The Technical Approach is geared to an open-sourced architecture on IaaS or PaaS.
9	Attachment A - Administrative Requirements Checklist	Would it be possible to submit a prototype and technical approach without having all the Administrative Requirements in place? As a small business, it might make more sense to prepare all the Administrative Requirements after being selected into the vendor pool.	The State has revised the Administrative Requirements. See revised RFI for updated language.
10	Section D.1 (c) - Participation Instructions	Will the State accept the JIRA link as evidence for application lifecycle management to plan, track, and release the software, if we provide while submitting?	No. GitHub must be used to provide evidence to document lifecycle management.
11	Section D.1 (c) - Participation Instructions	It is mentioned that the version control repository has to be publically accessible, is the expectation that the vendor needs to create a repository on GitHub / or State will give a GitHub repository to the vendors?	Vendors must create a GitHub repository.
12	General Suggestion	State could include in the RFI a Standard Template for response that would make responses unique in format.	The State cannot provide a template during this refresh cycle.
13	General Comment	Vendors with names that start with "F" are not assigned to either prototype A or B.	The State removed the prototype assignment matrix.
14	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach	Please consider increasing the 2,000 limit on the technical approach.	The 2,000 word limit applies to the Technical Approach narrative only. This is not the limit for the README file.
15	Attachment 1 - Section 1, Working Prototype	Will organizations with names that start with "F" be assigned to Prototype A or B?	The State removed the prototype assignment matrix.
16	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach	Can you please clarify if the 2,000 word limit stated on page 16 of the pre-release RFI only applies to the description of the technical approach used to create the working prototype? Or does this word limit apply to the entire README.md file; if yes, will you please consider increasing the word limit so all vendors can thoroughly respond to the lettered requirements listed in the Technical Approach section (2) on pages 16 and 17?	The 2,000 word limit applies to the Technical Approach narrative only. This is not the limit for the README file.
17	Section G.3, Bidder Declaration	Are vendors allowed to add subcontractors after the ADPQ Vendor Pool RFI award is made? Or are vendors limited to the subcontractors proposed with the RFI submission?	Vendors are not limited to the subcontractors used during the RFI submission.
18	General Question	Is the Vendor allowed to prime a submission for the ADPQ Vendor Pool Refresh, as well as participate as a subcontractor to another prime?	For the purposes of this RFI and prototype, yes. However, subsequent RFOs may or may not have requirements around the use of subcontractors.
19	General Question	Will the CDT consider adding past performance to the evaluation criteria for the ADPQ Vendor Pool RFI? We believe past performance references will allow the CDT to further evaluate if companies have previous Agile project experience similar in scope, size, and relevancy to the ADPQ Vendor Pool. Past performance would also allow vendors to demonstrate experience executing contracts in the State of California.	Past performance will be considered at the RFO level. Past performance requirements will be established on an RFO by RFO basis.
20	Attachment 1 - Section 1, Working Prototype	How will the State ensure digital service Prototype A and Prototype B scenarios are of the same level of functional complexity to enable streamlined State review and equitable scoring of all vendors?	The State has made a good faith effort to establish prototypes that are similar in complexity.
21	General Question	Will the State be sharing evaluation results with each vendor confidentially who responds to the ADPQ Vendor Pool Refresh RFI?	The State is open to individual debriefs with vendors after the refreshed list is established. Vendors must request a debrief in writing within 30 days of the announcement of vendors.
22	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach	Will the U.S. Digital Services Playbook evidence and references to the list a. through u. be counted in the 2,000 word limit for the Technical Approach? (i.e. is the State expecting the entire README.md to be under 2,000 words?)	The 2,000 word limit applies to the Technical Approach narrative only. This is not the limit for the README file.
23	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach	Regarding the statement: "Used at least five (5) modern and open-source technologies, regardless of architectural layer (frontend, backend, etc.);" Does the State include DevOps technologies in this list? (e.g. testing automation tools, deployment automation tools)	The State will allow one (1) DevOps technology as one (1) of the five (5) technologies used to create the prototype.
24	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach	Regarding the statement: "Modern" is to be understood as any technology or standard released, created, initiated or finalized in the five (5) years preceding the release of this RFI. Would the State consider the most recent stable build date of a technology as the "finalized" date? Some technologies have been around for longer than five years, but have had several stable builds / versions within the last five years.	No. The technology/standard must be released, created, initiated or finalized in the last five (5) years.

25	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach	Is the State expecting vendors to follow all plays in the U.S. Digital Services playbook, such as the checklist in Play 5: Structure Budgets and Contracts to Support Delivery? Several of these items may not apply to this RFI response. How would the State like us to respond to those that do not apply?	Vendors should respond with only those items that apply.
26	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach	Regarding: "c. Understood what people needed, by including people in the prototype development and design process;" Please could the State confirm if any special qualifications will be preferred or required for a person / Subject Matter Expert to fill this role?	No special qualifications are required. These are notional roles for the purpose of developing the prototype.
27	General Question	Please could the State confirm if there is a cap on the total contract value that the State can procure through an RFO to the ADPQ vendor pool?	There is no cap at this time.
28	Attachment 1 - Introductory Paragraph	Use of open source NoSQL database is strictly prohibited?	Removed "relational" to address this.
29	Attachment 2 - Section 2.u.	If the platform underlying the prototype is comprised of Amazon Web Services, are these considered open source and free of charge?	This would depend on the specific service from AWS.
30	Attachment 5, Section 4	Can the State confirm that the highest scoring Vendor will always be contacted by approved State Agencies/Departments first for any and all RFOs under this ADPQ? Can the State confirm that only if the highest scoring Vendor cannot provide resources, then the 2nd highest scoring vendor is contacted so that it is conceivable that vendors ranked beyond the first two highest ranked vendors may never be contacted and given the opportunity to be awarded?	All vendors that are selected for the Vendor Pool will be equally eligible to respond to subsequent RFOs.
31	General Comment	We are a small Sacramento company that has extensive experience implementing complex systems for California agencies and departments. Being small and agile, we have limited resources with which to build an extensive prototype for the ADPQ refresh. Please consider limiting the scope of the prototypes so local small businesses can effectively compete.	The State has attempted to limit the scope of the prototypes. Furthermore, the State is allowing vendors to choose one (1) of two (2) prototype options.
32	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach (k)	With respect to the requirement that the app be responsive and work on multiple devices, please clarify what devices/browsers the app will be tested on? Will it be evaluated on IE/Firefox/Chrome/Safari? iPad, iPhone, Android?	The prototype will be tested on the most current version (and -1) of IE, Firefox, Chrome, Safari, in addition to the most widely used versions of iOS and Android.
33	Section D.1 (c) - Participation Instructions	Will the State identify the "design assets and all associated documentation required"?	Design assets and associated documents are those that the vendor used to produce its prototype.
34	Attachment 1 -	Will the State identify the "design assets and all associated documentation required"?	Design assets and associated documents are those that the vendor used to produce its prototype.
35	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach (s)	There's a requirement that the app be deployed in a Docker container. Does this apply to both the local and production environments? Can we utilize other container brands such as Cloud Foundry?	Yes. Vendors must use an opened source container.
36	Attachment 1 - Section 2, Technical Approach/Attachment 3	There appears to be an inconsistency between the Technical Approach in Attachment 1 and the Primary responsibilities in Attachment 3. The Technical approach in Attachment 1 Section 2 identifies Docker only whereas the DevOps Engineer in Attachment 3 Page 30 requires knowledge of Containerization technologies other than Docker.	Vendors must used an opened source container.
37	Section G, ADPQ Vendor Pool Refresh Administrative Requirements	There appears to be an inconsistency in the documents referenced. There is a reference to Attachment E: ADPQ Administrative Requirements Checklist (page 9 of 54). This is inconsistent since the ADPQ Administrative Requirements Checklist is Attachment A in the Draft RFI (page 36 of 54). Attachment E is the Bidder Declaration (page 40 of 54)	Corrected.
38	Attachment 3 - ADPQ Vendor Pool Labor Categories and Descriptions	Attachment 3 states "Vendors must assemble a multidisciplinary and collaborative team that includes, at a minimum, five (5) of the labor categories as identified in Section A, ADPQ Vendor Pool Labor Categories, below. 1. ADPQ Vendor Pool Labor Categories." It appears that that the reference to "Section A" should be "Section 1".	Corrected.
39	Section A.1, ADPQ Vendor Pool Refresh Key Action Dates and (page 4 of 54) and A.5.B ADPQ Vendor Pool Refresh Process Components (page 5 of 54)	We request that the State consider establishing a minimum period of time, e.g., 2 weeks, between the date that answers are provided to the RFI questions and the Due Date for the Vendor RFI Response Submissions. Answers to vendor questions may affect vendor responses; adequate time to incorporate the responses are needed by Vendors. The due date for questions to be submitted by vendors is 2/10 and the RFI response submission is due 3/3; however, no date is identified as to the date that answers to questions will be published.	Added "Release of Answers to Vendor Pool Questions" (02/16/17), which provides a minimum of 2 weeks until response due date.

40	Section F.2, Off Boarding (page 9 of 54)	<p>With respect to the off boarding, we request that the third bulleted item (identified below) be modified as follows:</p> <p>Recommended modification to third bullet: "Vendor has failed to submit an offer to an ADPQ RFO since the last time the ADPQ Vendor Pool was refreshed provided that at least three solicitations were made in the previous qualifying period."</p> <p>In order that vendors have an opportunity to assess the opportunities and monitor their responsive to being on the pre-qualified vendor pool, we request that the State publish the anticipated schedule of procurements in the next six-twelve months. Without this information, vendors will not have information regarding how to plan the procurements for which the vendor is well qualified to respond. This is important since failure to respond in the period will result in removal from the pool. The language from the RFI is "...Vendor has failed to submit an offer to an ADPQ RFO since the last time the ADPQ Vendor Pools was refreshed."</p>	See revised RFI for updated language.
41	G.11 Substitution of Key Staff Acknowledgement / Attachment M: Substitution of Key Staff Acknowledgement	<p>G.11 Substitution of Key Staff Acknowledgement: We request that the State modify the language in this section to provide a period of time during which vendors can provide an alternative replacement if the State rejects a proposed replacement staff member, rather than immediately declaring the vendor is in material breach of the contract; that the Vendor and the State agree on the timeline. We have provided a redlined section below:</p> <p>If the State rejects a proposed replacement staff member and a qualified replacement is not provided to the State for approval, the Vendor shall have a period of ten days to provide another replacement. If an adequate replacement is not provided within the timeline required, and the Vendor and State cannot agree on the replacement within an additional five days, Vendor may shall be in material breach of the contract if the vendor is unable to provide the services, unless the State provides an extension in writing. The State will not unreasonably delay or deny acceptance of Vendor's proposed candidate. The candidate receiving acceptance by the State shall be available to start at a date mutually agreed to by the State and the Vendor. immediately, unless otherwise agreed to by the State.</p> <p>We believe that a typical and practical time frame for new staff to start is a few days to 4 weeks rarely does the staff immediately start upon Acceptance by the State. Also, as a practical matter, project success is not usually dependent on a single role not being staffed in the short term. Despite lengthy delays in staffing a single position, other team members can often fill in the gaps or other resources assigned to complete the project on schedule.</p>	See revised RFI for updated language.
42	Attachment 1 - Section 1 Working Prototype	Rather than assigning vendors to Prototype A or Prototype B based on the first letter of the Vendor's company / firm name; we request that vendors be allowed to self-select their prototype category (A or B). This will enable vendors to select the area that is best suited to their capabilities rather than being based on the first letter of their company name.	The State has removed the prototype assignment matrix.
43	Attachment 1 - Section 1 Working Prototype	There is a letter "E" under both Prototype A and B.	The State has removed the prototype assignment matrix.
44	Section A, Agile Development Pre-Qualified Vendor Pool Refresh Overview	Do existing ADPQ vendors need to reapply?	No.
45	Section A.1, ADPQ Vendor Pool Refresh Key Action Dates	If existing ADPQ vendors need to reapply, can the State clarify exactly what an existing ADPQ vendor pool member needs to submit?	See revised RFI for updated language.
46	Section D, ADPQ Vendor Pool Refresh Participation and Submission Instructions	Will the State rethink the forms and format that candidates have to submit as they are onerous and time-consuming, which impacts our ability to craft a compelling response?	The State has revised the Administrative Requirements. See revised RFI for updated language.