

#	Section/Attachment	Question	CDT Response
1	Attachment 1: PQVP AD-DS Working Prototype and Technical Approach Requirements Section 2, Technical Approach	Section 2 lists technical best practices to follow, and item "f" says "Deployed their software in an open source container, such as Docker (i.e., utilized operating-system-level virtualization)." Is using a "serverless" architecture such as AWS Lambda an allowable substitute for using a virtual container such as Docker? AWS Lambda would be a Platform as a Service (PaaS) architecture and would use AWS Lambda microservices as an alternative to Docker.	Vendors must use an open source container. The container can be something other than Docker, provided it is open source.
2	Attachment 2: US Digital Services Playbook Play 9: Resources are Available in Multiple Regions	The term region in the context of cloud computing typically means using a hosting environment distributed across geographically distinct locations. Is it the state's intention that submitted prototypes use geographically distinct data centers or is it sufficient to deploy on physically separate cloud infrastructure (Availability Zones) in the same region?	It is sufficient to deploy on physically separate cloud infrastructure (Availability Zones) in the same region
3	Attachment 2: US Digital Services Playbook Play 5: Structure Budgets and Contracts to Support Delivery	Play 5 seems to be more geared towards planning performed by Government Agencies. Can the State please clarify if vendors should utilize this Play while describing how we use the US Digital Services Playbook in development of the prototype?	Not all plays may be necessary. As such, Vendors should only respond with plays that apply to their approach.
4	Attachment 3 - PQVP AD-DS Labor Categories • Section G, PQVP AD-DS Administrative Requirements G.15 PQVP AD-DS/CMAS/IT MSA Classification Mapping and Pricing	If selected to join the Pre-Qualified Vendor Pool, do the labor categories used for development of the prototype limit the labor categories available for submission to the State after selection in Attachment R?	No.
5	Statement of Work, Section A, Agile Development Pre-Qualified Vendor Pool Refresh Overview	How many contracts for Agile Development—Digital Services were awarded in 2017 to the existing PQVP Vendor Pool list, and which vendors were awarded the contracts?	Approximately 17 - 20 contracts have been issued since late 2016. Statistical data on individual Vendors awarded these contracts are not available at this time. As soon as this information is available, it will be posted to CDT's GitHub site.
6	Statement of Work, Section A, Agile Development Pre-Qualified Vendor Pool Refresh Overview	What was the total dollar amount for contracts awarded to the existing PQVP Vendor Pool list in 2017?	Approximately \$60M in contracts have been awarded from PQVP since late 2016.
7	General Question	What is the objective for this vehicle, what tasks do you anticipate coming out of this, and what do you expect the contract/task order values to range between?	This vehicle will be used for the development of digital service products and components of digital service products in collaboration with approved State Agencies/Departments. The value of contracts awarded to PQVP vendors range from \$400,000 to approximately \$10 million.
8	General Question	Will a data set be provided to guide the development of the product/prototype?	A sample data set will be provided with the final RFI release. However, Vendors are allowed to used their own data sets, so long as their Working Prototype complies with the technical requirements outlined in the RFI.
9	General Question	Will vendors be required to track hours utilized in development of the prototype to track and estimate development costs?	This is not a requirement. However, it would be useful information to provide with your response.
10	Attachment 2: US Digital Services Playbook Play 6: Assign One Leader and Hold that Person Accountable	Will a product owner be assigned, or will the submitter be expected to assign one internally from their team?	The Vendor will be expected to assign one internally from their team.
11	Attachment 2: US Digital Services Playbook Play 11: Manage Security and Privacy through Reusable Processes	Will the submitter have a POC for to go through the SORN and PIA process? For usability testing, will the submitter be required to go through the PIA process?	Neither process is required for the Prototype.
12	General Question	Does the environment the submitter builds the in prototype need to be FedRAMP certified?	For the purpose of the RFI prototype, no.
13	Attachment 2: US Digital Services Playbook	Are vendors required to meet all the digital playbook items in order to be pre-approved, or are these requirements that must be met at the task order level when tasks are released?	Not all plays may be necessary. As such, Vendors should only respond with plays that apply to their approach.
14	General Question	Why is the vendor pool being expanded?	Overall, more California Agencies/Departments are requesting to use an Agile approach to manage and execute their IT Project(s). The pool is being expanded to onboard additional, well-qualified Vendors to ensure the pool is adequately resourced to handle the additional requests.
15	General Question	What is the expected scale, budget and frequency of anticipated RFPs/projects that would fall under the PQVP agreement?	This is not known and cannot be estimated. However, 17 - 20 contracts totaling \$60 million have been awarded from PQVP since late 2016.
16	Statement of Work, Section A 1. PQVP AD-DS Key Action Dates	During the web conference in December, the state team indicated there would be 6 weeks from the time of the RFI release until the response was required to be submitted. The schedule in the pre-release RFI shows 4 weeks and 1 day. Can you please confirm or clarify whether the timeline will be extended to allow 6 weeks?	In previous releases of PQVP (aka ADPQ), Vendors were only allotted 4 weeks. Since this is a soft refresh, and incumbents are not expected to resubmit their prototypes, the State will keep consistent with the 4 week response time requirement. The State will explore a 6 week response time with a hard refresh in the future.
17	Statement of Work, Section B. PQVP AD-DS Process Components (#6)	During the web conference in December, the state team indicated that vendors would be able to qualify separately for agile delivery practices and usability engineering. This does not appear to be reflected in the pre-release document. • Is usability engineering required for the response as indicated in the playbook? If separated, will Vendors have a way to indicate which area they intend to qualify for? • What process will the state use to distinguish between these two areas? • Which requirements apply to the different areas? • Which of the digital services plays apply to the two different areas?	The State has elected not to move forward with the two qualification groups with this soft refresh. However, this may be explored for a hard refresh in the future.
18	Statement of Work, Section E.1. PQVP AD-DS Screening Process	Will the agile delivery and usability engineering response be weighted differently?	The State has elected not to move forward with the two qualification models with this soft refresh.
19	General Question	We see that 20 contracts were awarded to the ADPQ/PQVP since June of 2016. Were there any other contracts awarded to the PQVP not listed on the CWDS site?	Only three (3) contracts were awarded from PQVP for Agencies/Departments other than CWDS--two (2) for the Department of Motor Vehicles and one (1) for the Department of Health Care Services.
20	General Question	What was the aggregate dollar amount awarded to the PQVP via those 20 contracts? If additional contracts were awarded that are not currently listed on the CWDS site, what the aggregate dollar amount awarded via those contracts?	Approximately \$60 million in contracts have been awarded from PQVP since late 2016 for all Agencies/Departments.

#	Section/Attachment	Question	CDT Response
21	Attachment 1: PQVP AD-DS Working Prototype and Technical Approach Requirements	Please clarify if RFI can be executed outside US containing team members participating in RFI from various geolocations outside US	Nothing precludes off-shore resources being used for this RFI and the development of the Working Prototype. However, Agencies/Departments releasing subsequent PQVP RFOs to the pool may limit development to include only Vendor staff who are physically located in the US. There is no guarantee that off-shore resources can be used for awards from a subsequent PQVP RFO.
22	General Question	If a vendor is already in the ADPQ do they need to submit a response to be in the PQVP-AD or is this the same pool?	Incumbent Vendors do no need to resubmit a Working Prototype or Technical Narrative. However, all Vendors, including Incumbents, must submit all Administrative Requirements (see Attachment A: PQVP AD-DS Administrative Requirements Checklist) through this refresh.