



Cheryl R. Bailey, Ph.D.
Acting Executive Officer

Herbert Rouson, Jr., J.D.
Acting Deputy Executive Officer

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS
Administrative Services Division
Office: Gallery Place
616 H Street NW, 6th Floor
Washington, DC 20001
Mailing Address: 500 Indiana Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20001-2131



Geoffrey A. Mack
Acting Administrative Officer

AMENDMENT NO. 2

TO: ALL PROSPECTIVE BIDDERS

AMENDMENT

ISSUE DATE: August 16, 2022

SUBJECT: Solicitation Number DCSC-22-RFP-097 - Coaching for Mid-Level Managers

RFQ SUBMISSION

DATE: Thursday, August 18, 2022, No Later Than 3:00 pm, Eastern Standard Time.

The subject solicitation is amended as follow:

Delete in its entirety:
Submission Date Tuesday, August 16, 2022, no later than 2:00 pm, EST

Replace with the following:
Submission Date Thursday August 18, 2022, No Later Than 3:00 pm, EST

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED

One (1) copy of this amendment is being sent to only those offerors who received a copy of the solicitation. Offerors shall sign below and attach a signed copy of this amendment to each offer to be submitted to the Courts in response to the subject solicitation. Offers shall be emailed in accordance with the instructions provided in the original solicitation documents. This amendment, together with your offer must be received by the District of Columbia Courts no later than the date and time specified for offer submission. Revisions or price changes occasioned by this amendment must be received by the Courts no later than the date and time set for offer submission. Failure to acknowledge receipt of this amendment may be cause for rejection of any offers submitted in response to the subject solicitation.

Darlene D. Reynolds

Darlene D. Reynolds
Contracting Officer

This amendment is acknowledged and is considered a part of the subject solicitation.

Signature of Authorized Representative

Date

Title of Authorized Representative

Name of Firm

Attachment: **Questions and Responses**
Solicitation No.: **DCSC-22-RFP-097**
Caption: **Coaching for Mid-Level Managers**

1. Per Section L.1.4, we understand that the solicitation requirement is for hand delivery/courier services for delivery of all proposal responses. Will the courts please reconsider and allow for hand delivery OR electronic (email) delivery for proposal responses?

Response: The Courts will ONLY accept proposal responses via hand delivery or courier service(s) on August 16, 2022, no later than 2:00 pm EST.

2. As the Professional Coaching for Mid-Level Managers Program was begun in 2017, we are assuming there an incumbent is currently providing the same or similar services and that this requirement is a continuation of whatever contract has been in place for the past 5 years. Can the Courts advise if this is an accurate assumption? Also, can the Courts please provide the name of the incumbent firm and the contract number under which the incumbent has been working?

Response: The incumbent is CHANGE FUSION, LLC. No assumption should be made regarding the continuation of services from previous years.

3. If there is an incumbent as assumed, can the Courts advise if the work requirements for the previous 5 year contract is the same and/or substantively similar as the requirements outlined in the current solicitation?

Response: No assumption should be made regarding the similarity of requirements from previous years.

4. We are assuming our pricing response to the solicitation should include the Representations, Certifications, and acknowledgements provided on pages 2-5. Is this an accurate assumption?

Response: The Representations, Certifications, and acknowledgment provided on pages 2-5 should be included in Volume II – Price Proposal – Tab B.

5. Can the Courts confirm that Section L.2.4.1.4 is asking for a full copy of our corporate Articles of incorporation, partnership or joint venture agreement within the pricing proposal response?

Response: Yes. Please provide a full copy of your Corporate Articles of Incorporation, Partnership or Joint Venture Agreement. This information should be included in Volume II – Price Proposal – Tab B.

6. Based on Section B.2.3 we are assuming only one contract will be awarded. Is this an accurate assumption?

Response: Yes.

7. We understand there are approximately 150 middle managers who might be expected to participate in this program. Does the Court expect any significant change (increase or decrease) in the number of mid-level managers over the anticipated up to 5-year contract term?

Response: No. The Courts do not anticipate significant changes in the number of our mid-level managers.

8. Is participation in the coaching program mandatory or optional for the Court's mid-level managers?

Response: Mid-Level managers are recommended to participate in the Coaching Program by their supervisor or Director.

9. What is the estimated percentage of mid-level managers who have already participated in the coaching?

Response: 40%

10. What does the Courts estimate the turnover of mid-level managers to be each year?

Response: The DC Courts turnover rate is not sizable.

11. We are assuming that Attachments J.2, J.3, J.4 and J.5 are to be included in our pricing response. Is this a correct assumption?

Response: Volume II – Price Proposal – Tab B is where the offeror(s) shall complete and return with their proposal the Representations and Certifications (Attachment J.2 - Anti-Collusion Statement, Attachment J.3 - Ethics in Public Contracting, Attachment J.4 - Non-Discrimination, J.5 - Certification of Eligibility, J.6 - Tax Certification Affidavit and Section K - Certification Regarding a Drug-Free Workplace).

12. We are assuming that Attachment J.6 is to be included in our pricing response ONLY if our pricing package exceeds \$100,000 dollars. Can the Courts please advise if this is an accurate assumption?

Response: Yes.

13. It is our understanding that, assuming our firm is awarded the contract, Attachment J.7 is to be completed and provided to the Courts at the end of the Contract period at final invoicing. Is this an accurate assumption?

Response: Yes.

14. The attachment for past performance is labeled J.8, however, the header in the document states that it is J.9 and this is referenced in Section L.2.7.3 as Attachment J.9. Can the Courts advise if there is a missing document or if this is actually to be referenced as Attachment J.8 or J.9?

Response: No. There is no missing document. The correct attachment label should reflect J.8 instead of J.9. Attachment J.8 should be included in Volume I – Technical Proposal – Tab C.

15. Should a security clearance be designated by the CO (per Section H.9.1), can the Courts please advise the type(s) of such clearance as might be required for support of this contract work?

Response: There's No Requirement for a Security Clearance.

16. We are assuming the Court is asking for contractors to provide a copy of all of Solicitation Section K in our pricing response. Is this an accurate assumption?

Response: No. A signed copy of Section K - Certification Regarding a Drug-Free Workplace) should be included in Volume II – Price Proposal – Tab B.

17. Section L.2.6 asks for a copy of registration in the System for Award Management (SAM.gov). Are the Courts asking for a full copy of the registration or only some portion of the registration (for example Entity Registration, Core Data, Business Information, etc.) If only some portion of our SAM.gov registration is desired, can the Courts please advise the desired portion to be provided?

Response: Only a portion of the SAM.gov registration is required including the Offeror's: Full Business Name, Unique Entity ID (UEI), CAGE, Physical Address, and Mailing Address.

18. Can the Courts please advise if our minimum of 3 past performance references must also be within the past 3 years?

Response: Yes

19. Are there any specific requirements regarding formatting of our proposal response?

Response: No

Page 4 of 4

20. Can the Courts advise if there are any page limits for either our technical or pricing proposal responses?

Response: No. There's no page limit for the technical or pricing proposal response.

21. Do the Courts have an anticipated timeframe for return to on-site, in-person training?

Response: No.