Questions & Responses for Solicitation No. DCSC-18-RFP-0024
Solicitation Preparation and Source Selection Services for D.C. Courts Case Management System

1. You mention that responses to our questions are provided by the program office. Will you please explain
   a. What program office this is and where organizationally it belongs to? For example, is it the D.C. Courts’ program office? The Program Office is within the Information Technology Division of the Courts. Please refer to Section “C” of the Solicitation.
   b. What will be the role of the program office in this project? The Program Office will be responsible for overseeing this effort including facilitating stakeholder sessions, providing access to applicable documentation and acting as the contractual representative for the Contracting Officer. Please refer to Section “C” of the Solicitation.
   c. If applicable, what kind of decisions will the program office make versus those that the Courts will make? What other entities will need to make decisions, such as Purchasing? For example, when making
      i. Decisions to approve the requirements as presented by the contractor. The Source Selection Evaluation Board will review all proposals per the criteria in Section M.2. The Program Management Office will review and approve the deliverables and milestones on behalf of the Contracting Officer. The PMO is also responsible for the execution of tasks within the project plan.
      ii. Decisions to approve the RFP as release-ready. Not applicable
      iii. Decisions about selection phases and schedule, upon the recommendation of the contractor. The Source Selection Evaluation Board will review all technical proposals per the criteria in Section M.2 and Pricing Proposal evaluation criteria described in Section M.4.
      iv. Decisions about evaluation scope, process, identity of evaluators, methods and tools, as recommended by the contractor. The Source Selection Evaluation Board will review all technical proposals per the criteria in Section M.2 and Pricing Proposal evaluation criteria described in Section M.4.
      v. Decisions about an Apparent Successful Bidder (ASB) or similar. The Source Selection Evaluation Board will review all technical proposals per the criteria in Section M.2 and Pricing Proposal evaluation criteria described in Section M.4.

2. Regarding responses to questions you receive, who are the staff and managers that review the questions and craft the applicable answers? The Program Management Office and the Contracting Office are responsible for responding to the questions submitted.

3. In reference to our earlier question no. 37, would the Courts please explain what benefit is intended by “illustrating” a requirement as necessary? Some case management system requirements will be straightforward and easily understood while other requirements may require additional detail in the form of a use case/user story to convey the expectation.
4. The uncertainty of award timing notwithstanding, from what date onwards would the Courts prefer work to begin in this project? The Court intends for the awardee to begin work immediately following execution of the contract by the Contracting Officer. As specified in Section F.3.1, the Project Plan is due within 14 days of the award. Additional deliverables and milestone due dates are also included in the table associated with Section F.3.1.

5. Did the solicitation in attachment J.11 receive responses, was there a final selection? If so, what is the purpose of soliciting these services once more? Yes there was a final selection. The purpose of attachment J.11 is to provide background information on the Courts previous Case Management System RFP.

6. How many past performance evaluation forms (J.9) should be submitted? Three (3) Do these forms need to match the past performance clients listed in Volume I? Yes.

7. Should the past performance evaluation forms (J.9) be submitted by past clients directly, or included in Volume II with signatures? Past performance forms (J.9) may be submitted in accordance with Section M.2.4 – Volume 1 – Technical Proposal in Tab D. Some clients require past performance evaluation forms be submitted directly to requesting office, this is acceptable. If submitted directly by the client, how should these be submitted and what is the deadline? Past Performance Forms (J.9) shall be submitted via email to the Contract Specialist of this Solicitation to: Francoise.Brent@DCSC.Gov; if past performance form(s) will be submitted via email directly from client, Offeror(s) submitting proposals shall include a statement as such in Volume 1 – Technical Proposal in Tab D. Deadline is the same as proposal(s) due date.

8. Letters of Reference – must these be letters from the past client, or can this include a project description with reference contact information? If a full letter is needed, should these be sent to the Courts directly? Please refer to Section M.2.4(b) of the Solicitation. Letters of reference shall be included in proposal submittal in accordance with Section L.19.3 of the Solicitation.

9. If our firm does not currently pay DC taxes or hold a DC Employer Tax ID number, but certifies intent to obtain necessary license, registration, or certification prior to contract award (see L.20.2.1.5), how should we complete Attachment J.6 Tax Certification Affidavit? Can we submit a Certificate of Good Standing from our home state instead? Yes. However, the offeror shall certify its intent to obtain the necessary license, registration or certification prior to contract award.

10. Section M.2.2 does not appear to correspond with Tab B: Approach to Meeting RFP Requirements. Should we discuss the project approach, management, and schedule here instead (C.5.1.4, C.5.1.6, C.5.1.8)? Section M.2.2 Tab B Core Scope of Work coincides with Section C.5.1.5.

11. Where should we address financial condition and SAM registration (C.5.1.10 and C.5.1.11)? Volume II – Tab B – General Information

12. Is the project directed only at the Superior Court, or for the full District of Columbia Court system? Please refer to Section C.2 (Overview of the District of Columbia Courts) of the subject Solicitation.
13. We understand the IT PMO collected over 300 technical and functional requirements and utilized these in the May 2017 RFI process. Regarding these requirements, we have the following clarifying questions:
   a. Do the existing requirements include interface/integration requirements for the new solution? Please refer to Section C.1.2 of the subject Solicitation.
   b. Do the existing requirements include data migration requirements for the new solution – from the CourtView2 and C-Track CMS solutions to the future one? Please refer to Section C.1.2 of the subject Solicitation.
   c. Do the existing requirements include Reporting requirements needed for business users and IT? Please refer to Section C.1.2 of the subject Solicitation.
   d. Do the existing requirements include specifics about data exchanges on the ESB? Please refer to Section C.1.2 of the subject Solicitation.

14. During the May 2017 RFI process, were responsive vendors narrowed down? Will scoring or evaluation sheets be available at the beginning of the project? Please refer to Section C.1.2 of the subject Solicitation.

15. Regarding Scope of Work 1.6 in the RFP, “The Contractor shall structure use cases and user stories to illustrate requirements as necessary”, do the Courts anticipate 300+ use cases / user stories to be written, one for each requirement? Or is this something that can be bundled together by business area or topic? The Court expects the selected contractor to possess the necessary expertise to determine the appropriate use of both Use Cases and User Stories when illustrating the Court’s requirements.

16. Given the tight Q&A timeframe, would it be possible to extend the deadline by 10 business days (Jan 26), to allow time to incorporate feedback into our response? Per Amendment No.1 to the Solicitation issued on January 8, 2018, the due date of proposals submission was extended to January 18, 2018 no later than 2:00PM, EST.

17. Would you please confirm these dates or advise otherwise? Initial due date for proposals submission was are Friday, January 12, 2018 by 2:00PM EST. Per Amendment No.1 to the Solicitation issued on January 8, 2018, the due date of proposals submission was extended to January 18, 2018 no later than 2:00PM, EST.

18. Would you please advise when after the proposal questions due date the Courts anticipate to have answers to the questions received? The Courts anticipate to begin answering questions tentatively on Tuesday, January 9, 2018 by 5:00PM, EST. However, the Courts have up to three (3) days prior to proposals submission due date to provide formal/official responses to questions.


20. Will you publish the all of the questions from all parties (with the respective answers) to all of the potential solution providers? Responses to questions will be provided to prospective offerors who submitted questions, and will be posted to the Courts’ website and on FedBizOpps.Gov.
21. Would the Courts consider accepting electronic submissions only by the due date, rather than proposals in paper? Doing so would allow respondents to: No
   a. Factor in your answers to create better proposals
   b. Avoid the need for delivery contingency time given winter weather

22. What are the business drivers and objectives for the D.C. Courts Case Management System project? Please refer to Section C (DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATIONS/WORK STATEMENT) of the subject Solicitation.
   a. What is the justification for investing in this project? Please refer to Section C (DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATIONS/WORK STATEMENT) of the subject Solicitation.
   b. Is there key new functionality that is critical for acceptance by the stakeholders? Please refer to Section C (DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATIONS/WORK STATEMENT) of the subject Solicitation.
   c. Are these drivers and objectives documented in court plans or budgets? Please refer to Section C (DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATIONS/WORK STATEMENT) of the subject Solicitation.
   d. If so, where can we obtain that documentation? Please refer to Section C (DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATIONS/WORK STATEMENT) and Section J (List of Attachments) of the subject Solicitation.

   a. Is there a documented strategy for where and how this application is hosted? Please refer to Section C.4 (D.C. Courts Technical Environment) of the subject Solicitation.
   b. Are there identified technical opportunities or resources that the new application should leverage? Please refer to Section C.4 (D.C. Courts Technical Environment) of the subject Solicitation.
   c. Are there weaknesses or threats that the Courts are seeking to address with this acquisition? Please refer to Section C.4 (D.C. Courts Technical Environment) of the subject Solicitation.
   d. Are these drivers documented? Please refer to Section C.4.7 of the subject Solicitation for additional relevant documents.
   e. If so, where can we obtain that documentation? Please refer to Section C.4.7 of the subject Solicitation for additional relevant documents.

24. Would you please describe or provide documentation on the governance structures and processes for this project?
   a. Is there an Executive Sponsor/ Sponsors? Yes.
      i.  What are their position(s) in the D.C. Courts? The Court does not wish to reveal that information at this time.
      ii. How long have they as Executive Sponsor(s) for this project? The question as constructed is not clear.
   Is there a Steering Committee or equivalent group for this project? Yes.
      i.  What is the composition of this group? The Court does not wish to reveal that information at this time.
ii. How long has this group been in operation? The Court does not wish to reveal that information at this time.

c. To what extent is Purchasing represented in the Steering Committee or equivalent? Please refer to Section M (EVALUATION FACTORS) of the subject Solicitation.

d. Are there other individuals or groups in the Governance structure for this project? The Court does not wish to reveal that information at this time.

25. Which entities do the Courts consider stakeholders in this initiative? Please refer to Section C.2 (Overview of the District of Columbia Courts) of the subject Solicitation.

26. How do the Courts prefer the requirements be vetted with these stakeholders if applicable? Please refer to Section C.5.1.5 of the subject Solicitation.

27. The 2018 D.C. Courts Budget Justification shows a budget table on page 278. How is this table related to this Solicitation and any subsequent technology procurement and implementation. The Budget Justification in the table referenced below is an overall infrastructure request that includes underlying architecture of the current as well as future integrated case management system.

28. What is the desired scope of the project management for this consulting engagement? Specifically:
   a. Does project management responsibility requested by this Solicitation end with the completion of the tasks in Table C.3.1 or extend beyond? The project management responsibility requested by this Solicitation does not extend beyond the completion of the tasks in Table C.3.1.
   b. Do the project management responsibility and authority of the consultant engaged through this Solicitation extend to D.C. Court, stakeholder, and other related stakeholders involved in this project? The project management responsibility and authority of the consultant engaged through this Solicitation does not extend to D.C. Court, stakeholder, and other related stakeholders involved in this project.

29. What is the scope of the 300 functional and technical requirements that the Courts have already identified? Please provide the categories of requirements covered. Please refer to attachment J.12 of Solicitation Number DCSC-18-RFP-0024.

30. What is the scope of requirements desired by the Courts that pertain to functions, features, access and benefits for self-represented litigants (SRLs) and those for justice partners? Please refer to attachment J.12 of Solicitation Number DCSC-18-RFP-0024.

31. Please provide a list of the “other historical RFP artifacts for potential inclusion” (Please see section C.1.2 of Solicitation Number DCSC-18-RFP-0024) (Please see section C.1.2 of Solicitation Number DCSC-18-RFP-0024).

32. How is the 2002 IJIS Integrated Case Management System RFP related to this Solicitation? The inclusion of the 2002 IJIS Integrated Case Management System RFP is to provide additional background information on the Courts current Case Management System.
33. Work items C.2.5, C.2.6 and C.2.7 speak to tasks that appear to apply after the RFP is developed and presumably released. However, these items are listed under the heading “RFP Development”. Would you please clarify this conflict? The selected vendor is expected to perform work items C.2.5, C.2.6 and C.2.7 post RFP development.

34. Would you please clarify which core scope of work items in Section C.3 Scope of Work map to and produce output for each of the deliverables listed in Table F.3.1 – Deliverables? It is the Courts expectation that the selected vendor will leverage its expertise in grouping the core scope of work items necessary to meet the stated deliverable.

35. Please clarify the Courts’ expectations for the selected contractor to work onsite vs. off-site. For example, question C.5.1.8 asks about the location of the office from which the management of the project will occur. The Courts does not require the selected contractor to work exclusively onsite. However, the Courts will require in-person attendance at a significant portion of the weekly/monthly meetings.

36. Do the Courts have a business need for in person attendance at all weekly meetings? The Courts will require in-person attendance at a significant portion of the weekly/monthly meetings.

37. What other meetings do the Courts anticipate that require the selected contractor’s attendance in person? Additional meeting requirements are To Be Determined and negotiated with the selected contractor.

38. Will the Courts provide up to three (3) licenses to access and use the Courts’ requirements management tool? The Courts will provide the necessary access to the Court’s requirements management tool as determined by the Courts. Will the Courts provide for remote access and use the Courts’ requirements management tool? The Courts will provide remote access and use to the Courts’ requirements management tool.

39. The time allocated to RFP release, receipt of proposals, their evaluation and vendor selection appears to be three (3) months - June through August.
   a. Are the Courts prepared with contingency plans in the event that vendor selection is delayed? The Court intends make the award decision not later September 30, 2018.
   b. What are the consequences to the Courts and the consultant selected in this Solicitation if the selection is delayed for reasons beyond the reasonable control of the consultant? The Court intends make the award decision not later September 30, 2018.

40. Relative to item M.4.3.a., what is the independent Courts’ cost estimate for this engagement? The Court does not intend to disclose that information.

41. With regard to proposal response format requirement “C.5.1.10 Provide your company’s financial condition to show the financial viability of the company (Dun & Bradstreet).” – What artifact do you wish for us to submit? Our Dun & Bradstreet number? Yes, please provide your firm’s D&B number and the most recent audited financial statement or a letter from a financial institution showing your firm’s current line of credit and the amount.
42. With regard to proposal response format requirement, “C.5.1.11 Company must be registered and active in the System for Award Management (SAM.Gov).” – What artifact do you wish for us to submit? Our SAM number? Yes.

43. With regard to Attachment J.5 – It reads as follows:

CONTRACT/PROJECT NAME: _________________________________________________
__________________________________________________, being duly
sworn, or under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States, certifies
that, except as noted below, (the company) or any person associated therewith in
the capacity of (owner, partner, director, officer, principal investigator, project
director, manager, auditor, or any position involving the administration of federal
funds) is not currently under suspension, debarment, voluntary exclusion, or
determination of ineligibility under any Federal, District or State statutes; has not
been suspended, debarred voluntarily excluded or determined ineligible by any
Federal, District, or Stage agency within the past three (3) years; does not have a
proposed debarment pending; and has not been indicted, convicted; or has a
Civil judgment rendered against it by a Court of competent jurisdiction in any
matter involving fraud or official misconduct within the past three (3) years.

The phrase, “CONTRACT/PROJECT NAME:”, would indicate that the blank should be filled with
the title of the consulting engagement. However, the language that follows indicates that the
blank should be filled with name of a company representative with the authority to bind the
firm they represent. Would you please resolve this contradiction? Please delete Contract/ Project and replace with Contractor.

44. L.19.3 Volume I – Technical Proposal shows a table that lists the tabs required. Tab D is identified as Past Performance. With that identification, there is a note to see section M.2.4. Section L.21 also presents a chapter entitled “Past Performance”. Its text is significantly different and appears to be more specific to the nature this RFP than section M.2.4. Would the Courts please advise which is applicable when responding under Tab D “Past Performance” – section M.2.4 or section L.21? Section L.21 provides the information being requested regarding Past Performance; both the Letters of Reference and the Past Performance Evaluation form; Section M.2.4 specifically identifies from the requested information provided in Section L.21, what will be evaluated for points.

45. Section L.21 contains the right for the Courts to contact the owners of projects known to have been completed within the last three (3) years but not supplied as references. The text indicates that the information received under such a right may be used in the evaluation of past performance. Will the Courts notify us of their intent to contact such owner(s) with at least a five (5) day notice so that we may inform our clients of the intended contact and provide the Courts with the name, role and contact availability of the person(s) that our client(s) may choose to designate as being knowledgeable about the project(s) and authorized to be references for the Courts? No, the Court will not provide a notification of intent to contact owners of projects known to have been completed within the last three (3) years but not supplied as references.
46. (Continued from L.21 above) Will the Courts disclose what such information was received, from which owner(s) and which person(s), the extent of their authorization to speak on behalf of the owner(s), the role the person(s) performed relative to the project(s), and to what extent the information received influenced the evaluation of past performance, if applicable? No, the Courts will not disclose what such information was received, from which owner(s) and which person(s), the extent of their authorization to speak on behalf of the owner(s), the role the person(s) performed relative to the project(s), and to what extent the information received influenced the evaluation of past performance.

47. Section C.5.1.6 requests a proposed project schedule. However, the instructions in Sections L and M do not seem to identify where or under which tab a proposed schedule needs to be shown. Will the Courts please advise:
   a. Under which tab and heading, if applicable, project schedule information needs to be provided. Please refer to Table C.3.1 (Item 3.0 Project Plan Development) of the subject Solicitation.
   b. What format the Courts wish the schedule information to be in. For example, a list of tasks and deliverables; shown in a table, a Microsoft project report, and so on. Please refer to Table C.3.1 (Item 3.2 Project Plan Development) of the subject Solicitation.
   c. What date to use as a start date of the project, considering that its end date is fixed as of September 30, 2018. Please refer to Table B.3.1 of the subject Solicitation.
   d. Alternatively, would the Court advise if a schedule that shows workweeks or workdays only, without dates, is preferred or admissible. Schedules should include specific dates.

48. Section B.4 Price/Cost, table B.4.1 suggests that pricing be provided for CLIN# 0001 (Requirements Validation and Request for Proposal (RFP) Development for Court Case Management System) and for CLIN# 0002 (Source Selection Services and Support for Court Case Management System Solicitation Award – See Section C.3 – Scope of Work), with a total price composed of these two items. Section L.20.1.1 requires the format provided in Section B.4 to be used for Volume II – Tab A – Price Information/Proposal. However, Section L.20.1.1 also requests a “detailed breakdown of proposed price to include document review, requirements collection and validation, use case development, solicitation drafting, selection and award artifacts.” This breakdown is a subdivision of the work that is different to the subdivision of tasks and different to the subdivision of deliverables. Also, this breakdown is not supported by the required format shown in Section B.4. Would the Courts please resolve this conflict? Completion of Table B.4.1 is not a “suggestion” but rather a requirement for all respondents. Respondents shall provide a single price for each of the two CLINs. It is anticipated the pricing will be based on the Scope of Work as described in Section C.3. Section L.20.1.1 lists the primary tasks and deliverables in Table F.3.1. We do not see any conflict.

49. Section M.2.4 requests, among other things, three (3) letters of reference to the Courts to include information about previously performed District or Federal or private entity contracts of equal or larger size providing similar and/or like services, inclusive of dates of contract. Is it the Courts’ intent to receive additional letters of reference from three of our clients, attached to the proposal, or is this requirement fulfilled by submitting the references on the Past Performance Evaluation Forms (J.9) as Section L.21 would indicate? Would you please clarify? This requirement is fulfilled by submitting the references on the Past Performance Evaluation Forms (J.9) as Section L.21 would indicate.
50. Section L.20.2.2 requests Past Performance Evaluation Forms (Attachment J.9) be included in Volume II, Tab B – General Information. However, section L.21 in the first full paragraph on page 46 indicates that Attachment J.9 be returned with the technical proposal submission which is Volume I. Finally, Item M.2.4 indicates that “three (3) letters of reference to the Courts …” be included in Volume I, Tab D. Would the Courts please clarify the applicable Volume and Tab? Please provide Past Performance Evaluation Forms in Volume I Tab D.

51. The deliverables listing in table F.3.1 shows a deliverable “Document Use Cases/User Stories”. The scope of work includes an item C.3.1.6 “The Contractor shall structure use cases and user stories to illustrate requirements as necessary”. Yet, item C.3.2.2 omits use cases from a non-exhaustive list of parts of the comprehensive RFP to be developed. Would the Courts please indicate whether both use cases and user stories are in scope “as necessary” to illustrate requirements? The Court expects the selected contractor to possess the necessary expertise to determine the appropriate use of both Use Cases and User Stories when illustrating the Court’s requirements.

52. Given that the nature and purpose of use cases and user stories are significantly different, would the Courts indicate and describe their preference for one over the other? The Court expects the selected contractor to possess the necessary expertise to determine the appropriate use of both Use Cases and User Stories when illustrating the Court’s requirements.

53. What are the things that the Courts seek to avoid or improve by requesting use cases and user stories to illustrate requirements as necessary? For example, are the Courts concerned about exception scenarios that a system needs to support that may be lengthy to describe in a narrative but that could be more concisely expressed through a use case? Another example would be a need to express the business outcome one desires to achieve by using a stated feature set in the system when performing in a particular role; such a need could be expressed and put into a business context quite effectively through a user story. Your answer will help validate and tune the proposed methodology and approach. The Court expects the selected contractor to possess the necessary expertise to determine the appropriate use of both Use Cases and User Stories when illustrating the Court’s requirements.

54. The attribute “as necessary” notwithstanding, would the Courts please indicate approximately how many use cases and user stories you expect to see in the RFP? The Court expects the selected contractor to possess the necessary expertise to determine the appropriate use of both Use Cases and User Stories when illustrating the Court’s requirements.

55. Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like from India or Canada)

   Companies from outside the United States are not prohibited from this Request For Proposal (RFP). Given the confidential nature of the involved information, a significant portion of the tasks to be performed are required to be done on the Court’s premises. Please refer to Section C.3 of the subject Solicitation for task requirements.

56. Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

   Yes, please refer to Section C.3 (Table C.3.1 item 2.3) of the subject Solicitation for meeting requirements.
57. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)
   Given the confidential nature of the involved information, a significant portion of the tasks to be
   performed are required to be done on the Court’s premises. Please refer to Section C.3 of the
   subject Solicitation for task requirements.

58. Can we submit the proposals via email?
   Please refer to Section L.2 and Sections L.18 – L.21 of the subject Solicitation for proposals
   submittal instructions and requirements.