

Request for Offers (RFO) Addendum

RFO Number: RFO0057

Addendum Number: 01

Date of Addendum: May 4, 2015

Original Due Date, Time: May 8, 2015; 4:00 PM

Revised Date, Time (if changing): NA

Title: MNSure IT Development Project – Quality Assurance Analysts

SCOPE OF ADDENDUM

The following are changes to the RFO: Posting questions and answers:

Question1: Why is DHS reposting the same RFOs that it posted earlier this year?

Answer1: We have determined that additional resources will be needed to work on this project.

Question 2: Did DHS retain any personnel from the original RFO that is now being reposted? If so, which RFOs did it choose to award contracts against?

Answer 2: Yes, the State has executed work orders with resources from the original RFO responses. This RFO was posted due to the State's need to hire additional Quality Assurance Analysts.

Question 3: If DHS did not award any contracts against the original posts, what has it revised in the reposting? If nothing, how has DHS revised its expectations to mitigate the risk of receiving proposals whose candidate profiles are similar if not identical to the previous set of competitions?

Answer 3: See above – we have awarded contracts under the initial RFO0038. The re-posted RFO was not revised except to update the timelines and submission instructions.

Question 4: How many QAs and PMs did DHS select from the first posting? How many does DHS plan to hire in each category for the reposting?

Answer 4: The original postings called for 4 QA's and 10 PM's. Re-posted RFOs call for 5-10 additional QA's and 5-10 additional PMs. Please see the current postings for more information on the additional resources needed.

Question 5: How does DHS and/or SITE plan to increase and strengthen its communication with vendors so that vendors can properly manage its recruitment pipeline and sustain an open, fact-driven communication with its proposed candidates?

Answer 5: Due to the large volume of responses received for this and other recent RFOs, the review process required additional time to ensure a thorough and complete evaluation process. We understand that this is not always conducive to resources still being available once the evaluation process is complete. To help address this concern, once the RFO is complete, an email is sent to all responsive vendors notifying them that the process has been completed and to thank each for their submissions.

Question 6: Are desired skills of equal importance to required skills? Understanding that there is a point system in the evaluation process, can DHS provide a prioritized skill list and/or explain how the point system works?

Answer 6: Each candidate is evaluated according to the evaluation process stated within the RFO. First, the evaluation team confirms that the candidate meets the required skills – this is a pass/fail standard. Candidates meeting the required skills are then scored based on their strength in the desired skills (70% of the score). Finally, cost assessment is completed (30% of the score). We then use an interview process if necessary to select from the top candidates.

Question 7: If a vendor's proposed candidate is strong in all areas but lacks one or two skills, will DHS still consider them or does said gap remove them from the pool of acceptable candidates?

Answer 7: We complete evaluations of all candidates meeting the pass/fail requirements of the RFO.

Question 8: Is DHS expecting vendors to propose contractors, full-time employees or a combination thereof for the required 8 engagements for PMs and 5 for QAs?

Answer 8: The RFO is for contractors to complete work orders with the State under the SITE Master Contract program.

Question 9: If a vendor proposes a candidate(s) that was proposed during the original posting, will DHS de-qualify the proposed and remove them from the pool of acceptable candidates? Or, alternatively, may vendors re-propose candidates that met all of the requirements in the original posting and the re-posting?

Answer 9: If you have previously submitted candidates for RFO0038 that are no longer available you are able to submit new candidates so long as your submission of candidates does not exceed 5 in total. See page 1 of the RFO for complete instructions.

- If you have previously submitted candidates for RFO0038 and they are still available, send an email to the contact person listed with a copy to the MNIT.SITE@state.mn.us

inbox indicating the candidates name and proposed hourly rate. There is no need to resubmit the entire proposal.

- If you have previously submitted candidates for RFO0038 that are no longer available you are able to submit new candidates so long as your submission of candidates does not exceed 5 in total.

Question 10: We are curious as to whether you did hire contractors on RFO0038 and you are now going from 5-10 to 20 or so contractors? We do have candidates that we submitted, and some remain available and meet the requirements....would they be seriously considered if we resubmit?

Answer 10: This RFP0057 is for the purposes of hiring an additional 5-10 resources. The candidates will be selected based on the process described within the RFO and above in question 9.

Question 11: Are there any incumbents in these positions now or are these new positions?

Answer 11: These are all new positions.

Question 12: Will payments be made on a time and materials basis or on an approved deliverable basis?

Answer 12: Payments will be made on time and materials basis.

Question 13: Is there a limit on the number of candidates we can submit?

Answer 13: Please see question and answer number 9 above.

Question 14: We received the RFO for the additional QA Analyst's. I was wondering if you would you be open to setting up at time to chat in more detail about these opportunities? I would like to learn more about the type of candidates that you are looking for and would be a good addition to your team.

Answer 14: See the RFO and Questions and Answer addendum for the State's eligibility and proposal instructions. As needed, the State will interview top candidates to make final selection decisions.