



Department of Administration
Shared Services of Alaska
8th Floor State Office Building
PO Box 110210
Juneau, AK 99811-0210

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER

DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: 08/30/19

RFP TITLE: 2020-0200-4326 Integrated Pension and Health Benefits Solution

AMENDMENT 3

IMPORTANT NOTE TO OFFERORS: Only the following items referenced in this amendment are to be changed. All other sections of the RFP remain the same.

NOTE: It is the proposer's responsibility to review and acknowledge receipt on Submittal form A

- 1. This amendment serves to include and make part of the following questions and answers received.**

Question: We are seeing many states adopt a standard of NIST compliance for technology vendors. The FedRAMP High requirement is significantly limiting to competition, will increase costs and potentially increase timelines.

In lieu of FedRAMP High requirement, would the State accept a Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) solution in a NIST-compliant secure environment? Proposed changes to language are as follows:

The Cloud Services provider will be ~~Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program (FedRAMP)~~ certified NIST compliant at the ~~High~~ Moderate level. DRB reserves the right to inspect the Government Cloud Services provider's ~~FedRAMP~~ NIST Readiness Assessment Report and other such ~~NIST FedRAMP certification~~ supporting documentation.

If FedRAMP is required, please confirm that the vendor's compliance can go into effect prior to the date of the State's data being loaded into the environment?

Answer: T5.58 on form H States "The Cloud Services provider and any implementation subcontractors responsible for infrastructure must be approved by the State OIT." The State would prefer any cloud-based solution be hosted within the State's sanctioned cloud environment. Many cloud services providers, such as Microsoft Azure, offer FedRAMP Moderate and FedRAMP High certified environments. If proposing a cloud-hosted solution alternative to State provided environments, then the proposed solution should adequately meet compliance standards governing PII, PHI, and PCI DSS.

Question: Will the State consider the best-of-breed approach, where a premier benefits administration system responds only to the benefits administration portion and a premier pension administration system responds only to the pension portion? The two awarded companies would then partner together to provide seamless integration and user experience and the State would benefit from the best technology in both areas.

Answer: Yes, the State will allow this type of approach; however, there must be one proposal between the partners and DRB would expect one company to act as the prime contractor. The proposal must describe the integrated approach and DRB expects the Offerors to agree on standards for development methodology, testing, documentation, etc. In other words, the partnership must appear as one company for all aspects of the project.

Question: Would the State of Alaska consider a secure multi-tenant cloud-based solution hosted within a secure vendor environment? Several items within Submittal Form F preclude vendors using this model from responding, such as:

- T5.14-Policy - "The Offeror shall not undertake Network security auditing, testing and scanning without prior approval by the SSO"
- T6.04-Documentation - "...The IT Operations Manual will provide DRB staff the knowledge to efficiently operate and update the System independent of Offeror assistance..."

Answer: The requirements T5.14 and T6.04 do not preclude a vendor-provided cloud solution. T6.04 refers to the application as installed and configured.

T5.14 is revised as follows:

The Offeror shall not undertake network security auditing, testing and scanning on any State network without prior approval by the SSO.

Question: The reference requirement below seems to severely limit qualified competition. Will you adjust the requirement as follows:

Offeror must have a proven record of successful completion of at least three (3) Benefit Administration System projects, **at least one of which is for a state or local public** ~~for state or local public~~ benefit modernization projects performed within the past ten (10) years. The size of the project must meet or exceed the following characteristics:

- The unique member record population was 80,000 or more
- The unique number of contributing employers was 100 or more

Answer: The State is seeking an expert in providing Benefit Administration Systems to public benefits organizations, and therefore will not consider changing the requirement as requested. We will amend the requirement as follows:

Offeror must have a proven record of successful completion of at least three (3) Benefit Administration System projects for state or local public benefit modernization projects performed within the past ten (10) years. These projects may have been for retirement, insurance or both. The size of the project must meet or exceed the following characteristics:

- The unique member record population was 80,000 or more
- The unique number of contributing employers was 100 or more

Question: The deadline for responses to all questions in the RFP is August 30th. Will the state allow for a timeline extension to the RFP due date to give all responders a full 8 weeks to complete the RFP once questions are answered? This would put the new deadline for receipt at Tuesday, October 29th.

Answer: See amendment 2

Question: Would DRB please consider extending the deadline to submit questions and the proposal due date by 2 weeks?

Answer: See amendment 2

Question: Section 3.08, page 18

Would the State entertain removing or amending the requirement that excludes subcontractors' experience when assessing Minimum Prior Experience Qualifications (Submittal Form F – Mandatory Requirements)? Projects as large and complex as the one represented by this RFP require not only significant experience with Benefits Administration System Software, but also have many additional disciplines that are critical to the success of the endeavor. Disciplines such as project planning and management, organizational change management, testing methodologies and data migration / conversion. Allowing bidders to combine their prospective areas of expertise will result in the State receiving responses from firms that are able to bring the best of all disciplines to the State.

Answer: The State is seeking an expert in providing full Benefit Administration Systems solutions, and therefore will not consider changing the requirement as requested.

Question: Section 4.04 Service Approach (Submittal Form B) – Part 2 (page 25)

- Provide a detailed explanation of how your proposed solution would integrate with DRB's Kofax ECM solution.
- Describe the advantages and disadvantages of using DRB's Kofax ECM vs. another ECM solution. Indicate which ECM solution you feel would be in DRB's best interest to use. Describe why the proposed ECM solution was recommended.

Please provide the following information about DRB's current Kofax ECM solution:

- *List of activated Kofax modules/components, their version, and where they are deployed*
- *Document repository implementation and size*

Level and types of customization that were performed in Kofax

Answer: Below is information regarding DRB's current Kofax licensing:

1 AE#Y024300K IMAGE VOL 300K/YR VER: 9.0 S/N: UA28520
 1 AE#T024001U 1 CONCURRENT STATION VER: 9.0 S/N: UA28520
 1 AE#Y024600K IMAGE VOL 600K/YR VER: 9.0 S/N: UK59851
 1 AE#T024005U 5 CONCURRENT STATION VER: 9.0 S/N: UK59851
 1 AE#VY10600K PDF I+T 600K/YR VER: 9.0 S/N: UK59851
 1 EE#T024005U 5 CONCURRENT STATION VER: 9.0 S/N: UK59851
 1 EE#CBACKUPSWAD LICENSEDISASTER RECOVERY VER: 9.0 S/N: XK43211
 1 AE#Y024001M IMAGE VOL 1M/YR VER: 9.0 S/N: UK59851
 1 AE#VY10001M 1M/Yr KFX PDF IMG+TEXT VER: 9.0 S/N: UK59851

Question: Submittal Form E, Section 4.07 Performance Qualifications, Part 3: Performance Evaluations (page 28)

- The offeror must submit at least three surveys evaluating the offeror/firm and two surveys each evaluating the Project Manager, Architect/Solution Manager, and Lead Business Analyst.

Please confirm if the State would accept a single Performance Evaluation survey from a client that includes both the offeror/firm evaluation and an evaluation for Project Manager, Architect/Solution Manager and/or Lead Business Analyst.

Answer: While an offeror can have a client provide a Performance Evaluation survey for the offeror/firm, project manager, architect/solution manager, and lead business analyst, because of the possibility a client could evaluate each of those differently, please submit a separate survey for each (e.g. a survey form for the offeror/firm, a survey form for the project manager, etc.).

Question: Submittal Form F, Mandatory Requirements – Part 3: Mandatory Technical Requirements, Section T-007_Interfaces/Integration, Item T7.13, Integration (page 182)

- The System must integrate with the existing call System - Genesys. The System must support the APIs and integration standards used by Genesys to allow for DRB to integrate the existing Genesys based telephony applications with the proposed System.

Please provide the following information about DRB's current call System - Genesys:

- *List of activated Genesys modules/capabilities/add-on and where they are deployed*

The level and type of integrations DRB is looking for (e.g.: screen pop, voice portal functions, call recording access, etc.)

Answer: Advanced Session (70 Seats), Basic Session (70 Seats), Contact Center Level 2 (70 Seats), Interaction Recorder Add on (70 Seats), Interaction Supervisor add-on (15 Seats), Media Session (70 Seats), Unified Messaging add-on (70 Seats).

Question: RFP, page 14, section 3.01

How many IT staff will attend technical training and what are their roles?

Answer: Since a cloud-based solution might have a different technical exposure than an on-premise solution, technical training needs will be determined based on the solution to be implemented. At this time, DRB anticipates approximately 11 people with possible roles including hardware and software support, system administration, development, and business analyst.

Question: RFP, page 14, section 3.01

Does DA DRB have specific criteria they wish to be used to show technical training was conducted successfully?

Answer: DRB expects the Offeror to propose a technical training approach, including working with DRB to determine training objectives and evaluation methods.

Question: RFP, page 14, section 3.01

Are there any restrictions on the type of training material used for technical training?

Answer: No

Question: RFP, page 14, section 3.01

Does training need to happen at DA DRB premises or can it be remote?

Answer: Training is to be conducted at DRB's facility with an onsite instructor.

Question: Appendix 5

We reviewed the terms and conditions in Appendix A. Will you be releasing more specific terms and conditions with respect to license and other matters prior to the response due date?

Answer: No

Question: RFP, page 10, section 2.01

Please confirm that DA DRB requires bidders to include a new document imaging solution and that the existing RDB/imaging will be replaced.

Answer: As described in the RFP, DRB is requesting Offerors propose an ECM solution that integrates with DRB's existing Kofax ECM and/or an alternative ECM solution.

Question: RFP, page 10, section 2.01

What is the current RBM/imaging solution used by DA DRB? How many folders and how many images does it contain?

Answer: DRB is not currently checking images into folders inside of UCM. DRB checks in a TIFF and PDF for each content item.

Question: RFP, page 10, section 2.01

Does DA DRB wish to reuse any of its existing components such as Kofax, Crystal Reports, Knowledge Tree, etc.?

Answer: DRB would like to discontinue use of Crystal reports. In general, DRB is open to different technologies provided they offer the same or better performance.

Question: RFP, page 14, section 3.01

Can DA DRB please confirm that the vendors role in data conversion is only to transform and load the data into the new solution's database and that the BAS vendor is not responsible for any data cleansing activities?

Answer: The BAS vendor will not be responsible for any data cleansing activities.

Question: Is DA DRB able to accommodate vendor provided video conferencing equipment for use in project meetings? This would require a high-speed internet connection capable of supporting asynchronous video.

Answer: Yes, DRB can accommodate video conferencing equipment and has access to meeting rooms with video conference capabilities in place; however, DRB expects resources to be onsite for meetings they are leading.

Question: RPF, page 11, SEC.3.01, Submittal Form F, page 157, 057_General_Ledger_Requirements
If the vendor's BAS solution can meet the requirements of Submittal Form F General Ledger Requirements, do you still need a separate accounting package? Please explain the types of transactions which will be stored in this separate accounting package and if those transactions are for processes outside of the BAS.

Answer: The current general ledger cannot fully interface with the State Accounting System to accept and record all cash activity. The DRB internal general ledger also needs to provide certain data directly to the State Accounting System. Because of this restriction, a sub-set of required reporting and reconciliation can only take place using the State Accounting System directly.

DRB needs an accounting package that includes a general ledger, that reflects their chart of accounts, that can accept extract files from both the new BAS and the State Accounting System, as well as robust financial reporting and reconciliation tools that are not typically included in a BAS.

The "General Ledger" requirements on Submittal Form F are specific to the accounting package needs of the organization, while the "General Ledger Integration" requirements are how DRB expects financial transactions from the BAS to be fed to the general ledger.

Provided all requirements can be met, the vendor may propose an integrated accounting package within or as a subset of the BAS as part of the response as a proposed best practice for their solution.

Question: Submittal Form F, page 126, 036_General_Ledger_Integration_Process, Req ID 36.01

Can you please elaborate on the features of these two accounting systems?

Answer: Req 36.01 refers to the capability of the BAS to create general ledger extract files and export them.

Question: RPF, page 13, SEC.3.01

Data conversion and migration is a high collaboration exercise, and one of the key ingredients for success is active collaboration from the legacy SMEs who understand the data and business around the legacy data.

How many SMEs are supporting / will support data conversion and data migration effort for this implementation?

Answer: At least three.

Question: RPF, page 14, SEC.3.01

Can you please elaborate on the responsibility for each party on the statement "...BAS vendor will be responsible for participating in analysis of the legacy data to develop data maps for the new BAS, and working with DRB, Linea Solutions and the Data Migration vendor to migrate the legacy data to the target system and test the converted data."

Is this sentence limiting the BAS vendor responsibility to participation only? If that is true, will data migration vendor provide the data in the format of BAS vendor's BAS data schema? We do understand that regardless of responsibilities, the BAS vendor will have to provide the target data knowledge and business around the target data and data schema, may have to load data to implementation environments and participate in several data activities.

Answer: DRB expects the BAS vendor to work with DRB and the Data Conversion vendor to ensure data is properly mapped to the target environment. The BAS vendor is not responsible for transforming the data.

Question: RPF, page 14, SEC.3.01

Will the data migration vendor be required to meet implementation milestone project plan agreed by DRB and the BAS vendor? For example, provide converted data with 100% data quality before the entry of the parallel test, provide converted data with 90% data quality for the user acceptance test, etc.

Answer: Yes.

Question: Section 2.1

Please provide information regarding the current imaging system used. Are all images in the RBM/Imaging system?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Section 2.1

How many documents are currently imaged and the types (e.g., PDF, TIFF)?

Answer: 16TB ~7,000,000 documents.

Question: Section 2.1

Do the images have annotations?

Answer: Metadata is manually entered for each document; however, within the metadata there are auto populated fields based on first and last name. This will "autopop" fields such as address.

Question: Section 2.1

How do users currently access the system? Is there any type of integration to CRS or SIMS?

Answer: DRB currently uses BlueZone Session Manager to create interfaces to CRS. SIMS is a Java application that is accessed via a built-in interface.

Question: Mandatory Requirements, T10.70

Would DRB please provide a list of approved devices for review?

Answer: The State supports Cisco AnyConnect Secure Mobility as the VPN client for Windows7/Win8/Win10, MAC OS X and Linux 64-bit operating systems. Mobile device versions may also be downloaded for use with Apple or Android devices. Systems must have up-to-date virus software installed and running on your device. Users must have an active AD account with the State.

Question: Mandatory Requirements

The links provided in the Policy section were not accessible from the internet, can DRB please provide the following documents for review?

- <https://intranet.state.ak.us/admin/ETS/security/SecurityMapV7.pdf>
- https://intranet.state.ak.us/admin/ETS/security/SOA_Security_Planning_Guide.pdf
- State policy ISP-112 Third Party Security
- State policy ISP-142 Equipment Security
- State policy ISP-195 Prohibited Password Protection & Pre-Encrypted Attachments
- State policy ISP-164 Security Monitoring and Logging
- State policy ISP-179 Firewall Use
- State policy ISP-152 Incident Reporting

Answer: The above documents are included with this amendment.

2. This amendment addresses changes to section 1.09 RFP Schedule. Initial Evaluations Start Date has been changed to 09/26/19.

ACTIVITY	TIME	DATE
Issue Date / RFP Released		8/9/2019
Educational & Pre-Proposal Conference	10:00 AM AKST	8/14/2019
Deadline to submit questions	2:30 PM AKST	8/23/2019
Questions answered by	TBD	08/30/2019
Deadline to submit second round of questions	2:30	09/04/2019
Questions answered for second round of questions	TBD	09/11/09
Deadline for Receipt of Proposals / Proposal Due Date	2:30 PM AKST	9/25/2019
Initial Evaluations Start	TBD	9/26/2019
Interviews/Demonstrations	TBD	10/14/2019 – 10/17/2019
Clarification Period Begins	TBD	10/21/2019
Notice of Intent to Award	N/A	TBD
Contract Issued	N/A	TBD
Start Date	N/A	TBD