

State of Arkansas Department of Human Services
710-21-0048 Comprehensive Child Welfare Information System (CCWIS)
State Answers

Question ID	RFP Reference (page number, section number, paragraph)	Specific RFP Language	Question	Answers
1	Attachment N	"Please list every client state, tribe, or county (with an estimated population over 1 million as of 2020) where you (the prime contractor only) served as the prime contractor to implement, modify or maintain either a S/TACWIS or a CCWIS in the past eight (8) years."	1. will the State accept contract references from clients serving over 1 million people that are not a S/TACWIS or CCWIS?	No, the purpose of this specific request is to determine the Respondent's S/TACWIS experience. Listing "none" does not disqualify a Respondent. Please also see the answer to question #56.
2	Page 2, 1.3 Type of Contract	Year by Year PO	What if the DDI takes longer than 1 year, will the State extend the contract to complete the DDI phase?	Yes, the State expects to renew the contract for up to the full 7 years, pending successful performance by the Contractor.
3	Page 2, 1.3 Type of Contract	Year by Year PO	What is the States expectation on length of DDI?	The State is amenable to Respondents proposing any schedule so long as it aligns with the State's requirements.
4	General		Would the State consider an electronic submission for all documents?	No.
5	2.2.3 ARIES		Can the interface for ARIES be completed as a change order since the ARIES project is not yet implemented?	ARIES Release 1 (All Medicaid) is fully implemented and in production. The new solution will be expected to interface with ARIES.
6	Page 33, 2.5.4 Data Conversion	limited customer support	The contractor will require expertise from the States business/technical experts to assist with the data migration, what is meant by limited customer support?	The term 'limited customer support' is not found within the RFP. In section 2.5.4 Data Conversion (p. 33) the language reads: "The State will only be able to provide limited support on this effort, so Respondents should propose solutions which maximize any commercially reasonable efforts to automate the process or otherwise minimize the State effort and expertise required." Limited support in this context means the State has a limited amount of resources to assist with data conversion. The State will provide SMEs to explain legacy system data fields and values. The State does not have sufficient staff to mass update data. It is anticipated that selected Contractor will be able to automatically update data as part of the conversion process with State approval on the logic. If unable to systematically update data as part of conversion process, vendor solution is expected to be able to request necessary information to be updated next time users make an update to an applicable field in the new system.
7	2.5.7 Warranty Period	12 months of Warranty	Is that State willing to negotiate the warranty period to a shorter time frame?	Respondents should submit proposals which adhere to the requirements set forth in the RFP.
8	Attachment C and Attachment D	Mandatory, Tier 1 and Tier 2	Is it the States intention that Tier 1 and Tier 2 requirements can be treated as optional and not implemented? Or limited in the future via change requests?	All costs associated with a Respondent's solution (including but not limited to the development of any Tier 1 or Tier 2 features and functionalities) must be reflected in the Respondent's bid. The cost of all functions that the Respondent marks as "Out of the Box", "Configurable", or "Customizable" must be reflected in the vendor's bid. A Respondent may choose to omit non-mandatory requirements from their proposal if the Respondent deems them to be cost prohibitive.
9	General		Would DHS consider extending the submission date to July 16, 2021. With Covid, hard copy documents take a bit more time to create.	No.
10	Page 3, 1.6 C Agreement and Compliance Page and 1.8 Response Documents	b.Original signed Agreement and Compliance Pages. (See Agreement and Compliance Pages.)	Where are the agreement and compliance forms located?	Please see Addendum #1.
11	General - Legal (contract terms, BAA, etc); Attachment J, K, L, M		Can the Contractor provide proposed modifications to the contract terms and conditions provided in the RFP? Where should the contractor provide those suggested modifications?	No.
12	Page 155, Information for Evaluation	Instructions: In total for the sections 1.1 through 1.14 below, the Respondent shall provide a summary narrative no longer than one-hundred fifty (150) pages in length including graphics and tables using an 11 point font that describes the functionality of their solution.	Can Contractor utilize smaller font size for graphics and tables?	The font size applies to response text and not text incorporated in graphics and tables. However, Respondents should ensure all text is legible.
13	Page 47, Table 2 Contractor's M&O Key Personnel		The role in the third row on page 47 is blank. Is this content part of the Operations Manager role description?	Yes, the content in the row below the one labeled "Operations Manager" is a continuation of the description of the Operation Manager's role. Additionally, the numbers in parentheses which presently read "10 to 15" should read "7 to 10."
14	Attachment C, Attachment D, Dun and Bradstreet Report, Auditors Report, Annual Report, EOP and Resumes		Can Contactor include Attachment C, Attachment D, Dun and Bradstreet Report, Auditors Report, Annual Report, EOP and Resumes be included as separate electronic files?	Respondents must print all documents in accordance with instructions. For accompanying electronic submissions, documents may be submitted as separate files, but must be clearly labeled. Respondents should take note that every file submitted is subject to Freedom of Information Act requests. If the Respondent has indicated that a redacted copy of their proposal was included with their submission, clearly labelled, redacted versions of each file must be included.

15	Page 155, Information for Evaluation	Instructions: In total for the sections 1.1 through 1.14 below, the Respondent shall provide a summary narrative no longer than one-hundred fifty (150) pages in length including graphics and tables using an 11 point font that describes the functionality of their solution.	Is the proposal table of contents considered part of page count?	Please see the answer to question #26.
16	Attachment _ Table 1: DDI Performance Indicators	D-2 Critical Severity – ACF Determination of CCWIS Compliance. The Future System shall receive an ACF determination that it substantially complies with the requirements of the CCWIS Final Rule by a date mutually agreed upon between the State and the Contractor.	Would the state please define “substantially complies”	<p>We expect the Contractor to collaborate with the State to develop, document, and contribute to the integrated and iterative CCWIS Assessment Review (CAR) process using, at a minimum, the draft Self-Assessment tools and other guidance provided by ACF in achieving conformance to federal requirements with the goal of achieving CCWIS compliance. This includes providing the necessary resources, insights, and expertise to ensure the future solution supports the agency’s program needs, goals, and objectives in an efficient, effective, and economical manner.</p> <p>We understand the terms “substantially compliant,” “partially compliant,” or “compliant” are not specifically and quantitatively defined by ACF at this time, but the expectation remains to achieve overall conformance with federal requirements. The State expects the contractor to monitor, provide direction, adapt, and communicate ACF changes and updates as the CCWIS Assessment Review (CAR) process evolves.</p>
17	page 20, Section 2.2.2 Other DHS Systems	...greatest impact on the project due to their extended...	Would the state please complete the remainder of the last sentence so vendors understand the full intent.	The partial sentence has been replaced with the following: "State systems which may potentially have the greatest impact on the project include the systems discussed below in Sections 2.2.3 through 2.2.9."
18	Bidders Library - Exhibit 2		Can the State provide a complete list of required interfaces in addition to what is in .NET applications document	For a list of all required interfaces, please see Section 1.11.1 and 1.11.2 of Attachment A.
19	Page 2, Section 1.1 Additional Pertinent References: Page 13, Section 2.1, Paragraph 4 Page 29, Section 2.4.1 Page 30, Section 2.4.3	An enterprise solution that is designed at its core to allow Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) products be installed, integrated, and upgraded through scheduled releases	With the opening statement (provided in column D) and the multiple references which follow, is it true that the state is only considering responses that are based on COTS or SaaS implementations?	No, the State will receive and review all responsive proposals.
20	Page 3, Section 1.3, Article B Page 12, Section 1.33, Schedule of Events	The anticipated start date for the contract is January 3, 2022	Please confirm that this is the date the state expects work to begin toward implementing a system, and not the date in which functionality is expected.	Yes, this is the date the State expects work to begin unless the State and the successful vendor are able to mutually agree to a different date.
21	Page 23, Section 2.3.5, Paragraph 1	The State will use a deliverables-based approach to determine progress and completion .	What is the state's overall timeline for completion? Are there any circumstances that dictate a date by which all work must be delivered?	There are not external or internal factors or circumstances that drive dates for this project. The State expects the overall timeline for completion to be driven by the vendor’s baseline schedule that includes delivering a solution that meets all federal and state requirements, as well as Arkansas’ business needs, goals, and objectives.
22	Page 33, Section 2.5.4, Paragraph 2	Data conversion will need to occur from multiple legacy systems, including CHRIS, multiple .net applications, and Child Welfare documents in Edoctus, the current DCFS document management system. Data conversion and migration activities include working with the state to determine the data to be converted, building a data conversion schedule, tracking each data element being converted, validating that all records/images converted equals number of records/images written to the new database , testing the converted data in the shell of the future system, reporting progress and ensuring adequate staff is assigned to the effort.	Is data conversion explicitly called out because it is desired on its own merits, or is it just an expected consequence of a new implementation? Specifically, is the state interested in proposals that would allow the database to remain intact (or simply moved to a cloud location)?	Data conversion will be considered on its own merits. It is expected that the new solution will have its own database schema and trying to interface or leverage a legacy application’s database would be inefficient. The State is not interested in just implementing a new front end that leverages the existing backend.
23	Page 56, Section 2.9.7, Middleware Management	Primary responsibility for application related COTS (PowerBuilder IDE)	Is there a preference that middleware components should be written in PowerBuilder?	There is a preference that the new solution NOT be written in PowerBuilder as the state considers this a legacy technology. However; the State is open to all options that can quickly and economically meet the State’s requirements.

24	Page 2, Section 1.1, Paragraph 6	Establish the guiding principles for the project (e.g., minimize custom development)	Is the state willing to entertain a custom development solution as long as it meets all of the requirements, including utilization of configurable modules, efficiency, and ease-of-integration?	Section 1.1 Introduction (Page 2) states the following: "Critical technological objectives of this RFP include the procurement of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A true Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) platform which will bring interoperability of service-based modules, preferably as licensed products, to support DHS' modernization and continual enterprise evolution without restricting its ever-changing business needs • A highly configurable and flexible platform that will be an enabler of the expansion of technological capabilities to other state and federal agencies • An enterprise solution that is designed at its core to allow Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) products be installed, integrated, and upgraded through scheduled releases • Software modules that are implemented and modified by user configurations, not through constant custom coding that will result in yet another one-off child welfare system" Bottom line, if it is demonstrated to the state that proposed solution has equivalent advantages of a COTS solution then the state would entertain that solution.
25	General	Bid Submission Date	Would the State consider an extension in the submission due date so that offerors can provide a detailed and satisfactory response?	Please see the answer to question #9.
26	Attachment B, Information for Evaluation, Page 1	There is a 150-page limit to a Respondent's System Proposal and a 100-page limit to their Business Proposal.	Please specify the inclusions and exclusions in the page limits of System Proposal and Business Proposal. Are the cover letter, cover page, table of content, separators, etc. included in the page count?	Cover letter, cover pages, tables of content, dividers and required forms do not apply to the page limit. The System Proposal and Business Proposal are limited by the page limits, as explained in Attachment B.
27	Attachment B, Information for Evaluation, Page 1	There is a 150-page limit to a Respondent's System Proposal and a 100-page limit to their Business Proposal.	Does the State want System Proposal and Business Proposal in a single document? For easy evaluation can we submit as two separate documents?	A single document or separate documents are both acceptable, so long as it is clear which part corresponds to which proposal and the pagination of the specific proposals is clear.
28	Attachment K	Attachment K - Pro forma contract Pro forma contract	Do we need to provide a response for Attachment K with our proposal? If yes, where will this fit in the sequence of technical proposal packet?	No. The attachment is for your information only.
29	Attachment L	Attachment L - Business Associate Agreement	Do we need to provide a response for Attachment L with our proposal? If yes, where will this fit in the sequence of technical proposal packet?	Please see the answer to question #28.
30	RFP Section 2.9.2- Technical Support	The State shall provide "Level 1" technical support.	What is the current ticketing system used by the State?	Cherwell and Jira
31	RFP Section 2.7.2- Key Personnel	At a minimum, the Contractor will provide Staff with the following qualifications to fill the following roles for the DDI and M&O phases:	Can we have the same key resource for DDI as well as M&O (e.g. Proposed resource for Security expert can be same for DDI and M&O. Same for Engagement Director/ Executive)?	Key Staff may serve the State for both DDI and M&O, so long as they can fulfill all required obligations for their role(s).
32	RFP Section 1.8 : Response Documents- C	Electronic Copy Submission - File naming Convention	Are there any file naming convention to be followed for technical proposal packet, pricing and attachments to be submitted as part of this proposal response?	There is no required naming convention, but please ensure that the files are named in a manner that clearly identifies which file is which. Please also note the special requirements related to the submission of price information discussed in RFP section 1.15.
33	Attachment B, Technical Proposal Packet	RFP Section 2.9 Maintenance & Operations - Business Proposal	Q.3, Q.4, and Q.5 asks about referring to the RFP section 2.9.3, 2.9.4, and 2.9.5. However the section headings in the RFP file does not match with the questions asked. Should it be 2.9.5 (software Upgrades), 2.9.6 (System Documentation), and 2.9.7 (Role of the State) of the RFP file?	An updated Attachment B has been posted with these answers fixing this numbering discrepancy.
34	Attachment B, Technical Proposal Packet	RFP Section 2.5.5 Solution Design, Development, and Implementation: Testing - Business Proposal	There is a (note: the questions that correspond to RFP section 2.5.4 and 2.5.6 are below as they are scored separately from this section). What does this mean. Are we supposed to have the 2 questions repeated and respond in Section 2.5.4 and 2.5.6?	Please see Section 3.2 of the RFP. Therein, Respondents can see a scorecard that designates how items will be scored. (Sections 2.5.4 and 2.5.6 are scored separately, despite appearing in sequence in Attachment B). There is no need to repeat questions or answers multiple times.
35	Attachment B, Technical Proposal Packet Copy of CCWIS RFP Answer Set - Draft Answers 6.3.2021	Business Proposal, Section 2.5 Solution Design, Development, and Implementation	As per the questions/ sections asked for evaluating the Technical response, the numbering sequence is 2.5.1, 2.5.2, 2.5.3, 2.5.5, 2.5.7, 2.5.4, 2.5.6. Please confirm if we need to follow this same sub-section numbering sequence in the response document?	Yes, Respondents should clearly indicate which question they are answering.

36	RFP Section 1.13- AGREEMENT AND COMPLIANCE PAGES	The Agreement and Compliance Pages are included in the Technical Proposal Packet	We do not see anything titled as such in Attachment B Technical Proposal Packet. Can the State let us know where to find this page?	Please see the answer to question #10.
37	General	Estimated Budget	Does the State have an estimated budget for this contract?	Yes. The State has an estimated budget for both the Development and Maintenance & Operations (M&O) costs.
38	General	Product Demo	Has the State/ DHS seen any product demonstrations from any vendors prior to issuing this RFP?	The State has had no demonstrations in support of Respondent proposals for this solicitation. However, the State scheduled demonstrations as part of the evaluation process for a prior RFP (#710-20-0041). In addition, over the preceding several years various employees of DCFS saw system demonstrations at the State and at various trade shows, conventions, etc.
39	Attachment C (Functional Requirements Matrix) and Attachment D (Technical Requirements Matrix)	Attachment Hard Copy and Electronic Copy	Can the State please clarify the sequence of submitting Attachment C & D in the Technical Proposal Packet?	Attachments C and D may be included in a printed proposal after the System and Business Proposals requested by the Technical Proposal Packet. The other requested forms may be included before the Systems proposal.
40	Attachment B- Technical Proposal Packet	Attachment B- Technical Proposal: Business Proposal	As Business Proposal response starts with Section 2.13&2.14 and 2.2.12, Can we sequence the section numbering in the response document as 2.1- Adherence to Federal Requirements; 2.2- Minimum Qualifications; 2.3- Company Info.; 2.4- Project Governance and so on?	Please use the numbering provided in Attachment B. By way of example, the first section of a Respondent's Business Proposal should be "RFP Section 2.13 and 2.14 - Adherence to Federal Requirements"
41	RFP Section 2.6 System Hosting, Page 40	Attachment A - Sec. 1.11.1 & Sec 1.11.2	Integration Patterns: For service-based integrations, are there existing SOAP based web-services or mostly REST based services are in use integrating with other legacy systems and applications? Where are the APIs / services are hosted and what protocols do they support (e.g. REST, SOAP, etc.)?	Please see section 1.11 of Attachment A.
42	RFP Section 2.6 System Hosting, Page 40	Attachment A - Sec. 1.11.1 & Sec 1.11.2	Integration Patterns: For future system how the master data updates will be flowing in from MCI or MPI (Master Data Platforms for Client and Provider information)? What integration pattern will be used to get updates from MCI and MPI systems? For real time enquiry in current setup, does it provides services /APIs for validating or getting latest client information? How does master data is exchanged between systems in current landscape?	CCWIS will be first new solution to integrate with Master Client Index, since the original implementation. Accordingly, that governance is not clearly defined at this time. Defining those governance processes will be part of this implantation. This also applies to the Master Provider Index.
43	RFP Section 2.6 System Hosting, Page 40	Attachment A - Sec. 1.11.1 & Sec 1.11.2	Cloud Footprint (Cloud Applications Spread): What is the current cloud footprint of application landscape, that needs to be integrated with new CCWIS solution? What are the existing inflight application cloud migration initiatives in place, or any such plans for future?	DHS has current cloud footprints in AWS and Microsoft Azure platforms. There are also multiple SaaS solutions like Rocket Matter, MoveIT.
44	RFP Section 2.6 System Hosting, Page 40	Attachment A - Sec. 1.11.1 & Sec 1.11.2	Does Future System needs to send data regularly to Enterprise Data Warehouse (RPT2-PRD and Ireland)? What is the existing ETL platform in place?	The DHS Enterprise Data Warehouse currently leverages Microsoft SSIS.
45	RFP Section 2.6 System Hosting, Page 40	Attachment A - Sec. 1.11.1 & Sec 1.11.2	Data Volumes: How much volume of transactional data is currently generated on daily / weekly / monthly basis per module / functionality? How does these volumes are expected to grow? For example number any existing defined business matrix such as new cases in intakes, number of regular updates to existing cases, No. of assessments per day, No. of provider payments etc.	Refer to RFP Section 2.5.4.3. Presently, CHRIS has approximately 93,000 records in Blob Format. As of March 1, 2021, the total database is 207GB in size, of which 10.28GB is in unstructured (Blobs: images, attachments). It has a growth rate of approximately 1GB a month.
46	RFP Section 2.6 System Hosting, Page 40	Attachments A & C - 1.11 Interfaces	Data Integration: Are there any existing data integration needs to be considered other than the mentioned in Attachment A & C - 1.11 Interfaces for data Import/Export?	For a list of all required interfaces, please see Section 1.11.1 and 1.11.2 of Attachment A.
47	Page 62, Section 3.2 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SCORE, C. The Information for Evaluation section has been divided into sub-sections	RFP 2.2.12 Minimum Qualifications	How will the agency determine pass/fail? How many child welfare implementations as prime and/or sub is required to Pass?	To qualify under this Minimum Qualification, the Respondent needs to have completed only one implementation for a client (as described in Section 2.2.12) as a prime or a subcontractor.
48	Attachment A, Page 63, 1.11.1 Anticipated Data Exchanges and Data Exchange Partners at Implementation	RocketMatter - Office of Chief Counsel (OCC)'s Litigation Management Tool	Can agency clarify when RocketMatter will be implemented?	Rocket Matter is implemented. Please see the following link for information on its API: http://developer.rocketmatter.com/
49	Attachment A, Page 69, 1.11.2 Current Applications External to CHRIS	SSRS Reports and Admin Tool	Can you please share the revised 350+ SSRS reports?	Refer to Attachment A Section 1.12 (Page 72) for CCWIS minimum reporting requirements. See 49-SSRS Report Names tab of current 339 reports.
50	Attachment A, Page 70, 1.11.5 Integration of Evident Change Portal (DCS)	Assessments Tools	Can you please clarify if Vendor can propose their assessment tools ?	No.
51	Page 1 of Attachment B regarding 748-Attachment-C-Functional-Requirement-Matrix	In addition to responding to the specifications described above, fill out the tabs of Attachment C -Functional Requirements Matrix.	Should Attachment C-Functional Requirement Matrix be included with the response as a separate document or inserted into our Technical Proposal Packet?	Attachment C - Functional Requirements should be submitted as a separate document and will not be counted towards the respondent's page limit.
52	Page 13, Attachment B regarding 748-Attachment-D-Technical-Requirement-Matrix	This section will be scored based on a Respondent's completion of Attachment D (all tabs) and based upon the Respondent's answers to the below questions and prompts.	Should Attachment D-Technical Requirement Matrix be included with the response as a separate document or inserted into our Technical Proposal Packet?	Attachment D - Technical Requirements Matrix should be submitted as a separate document and will not be counted towards the respondent's page limit.
53	p. 47, Section 2.7.2, RFP	Table 2. M&O Key Personnel	There is a row in Table 2 with Responsibilities and Expected Qualifications but no Role identified. Please provide the role title for these Responsibilities and Qualifications.	Please see the answer to question #13.

54	Page 3, Section 1.6 Acceptance of Requirements Page 6, Section 1.12 Proposal Signature Page Page 6, Section 1.13 Agreement and Compliance Pages	<p>1.6 ACCEPTANCE OF REQUIREMENTS.</p> <p>A. The words "must" and "shall" signify a Requirement of this solicitation and that the Contractor's agreement to and compliance with that item is mandatory.</p> <p>B. A Contractor's proposal will be disqualified if a Contractor takes exceptions to any Requirements named in this RFP.</p> <p>C. Contractor may request exceptions to NON-mandatory items. Any such request must be declared on, or as an attachment to, the appropriate section's Agreement and Compliance Page. Contractor must clearly explain the requested exception and should reference the specific solicitation item number to which the exception applies. (See Agreement and Compliance Page.)</p> <p>1.12 PROPOSAL SIGNATURE PAGE.</p> <p>A. An official authorized to bind the Contractor(s) to a resultant contract must sign the Proposal Signature Page included in the Technical Proposal Packet.</p> <p>B. Contractor's signature on this page shall signify contractor's agreement that either of the following shall cause the contractor's proposal to be disqualified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional terms or conditions submitted intentionally or inadvertently. 2. Any exception that conflicts with a Requirement of this Bid Solicitation. <p>1.13 Agreement and Compliance Pages ***</p> <p>B. Contractors' Signature on these pages shall signify agreement and compliance with all Requirements within the designated section</p>	<p>As we work through the RFP and our approach, we believe there will be some RFP provisions and terms that will require some flexibility, including clarification and/or other adjustments to requirements and terms. The State/DHS have permitted exceptions and clarifications since the original release of this RFP. (See for example RFP 710-21-0035 (Emergency Rental Assistance) and RFP SP-21-0029 (Case Mgt System)).</p> <p>We are concerned that the language of Section 1.6 and 1.12 and the widespread use of the terms "must" and "shall" will restrict DHS' ability permit the needed clarifications and other adjustments. The request for the change in Section 1.13 is for alignment purposes.</p> <p>Other State/DHS RFP's have used an approach that did permit Vendors to identify exceptions, clarifications, terms or other adjustments.</p> <p>To foster competition and allow bidders to seek clarifications or modifications to terms, we request the following changes (the changes are denoted in red text):</p> <p>1.6 ACCEPTANCE OF REQUIREMENTS.</p> <p>B. A Contractor's proposal may will be disqualified, or its evaluation may be adversely impacted, if a Contractor takes exceptions to any Requirements named in this RFP.</p> <p>C. Contractor may request exceptions to Mandatory and NON-mandatory items (including contract terms). Any such request must be declared on, or as an attachment to, the appropriate section's Agreement and Compliance Page. Contractor must clearly explain the requested exception and should reference the specific solicitation item number to which the exception applies. (See Agreement and Compliance Page.)</p> <p>1.12 PROPOSAL SIGNATURE PAGE.</p> <p>A. An official authorized to bind the Contractor(s) to a resultant contract must sign the Proposal Signature Page included in the Technical Proposal Packet.</p> <p>B. Contractor's signature on this page shall signify contractor's agreement that either of the following may shall cause the contractor's proposal to be disqualified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional terms or conditions submitted intentionally or inadvertently. 2. Any exception that conflicts with a Requirement of this Bid Solicitation. <p>1.13 AGREEMENT AND COMPLIANCE PAGES ***</p> <p>B. Contractors' Signature on these pages shall signify agreement and compliance with all Requirements within the designated section except for any terms noted pursuant to RFP Section 1.6.</p>	The State will not accept those changes.
55	RFP Page 18, Section 2.1.4.2, 2nd Paragraph	In the event that the Future System does not offer a solution which provides an identical or substantively similar functionality as a .NET, the State is amenable to working with the Contractor to preserve one or more .NET applications and interface them with the Future System. This is not, however, the State's preference. In the event that the Contractor elects to preserve a .NET application, the Contractor shall be responsible for maintaining that .NET.	We understand that the State is amenable to working with the Contractor to preserve one or more .NET applications and interface them with the Future System. With that in mind, would it be fair to assume that if the .NET applications meet the listed requirements in the RFP and Attachments B, C and D, that there would not be an adverse impact to the technical scoring if the Contractor proposes to retain one or more .NET applications and interface them with the Future System for a specific module or set of functions to meet the stated requirements.	<p>No, there may be an adverse impact on technical scoring. (For example, It would add number of interfaces needed and increase solution complexity. It also adds additional burden on DHS to have to coordinate and negotiate changes between two vendors.)</p> <p>The State specified in the RFP language "This is not, however, the State's preference." (re: preserving .NET applications). The goal is to include as much functionality as possible under the CCWIS solution umbrella for compliance and to avoid M&O on older applications. See CCWIS requirement 1355.52(a)(3) "Not requiring duplicative application system development or software maintenance."</p> <p>In the event that the Contractor preserves a .NET as part of the Future System, this includes the obligation to maintain and support its operation. See RFP Section 2.1.4.2.</p>
56	Page 2, section 1.1.; Page 21, section 2.2.12.2	<p>2.2.12.2 Experience in Child Welfare The Contractor (or Subcontractor) shall have experience implementing a child welfare IT system with five hundred (500) or more users. This client could be a State, county, tribe, agency which claims Title IV-E funds, or analogous nongovernmental client. To help the State understand a Respondent's experience, Respondents shall complete the Child Welfare Client History Form (Attachment N). The proposed Project Manager shall have the child welfare systems experience noted below in Section 2.7.2.</p>	The updated RFP language in section 1.1 indicates that you want a COTS solution that can respond to, change, and integrate with child welfare and health care systems. Given SACWIS were not really built to integrate with health care and the few CCWIS adopted are not as well, it seems limiting to only accept bids from those who have implemented outdated "one-off" SACWIS or one of the few newer CCWIS solutions that have not been fully implemented and/or tested. Therefore, regarding section 2.2.12.2 of the RFP, and to allow for a fairer and more productive competitive bid process, would the State be open to using the language in the previous RFP which only required the contractor or subcontractor to have experience in implementing a Health and Human Services IT system or analogous client rather than the new minimum requirement for specifically child welfare IT system? The current language will exclude some of the world's most respected and largest technology and IT companies from offering Arkansas NextGen technology developed on modern SOA cloud platforms for child welfare and health care systems which far exceeds what past SACWIS and some of the current CCWIS provide.	<p>There is no requirement that a Respondent have built or maintained a CCWIS or SACWIS. This prompt on Attachment N is there to learn if a Respondent has this experience, but there is no requirement to have this specific experience.</p> <p>The State will receive and review all responsive proposals.</p>
57	RFP_710210048, Page 6, Section 1.13 "Agreement and Compliance Pages," A	<p>1.13 Agreement and Compliance Pages</p> <p>A. Contractor must sign all Agreement and Compliance Pages relevant to each section of the Bid Solicitation Document. The Agreement and Compliance Pages are included in the Technical Proposal Packet.</p> <p>B. Contractor's signature on these pages shall signify agreement to and compliance with all Requirements within the designated section.</p>	What pages are the "Agreement and Compliance Pages" located on within the Technical Proposal Packet (or within the main RFP document and/or Attachment documents)?	Please see the answer to question #10.

58	Attachment D, Technical Requirements Matrix, Tab - General System Behavior, Req #37	Application integration, both internal and external, will go through the DHS Enterprise Service Bus/Data Integration Hub.	What technology/solution is the DHS Enterprise Service Bus/Data Integration Hub?	The ESB is IBM AppConnect with WSRR as the registry. The State maintains the current version (or n-1) and plans to remain current.
59	Attachment D, Technical Requirements Matrix, Tab - General System Behavior, Req #37	Application integration, both internal and external, will go through the DHS Enterprise Service Bus/Data Integration Hub.	Can a vendor propose the use of another integration technology to speed the development and integration work and/or reduce costs for the State?	The State would consider other integration technology for applications not already on the DHS Enterprise Service Bus.
60	Attachment D, Technical Requirements Matrix, Tab - General System Behavior, Req #41	...solution will have the capability to work with security policy manager for Web services that allows for centrally defined security policies that govern Web services operations...	Does DHS already have a policy management tool for managing web service security?	Yes, DHS has multiple tools for managing web service security.
61	Attachment D, Technical Requirements Matrix, Tab - General System Behavior, Req #41	...solution will have the capability to work with security policy manager for Web services that allows for centrally defined security policies that govern Web services operations...	If DHS does already have a policy management tool for managing web service security, what tool is in place?	DHS utilizes several tool for managing web service security - F5 BigIP firewall, Cisco Umbrella.
62	Attachment J, Page 1	Except upon the approval of DHS, the terms and conditions set out in this section are non-negotiable items and will be transferred to the contract as written. DHS has determined that any attempt by any vendor to reserve the right to alter or amend the terms and conditions via negotiation, without the approval of DHS, is an exception to the terms and conditions that will result in rejection of the proposal. A statement accepting and agreeing to the terms and conditions set out in this section, or to alternate terms and conditions upon approval of DHS, is required to be submitted with the respondent's proposal.	Please confirm our interpretation of the first paragraph of Appendix J as permitting a bidder to either: (i) agree to all of the RFP terms and conditions "as is"; or (ii) agree to provide alternate terms and conditions that must be approved and agreed upon by DHS and the bidder in subsequent contract negotiations.	No. See Addendum 1, Revised Attachment J. DHS will not consider bids submitted upon condition of modified terms and conditions. See also Addendum 1, Revised Attachment B.
63	Attachment J, Page 1	Except upon the approval of DHS, the terms and conditions set out in this section are non-negotiable items and will be transferred to the contract as written. DHS has determined that any attempt by any vendor to reserve the right to alter or amend the terms and conditions via negotiation, without the approval of DHS, is an exception to the terms and conditions that will result in rejection of the proposal. A statement accepting and agreeing to the terms and conditions set out in this section, or to alternate terms and conditions upon approval of DHS, is required to be submitted with the respondent's proposal.	If a bidder is unable to agree to all of the current RFP terms, should bidder provide its proposed alternate terms and conditions for DHS consideration at the time of contract award or with its proposal submission?	Please see the answer to question #62.
64	Attachment J, Page 1	Except upon the approval of DHS, the terms and conditions set out in this section are non-negotiable items and will be transferred to the contract as written. DHS has determined that any attempt by any vendor to reserve the right to alter or amend the terms and conditions via negotiation, without the approval of DHS, is an exception to the terms and conditions that will result in rejection of the proposal. A statement accepting and agreeing to the terms and conditions set out in this section, or to alternate terms and conditions upon approval of DHS, is required to be submitted with the respondent's proposal.	Would DHS agree to contract directly with a third-party hosting provider utilized by bidder for this project (e.g., Amazon Web Services, Microsoft Azure, Salesforce Cloud, etc.), or accept "flow-up" terms and conditions required by such hosting provider(s)?	No.
65	page 3, Section 1.6, C.	Contractor may request exceptions to NON-mandatory items. Any such request must be declared on, or as an attachment to, the appropriate section's Agreement and Compliance Page.	For each section where signature acceptance for Agreement and Compliance Pages is required, please indicate where the acknowledgement signature should be provided.	Please see the answer to question #10.
66	page 4, section 1.8, A2b	b. Original signed Agreement and Compliance Pages.(See Agreement and Compliance Pages.)	Is there an additional place to sign the Agreement and Conditions? We see the proposal signature page, but do not see additional signature lines on each page or a section called Agreement and Conditions.	Please see the answer to question #10.
67	page 6, section 1.13, A	A. Contractor must sign all Agreement and Compliance Pages relevant to each section of the Bid Solicitation Document. The Agreement and Compliance Pages are included in the Technical Proposal Packet.	Is there a section called Agreement and Conditions in order to sign each page?	Please see the answer to question #10.
68	Attachment B page 1, sections 1.1-1.5	Your proposal should have two sections: a "System Proposal" and a "Business Proposal." Each section below indicates if the section is a System or Business proposal section.	Are the following sections: Section 1.1 General Functions, 1.2 Referrals, 1.3 Investigations and Differential Response, 1.4 Assessments, 1.5 Case Management part of the System Proposal or Business Proposal or separate section(s)?	These sections correspond to the Systems Proposal as they relate to desired functionality of the Future System.

69	Attachment A page 24, 1.4.1 Assessments Used Today and in the Future	The Future System must provide a platform for users to complete assessments as well as a repository of the assessments recorded results.	Is AR DHS requiring that we link to or embed the screens created by Evident Change for the assessments or can the vendor provide their own implementation of the SDM assessments and then send the data back as needed?	<p>The State has invested time, resources and expertise with Evident Change's SDM/TDM tool and wishes to continue to use what is being developed in the Future System.</p> <p>The State desires that the users of the Future System experience one system with a single log-on and a consistent look and feel throughout the system.</p> <p>The State is open to how that is accomplished (<i>i.e.</i> adjusting a vendor's implementation of SDM, building upon the States) so long as these two goals are met.</p>
70	Attachment A page 71, 1.11.5.1 Technical Requirements to Integrate Evident Change-hosted Systems into the Future System	Respondents must propose a Future System which integrates the Evident Change portal that will support seamless integration of SDM and TDM into the CCWIS solution.	Can the Evident Change portal assessments (SDM and TDM) functionality be accessed from mobile devices when offline? If not, is it required for the Future System to provide an offline assessment capability?	The implementation of the Evident Change portal discussed in the RFP is not yet live. The Future System will require the ability to access assessment capabilities offline (see Requirement M-1 in Attachment C).
71	Attachment A, page 75, section 1.12.5.1	The State presently maintains a contract with Evident Change to provide the features described in Section 1.12.5 through Evident Changes' Safe Measures system. Depending on the nature of what is proposed by the Contractor, the State reserves the right to maintain the Safe Measures system instead of a Contractor's proposed report or query tool. In the event the State elects to maintain Safe Measures in lieu of what is proposed by the Contractor, the State will reduce the contract remuneration accordingly.	If the state elects to maintain SafeMeasures, will the state maintain the direct contract and relationship with the purveyor, Evident Change?	Yes, in the event that the State wishes to pursue Safe Measures in lieu of the native capabilities of the Future System proposed by the Vendor, the State will maintain a contract with Evident Change directly.
72	Attachment A, page 75, section 1.12.5.1	The State presently maintains a contract with Evident Change to provide the features described in Section 1.12.5 through Evident Changes' Safe Measures system. Depending on the nature of what is proposed by the Contractor, the State reserves the right to maintain the Safe Measures system instead of a Contractor's proposed report or query tool. In the event the State elects to maintain Safe Measures in lieu of what is proposed by the Contractor, the State will reduce the contract remuneration accordingly.	If the prime vendor chooses to establish that the State will be best served through an election to maintain SafeMeasures as the report and query tool, is it acceptable to establish that the State will maintain its direct contract and relationship with the purveyor, Evident Change? In this case, will there be a recognition on the part of the State that there is no reduction in the prime vendor's proposed remuneration for the maintenance of SafeMeasures?	<p>To be a valid proposal, a Respondent must include all the reporting and query tools required by the RFP to be in the Future System. A vendor cannot omit this requirement in favor of the State working with Evident Change.</p> <p>It is the State's preference that the Future System include the reporting and query tools proposed by the Contractor in its RFP.</p> <p>The State's current, legacy System CHRIS uses Safe Measures through a contract the State maintains with Evident Change. In the event that the successful vendor's reporting and query tools are not desired by the State, the State may work with the successful vendor to incorporate Safe Measures instead of the reporting and query tools proposed by the Respondent in its proposal. Such a replacement would require an adjustment to what is proposed by the Vendor in their proposal and the contract during contract negotiations. Any changes would require the mutual agreement of both parties, including changes that affect remuneration.</p> <p>The State's current implementation of Safe Measures is developed specifically for CHRIS – it cannot be leveraged for the Future System.</p> <p>If a Respondent believes Safe Measures represents the best option for the State, it is free to engage Evident Change as a subcontractor for its proposal.</p>
73	Attachment A, page 75, section 1.12.5.1	The State presently maintains a contract with Evident Change to provide the features described in Section 1.12.5 through Evident Changes' Safe Measures system. Depending on the nature of what is proposed by the Contractor, the State reserves the right to maintain the Safe Measures system instead of a Contractor's proposed report or query tool. In the event the State elects to maintain Safe Measures in lieu of what is proposed by the Contractor, the State will reduce the contract remuneration accordingly.	If the State chooses to maintain SafeMeasures, how will the state score the technical proposal? How will the State score the proposal cost - with a reduction in remuneration or for the full proposal cost? How will the state determine the reduction, and will this reduction consider the impact a new case management system and data model will have on the existing SafeMeasures implementation?	Please see the Answer to Question 72.

74	Attachment A, page 75, section 1.12.5.1	The State presently maintains a contract with Evident Change to provide the features described in Section 1.12.5 through Evident Changes' Safe Measures system. Depending on the nature of what is proposed by the Contractor, the State reserves the right to maintain the Safe Measures system instead of a Contractor's proposed report or query tool. In the event the State elects to maintain Safe Measures in lieu of what is proposed by the Contractor, the State will reduce the contract remuneration accordingly.	If the State elects to maintain SafeMeasures, will the selected vendor be expected to integrate SafeMeasures into the selected platform? Will the costs for this integration be considered when determining any potential reduction in remuneration?	Please see the Answer to Question 72.
75	RFP: Page 4, Section 1.8.C.1.a & b (Response Documents; Additional Copies and Redacted Copy of the Technical Proposal Packet)	Response Documents - The RFP requires vendors to submit 1 original and 12 copies of the proposal in hard copy format (total of 13) in addition to 12 electronic copies in Flash Drives or CDs.	In order to reduce the impact on environment, we would like to request the State to dispense with the hard copies submission requirement and only require vendors to submit the proposal in electronic format.	Please see the answer to question #4.
76	RFP: Page 7, Section 1.16.B (Prime Contractor Responsibility)	The prime Contractor shall be held responsible for the contract and jointly and severally liable with any of its subcontractors, affiliates, or agents to the State for the performance thereof.	In a large Enterprise System such as Arkansas CCWIS, a prime vendor will likely have a number of subcontractors providing specialized products and services for which the prime vendor will not have any direct control. This includes software licenses for a number of commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) software products, cloud infrastructure services, and others. In such cases it will not be possible for prime vendors to be jointly and severally liable with their subcontractors. We request that the State remove this requirement or, at a minimum, appropriately modify it.	Request Denied.
77	RFP: Page 21, Section 2.2.12.2 (Experience in Child Welfare)	The Contractor (or Subcontractor) shall have experience implementing a child welfare IT system with five hundred (500) or more users.	Please confirm that by "users" you mean direct agency case workers (often referred to as "Internal Users"), and not ancillary users such as Part-Time users in other agencies, Providers, Trainers, Citizens, Attorneys, Hospital / Nursing Home Staff, and commodity suppliers (often referred to as "External Users").	Yes, for purposes of determining if a vendor's previous client was sufficient size, we are referring to the number of "Internal Users."
78	Attachment-A: Page 75, 1.12.5.1 (Safe Measures)	In the event the State elects to maintain Safe Measures in lieu of what is proposed by the Contractor, the State will reduce the contract remuneration accordingly.	Please confirm that "reduce the contract remuneration accordingly" refers to vendors' priced costs for report or query building tools, and not for the RFP-required reports themselves.	Please see the Answer to Question 72.
79	Attachment-A: Page 75, 1.12.5.1 (Safe Measures)	In the event the State elects to maintain Safe Measures in lieu of what is proposed by the Contractor, the State will reduce the contract remuneration accordingly.	Related to the preceding question, since vendor solutions may require report or query building tools to provide other functionality in their solution, please confirm that the State will not require vendors to reduce their proposed cost for those tools, even if the State decides to maintain SafeMeasures.	Please see the Answer to Question 72.
80	Attachment-A: Page 6, 1.1.14 (Records Retention and Security)	The State reserves its right to adjust its records retention policy in the future and the Contractor shall work with the State to ensure the Future System accommodates any applicable changes.	Is it the State's expectation that the Future System should have an archival solution when data needs to be removed from the system based on DHS policy?	It is the State's expectation that the Future System should have an archival solution when/if data needs to be removed from the system based on any possible future DHS policy updates.
81	Attachment-A: Page 11, 1.2.8 (Referral Disposition and Merger)	The Future System shall integrate this Intake Assessment tool for purposes of automating the disposition output of that tool.	If changes are required to the Evident Change system/tool in order for this integration/interface to work, who is responsible for making those changes?	Evident Change would be responsible for making any changes to Evident Change system(s)/tool(s).
82	Attachment-A: Page 24-25, 1.4.1 (Assessments Used Today and in the Future)	Presently, DCFS is transitioning from assessment tools embedded in CHRIS to the suite of tools built and hosted by Evident change, as discussed below in Section 1.11.5. The Future System must provide a platform for users to complete assessments as well as a repository of the assessments recorded results.	We assume this refers to instances where an assessment has been started by a worker either in an embedded CHRIS assessment or in the Evident Change suite of tools. Will DCFS require assessments begun in both embedded CHRIS assessments and the Evident Change suite to be completed in the Future System? We are looking for clarification that we correctly understand this requirement.	There will be no instance in which an assessment is begun in CHRIS, continued in the Evident Change portal, and then completed in the Future System. The State will transition its assessments to the Evident Change portal sufficiently in advance of the Future System's conversion and migration activities that any assessments started in CHRIS will have been completed in the Evident Change portal. Accordingly, the only "open" assessments requiring conversion/migration will be the ones begun in the Evident Change portal. However, the conversion/migration will require the Vendor to convert/migrate historical assessments completed in CHRIS.
83	Attachment-A: Page 25, 1.4.1 (Assessments Used Today and in the Future)	The Future System must accommodate changes in the assessments used by the State possibly prior to the system's go live and likely during the life of the system.	Since this RFP and this requirement do not provide specific information regarding the nature of future changes to assessments nor the number and timing, will the State handle these changes via Change Requests with the selected vendor? In other words, we wish to confirm that the State does not intend for offerors to attempt to estimate the cost for these potential changes?	This is correct. In the event the State changes its assessment approach this change would warrant a Change Request via the Change Control process.
84	Attachment-A: Page 61, 1.11 (Interfaces, Data Exchanges, and Integration with Evident Change Portal)	...the Future System shall integrate these tools (SDM and TDM) in accordance with the requirements below such that they can be seamlessly accessed by Future System users and appear to be an integrated component of the Future System.	Can the State provide details on the technology stack upon which these tools are built?	See Evident Change website for Structured Decision Making® & Team Decision Making tools details. https://www.evidentchange.org/assessment/structured-decision-making-sdm-model
85	Attachment-A: Page 61, 1.11 (Interfaces, Data Exchanges, and Integration with Evident Change Portal)	...the Future System shall integrate these tools (SDM and TDM) in accordance with the requirements below such that they can be seamlessly accessed by Future System users and appear to be an integrated component of the Future System.	Can the State elaborate or describe the features and technology of the Evident Change tools which would support providing the seamless access required by DCFS?	Please see Section 1.11.5 of Attachment A.

86	Attachment-A: Page 61, 1.11 (Interfaces, Data Exchanges, and Integration with Evident Change Portal)	...the Future System shall integrate these tools (SDM and TDM) in accordance with the requirements below such that they can be seamlessly accessed by Future System users and appear to be an integrated component of the Future System.	Because many of the features and functionalities of the Evident Change SDM and TDM are already built in some fashion into vendor solutions, "seamless access" and the "appearance to be an integrated component" seems to be an onerous requirement. These functionalities require and have impact on system workflow, business processes, rules, and so on. Requiring vendors to "unwind" or significantly redesign already available functionality is perhaps unwarranted. Can the State better describe "seamless access" and the "appearance to be an integrated component" and how it expects vendors to achieve this requirement?	Please see the Answer to Question 69.
87	Attachment-A: Page 61, 1.11 (Interfaces, Data Exchanges, and Integration with Evident Change Portal)	...the Future System shall integrate these tools (SDM and TDM) in accordance with the requirements below such that they can be seamlessly accessed by Future System users and appear to be an integrated component of the Future System.	In this same section, the State says that, ""The Future System shall support efficient, economical, and effective bi-directional data exchanges to exchange relevant data with systems designated as Critical in Federal CCWIS regulations." Is the State open to similar connectivity and integration (i.e data exchange) in satisfying the requirement to integrate with the Evident Change suite?	Please see the Answer to Question 69.
88	RFP: Page 23, Section 2.3.6 (Deliverables Expectation Document)	The Contractor will not perform any work on any deliverable until the DED has been approved in writing by the State.	How many days the State will have to approve DEDs?	The State expects to have at least 5 business days for the review and approval of Deliverable Expectation Documents (DEDs).
89	Attachment A: Section 1.6.2	A Client is a child who is the subject of a Referral, Investigation, Differential Response or Case. Clients are also the individual(s) who are subjects of the Referral, Investigation, Differential Response, and/or case, including but not limited to family members or other children. Clients include children who are classified as "foster care candidates" – those children who are being closely monitored in-home to ensure their safety as part of the Family First prevention plan.	Does this definition include resource family household members?	Yes, the definition of Client should include individuals who are members of a resource family household (i.e. "foster parents"). The resource family is also a form of provider paid through the Future System as well. The State will work with the Contractor to work out the specifics on this issue during the project.