



**State of Rhode Island
Department of Administration / Division of Purchases
One Capitol Hill, Providence, Rhode Island 02908-5855
Tel: (401) 574-8100 Fax: (401) 574-8387**

**Solicitation Information
September 9, 2016**

ADDENDUM # 1

RFP # 7550892

RFP Title: User Acceptance Testing Support

Bid Opening Date & Time: September 16, 2016 at 10:00 AM

Notice to Vendors:

ATTACHED ARE VENDOR QUESTIONS WITH STATE RESPONSES

NO FURTHER QUESTIONS WILL BE ANSWERED.

**Sharon Louro
Buyer I**

Interested parties should monitor this website, on a regular basis, for any additional information that may be posted.

Vendor Questions for RFP 7550892 User Acceptance Testing Support

Question 1: Is there a location requirement for the resources supporting the activities defined in the RFP? Can resources be located at alternative sites within the United States and/or outside of the United States?

Answer to question 1:

Providence RI is the preferred location for resources, but the State will consider resources located in other parts of the U.S.

Question 2: Will the state provide local work space for the staff supporting the activities defined in this RFP?

Answer to question 2:

Yes, within offices designated by the State.

Question 3: Can the staffing plan include initial ramp-up based on anticipated project/task needs or do all 36 resources need to be available on the first day of the contract?

Answer to question 3:

The State will consider either approach.

Question 4: Will the staff supporting activities defined in this RFP require access to the State test automation tool (currently JAMA) and if so, will the state provide the needed licenses? If the vendor is going to be required to provide licenses, can the state provide the necessary details so the vendor can include in pricing?

Answer to question 4:

The State will use the test automation tools JIRA and JAMA, and provide licensing. Alternatively, vendor is invited to propose alternate tools that they feel can be successfully deployed (although JIRA/JAMA will be used for SIT testing) and explain the benefits. In this case, vendor should expect to be responsible for the licenses for test support and State testers, but if the benefits outweigh the cost, the State is open to consider this.

Question 5: RFP Page/Section: General

What are the state's expectation regarding staff time on-site at the project's physical location?

Answer to question 5:

For those staff on-site in any of the State's offices, the testing standard is 8:30 to 6:00, with time allowed for lunch. Testers (State staff) normally work from 8:30 – 4:30pm, but follow-up and defect triage meetings usually run until 5:30pm or 6:00pm.

Question 6: RFP Page/Section: General

Does the state provide work space and network support for the 36 positions on a continuous basis?

Answer to question 6:

For those onsite, yes.

Question 7: RFP Page/Section: Section 2, Background Page 5

Is CSG, the IV&V vendor eligible for award of this UAT contract?

What level of effort in terms of FTE's is CSG currently providing in its UAT oversight?

Answer to question 7:

CSG's current role is organization and coordination. They are eligible to submit a proposal in response to the RFP. Currently, ongoing staffing for UAT oversight is approximately 2.0 FTEs, with some additional participation as IV&V separately.

Question 8: RFP Page/Section: SECTION 3: SCOPE OF WORK General Scope of Work Page 6

SECTION 5: COST PROPOSAL Page 11

Appendix A: Cost Proposal Consultant Services and Technical Assistance

The RFP anticipates that the UAT staffing needs to scale to workload associated with each release. Without details on each release it is difficult to bid a fixed number of hours for each of the 6 required tasks as prescribed in Appendix A for a 24-month budget and the 4 Option Renewal Years.

The state requires that vendors build a cost proposal estimating a 36 staff person UAT team.

The instructions in Appendix A indicate that "Offerors may add additional lines to this budget form to accommodate staffing patterns per task."

Are all vendors required to base their estimate of hours per task/deliverable in Appendix A on a 36 full-time UAT team, where the only difference in total costs for the 24-month budget and each option year is the hourly rate proposed by each vendor?

Assuming 36 people working 2080 hours a year for 2 years totals 149,760 hours. Please confirm that the subtotal for Appendix A should equal this number of total hours. Or can vendors bid less than a 36 full-time UAT team?

We recommend that the state award Cost Points on hourly rates, rather than total cost for the two-year budget if the number of hours per task required is not fixed at this time. Alternately, we recommend the State require costs to be submitted based on a fixed number of hours. This provides the state with an apples-to-apples comparison.

Answer to question 8:

As noted, it is difficult to project staffing specifically to support future major releases for functionality across three agencies when that roadmap is uncertain. Because the RFP calls for an estimate of 36 staff, vendors who submit proposals with different staff levels will be asked to adjust their submission or the State will make an adjustment as it sees fit to bring this to a comparable staff level for purposes of comparing the costs.

Question 9: RFP Page/Section: Specific Activities: Tasks/ Scope per UAT cycle, subsection 2, page 7

Does the state employ the JAMA reporting features or are other tools used for defect reporting? Are other reporting tools used by the project tracking?

Answer to question 9:

JIRA and JAMA are used for testing and defects, and Excel for Project Tracking. Microsoft Project tracking is currently used for a limited number of activities, and is not discouraged.

Question 10: RFP Page/Section: Specific Activities: Tasks/ Scope per UAT cycle, subsection 2, page 7

Please confirm that, at this time, the state does not expect the proposer to execute any test scripts.

Answer to question 10:

Current approach is to have all formal test scripts executed by State staff, with support by the testing support vendor. However, current support vendor does – at times – execute ad hoc scripts to determine how the system is functioning in order to respond to business questions. Vendor should have staff prepared in limited circumstances to execute scripts themselves (e.g., for small ad hoc cases, or more broadly in an emergency case, to be discussed and agreed to in advance), but this is not current standard practice.

Question 11: RFP Page/Section: SECTION 4: TECHNICAL PROPOSAL, subsection 3, page 11

Please provide the current project plan for the initial base term: October 2016 to September 2018.

Answer to question 11:

Such a project plan does not currently exist. The current Release 7.0 activities tracker primarily ends in September 2016, with the deployment of Release 7.0 and immediate follow-up activities. Separate plan documents do exist for selected functionality that will stretch beyond this time (Auto-Renewal, Open Enrollment, and Medicaid Passive Renewals), but these are limited in scope (within Q4 2016) and have not yet been integrated into a consolidated document.

Question 12: SECTION 5: COST PROPOSAL, page 11

For the purposes of bidding, how many hours should proposers use for annual cost? Should 2080 be used as the standard year for the cost proposal?

Answer to question 12:

2,080 is a good assumption for the standard year. Current assumption is that 45 hours will be worked by staff as the target for a normal week, but holidays and PTO will reduce that total.

45 hrs/week x 52 weeks = 2,340 annual hours – 29 total holidays/PTO days = 2,079 annual hours

Question 13: Page 3 of the RFP indicates that unless otherwise stipulated, that pricing submitted is to be a firm and fixed price. There is no mention of the pricing being on a Time and Materials basis however, the nature of the RFP (i.e., no defined scope for releases, a stated potential for the State to increase or decrease the number of staff, indication of a need to ramp staffing levels up and down to support peak activity, etc.) indicates the need for a flexible staffing model to support the tasks defined. Is this to be a Time and Materials contract? If not, please provide the details of each release for the proposed contract timeframe.

Answer to question 13:

Price should be fixed at the requested staffing level of 36 staff. However, per the proposal, the State reserves the right to increase or decrease the number of staff to accommodate requirements. These adjustments would be reviewed with the vendor and would cause a price adjustment on an equivalent time and materials basis using the hourly rates by level for the

staff. If there are additional cost considerations that would need to be accounted for with staff increases/reductions beyond hourly rates, vendors should describe these factors and cost implications in their response, so that the State can factor them in to the review and future planning.

Question 14:

Does the 10-page limit include samples of deliverables and/or Executive Summary?

Answer to question 14:

Yes

Question 15: Is the expectation that vendor will assist with UAT for Health Insurance Programs (Medicaid and Marketplace) and Human Services programs (SNAP/TANF)?

Answer to question 15:

Yes

Question 16: Since major releases were not included in the proposal, is the expectation for the proposed work plan to document timelines needed for each release testing efforts?

Answer to question 16:

For the purposes of timeline inclusion, work plans should use the assumption of four new functionality releases per year (quarterly).

Question 17: Please confirm the following release schedule:

- Proposed Release 1 – December 31, 2016
- Proposed Release 2 – March 31, 2017
- Proposed Release 3 – June 30, 2017
- Proposed Release 4 – September 30, 2017

Answer to question 17:

The December 31, 2016 release is more likely to be a series of smaller M&O and warranty fix releases than a single, large planned release. The 2017 target releases are a good planning assumption.

Question 18: How many releases are planned for the period October 2017 through September 2018?

Answer to question 18:

Four major functionality releases with monthly smaller M&O releases. UAT has traditionally not been performed for the M&O releases.

Question 19: Is Task 6 “Open Enrollment and/or Other Special Timeframe Testing/Support” included in the four anticipated releases for 2017? Or, is Task 6 intended to represent an entirely separate work stream?

Answer to question 19:

This has the potential to be a separate work stream, with changes potentially included within the M&O release. The target would be to implement significant new changes in one of the planned for major releases (e.g., for new Auto-Renewal / Open Enrollment functionality to be included in the release for the end of September 2017). However, it is possible that during the Open Enrollment period, we need to test specific scenarios that are causing a significant number of customer issues and/or the proposed fixes or workarounds for those issues in order to either rapidly deploy a fix or be able to communicate a preferred workaround to our field staff and/or customers.

Question 20: Based on the answers to the questions and their significance to the cost proposal, is The State anticipating an extension to the proposal submission deadline, if answers are not released in a timely manner?

Answer to question 20:

Yes

Question 21: Does The State anticipate an equal distribution of the 36 resources between the agencies for UAT?

Answer to question 21:

No. The State expects that the vendor team will develop a set of core subject-matter experts in the specific policies and rules of the different programs, and support this with more generalized team members whose focus is on the tools and reporting, the planning of test segments for optimal testing, management of the overall process, etc. Given the disparate number of specific programs for DHS and complex Medicaid vs. MAGI or QHP, this staffing is likely to be uneven, however, team ratios would also need to adjust based upon the functionality included in a specific release (e.g., if a particular release is agreed to be 80% DHS-related changes, SMEs for other programs would need to adapt and assist based on that functionality).

Question 22: RFP Page # 6 RFP Section #3

The State says that there will be quarterly releases. Does the State have specific dates for these releases?

Answer to question 22:

No, not at this time. Per the above, planning on releases at the end of March, June, September, and December is appropriate.

Question 23: RFP Page # 7 RFP Section #3

The RFP says that State staff will be conducting the execution of scripts, does the State anticipate that the vendor will be conducting any script execution?

Answer to question 23:

(Same answer as question 10)

Current approach is to have all formal test scripts executed by State staff, with support by the testing support vendor. However, current support vendor does – at times – execute ad hoc scripts to determine how the system is functioning in order to respond to business questions. Vendor should have staff prepared in limited circumstances to execute scripts themselves (e.g., for small ad hoc cases, or more broadly in an emergency case, to be discussed and agreed to in advance), but this is not current standard practice.

Question 24: RFP Page #7 RFP Section #3

How many staff members are part of the Contact Center and Field Office Floor?

Answer to question 24:

This number will vary significantly by size and specific content of the releases, and may be adjusted within the span of testing for a specific release as deemed needed by leadership to hit testing targets.

Question 25: RFP Page #10 RFP Section # 3

The State is requesting 36 individuals in this RFP, will these individuals all be onsite at the same time and if so, where will they be located? Is the responding vendor responsible for creating an office or will they be provided working spaces?

Answer to question 25:

Please see replies to Questions 1, 2, and 3

Additionally, it is acceptable to propose that a limited number of vendor staff be located off-site, supporting remotely as the standard, but the vendor will be responsible for articulating this in advance and explaining why that arrangement is of benefit and how that staff will be able to perform at full effectiveness vs. being on-site.

Question 26: RFP Page #10 RFP Section #4

Are the deliverables to be included as part of the proposal response or as an appendix?

Answer to question 26:

Deliverables can be included as an appendix.

Question 27: Will we receive a consolidated response for the set of questions posted from all vendors responding to this RFP?

Answer to question 27:

Yes

Question 28: Are there any other vendor requirements outside those listed in the RFP that would restrict vendor qualification to participate and be awarded the contract to complete the services listed in the RFP?

Answer to question 28:

No

Question 29: Can Rhode Island Department of Administration share the list of organizations responding to this RFP?

Answer to question 29:

The list of respondents will be made available after conclusion of the RFP process.

Question 30: Is Rhode Island Department of Administration opposed to resources that are not US Citizens (i.e. Green Card, H1B, etc.)?

Answer to question 30:

No

Question 31: What is the software development methodology (Agile, Waterfall, Hybrid etc.)?

Answer to question 31:

Hybrid, primarily waterfall

Question 32: What is the current size of the QA organization at Rhode Island Department of Administration, UHIP project?

Answer to question 32:

There is no QA team at the Department of Administration.

Question 33: What is the size of InRhodes & RI Bridges development & testing team per release?

Answer to question 33:

The size of the development team per release changes according to the release size. InRhodes staffing is reducing as a result of the implementation of RIBridges. Approximately 130 staff supporting development and testing, although that staff number is fluid.

Question 34: Since we will be required to work with Deloitte & CSG, are there any pre-defined SLA's for information sharing?

Answer to question 34:

None at this time

Question 35: How many applications are in scope for the UHIP?

Answer to question 35:

UHIP support will be primarily for the RIBridges application, which integrates a worker-portal and multiple web-based front-end customer self-service portals. The combined application has interfaces to a number of federal and State systems, including key interfaces to the state MMIS system for managing Medicaid enrollments. In addition, the State has a series of data marts recently built that connect exclusively to the RIBridges system.

Question 36: When is the first UAT support expected for RIBridges?

Answer to question 36:

October 2016

Question 37: What is an M & O release?

Answer to question 37:

Maintenance and Operations, an implementation of vendor and State tested application functionality, which has State approval. These are smaller releases that normally happen once per month, although sometimes more frequently.

Question 38: We understand that UAT support is required apart from releases at key business time frames. How many such requests are expected in a year?

Answer to question 38:

While this is not possible to predict accurately, plan for 2 such requests per year. If a staffing adjustment is required due to these non-release requests, it would follow the processes described above for pricing staffing changes.

Question 39: What is the size of InRhodes & RI Bridges development & testing team supporting each release?

Answer to question 39:

(Same as question 33)

The size of the development team per release changes according to the release size. InRhodes staffing is reducing as a result of the implementation of RIBridges. Approximately 130 staff supporting development and testing, although that staff number is fluid.

Question 40: For the applications in scope please also provide a business overview and the details of size of application with respect to no. of screens / function points / requirements / use case points.

Answer to question 40:

Number of screens and function points are not easily available at this time, but a total of 1210 high-level functional requirements were identified and met through more detailed design and testing.

Question 41: What are the compliance regulations that the UHIP project needs to adhere to, for ex. USDA, SNAP, HIPAA etc.?

Answer to question 41:

The UHIP project must be in compliance with USDA and all other federal regulations (FNS, CMS, CCIIO, NIST, HIPAA, etc). The UHIP application is required to meet strict privacy and security requirements to receive an authority to connect (ATC).

Question 42: We understand that UAT execution will be done by State Contact Center, DHS, and EOHHS staff. Is it performed from a single work location or not? If not, please share details of the other work locations?

Answer to question 42:

Locations within Providence, Cranston, at a minimum, will be used.

Question 43: What are the application technologies? Is it a web or thick client?

Answer to question 43:

Web-based application for both the worker and customer portals.

Question 44: Based on the type of testing and the technology stack identified, the hourly rates for the resources may vary. Therefore are we allowed to provide a range of rates in the cost proposal for QA services or will we be allowed re-negotiate the rates once the technology stack and tools are finalized?

Answer to question 44:

A set range for each is preferred.

Question 45: Are there any existing test management and defect management tools being used by Rhode Island Department of Administration? If yes, please list them and share the existing tool licenses?

Answer to question 45:

See the replies to questions 4 and 9.

Question 46: Do you have any kind of test process framework in place? If yes, please detail out the process framework (Test strategy, planning, execution and defect management process)

Answer to question 46:

Current test process framework is unique by vendor supporting each of the three agencies. The State does not intend to share these. Vendors are being asked to detail the framework they would bring to assist the State.

Question 47: It is mentioned "This technical proposal should be based on 36 individuals". Does it mean a Core UAT team of 36 or does this include additional support that maybe called to support executions?

Answer to question 47:

36 is the full team size

Question 48: Could you please provide a break down by role (eg: Project Manager, Lead, Test Analyst, Functional Analyst etc.) for the 36 resources?

Answer to question 48:

This is part of the information that the State is looking to receive from each vendor providing a response.

Question 49: It is mentioned "Vendor to provide resources on days, nights, and/or weekends". Does Rhode Island Department of Administration expects 24* 7 support all the time or as per business requirements?

Answer to question 49:

In addition to the above-mentioned standard workday, occasional overtime hours which extend the workday, or add weekend workdays, is expected, based upon the conditions of the specific release.

Question 50: What is the preferred service delivery model? (For example: All Onsite, Onsite-Offshore)

Answer to question 50:

All onsite

Question 51: Refer: 3. Work plan; Does Rhode Island Department of Administration expects any specific number of test cases? Or covering any specific modules?

Answer to question 51:

Number of test cases and modules/functionalities to be covered will be dependent upon the scope of the releases, which is not currently available.

Question 52: As this is a multi-year engagement, with a multi-year extension are there are fixed rules or guidelines from the State of Rhode Island governing annual COLA increases?

Answer to question 52:

The State of Rhode Island provides for COLAs in select situations. However, we expect cost proposals relating to this RFP will not include COLA provisions.

Question 53: Is the vendor expected to provide a test plan/Roadmap for entire duration of 2 years or for the next release?

Answer to question 53:

The entire 2 years

Question 54: RFP Section # 2 | RFP Section Title Back ground | RFP Page #6

As mentioned in the RFP – RIBridges is one of the applications to be tested. Could you please elaborate how many health/social benefits program is supported on RIBridges? What is the technological platform of RIBridges? What is the monthly case volume handled by RIBridges?

Answer to question 54:

The platform supports approximately 48 different Human Services and Health programs (numbers can vary slightly depending upon the methodology for counting the programs). The application is a custom built J2EE application that leverages numerous COTS products from Oracle, IBM, HP, Perceptive and others.

*The RIBridges system goes live on 9/13/16 so accurate monthly case volumes are not yet available from that system, but the following are current approximate monthly volumes from the current systems:
InRhodes : 12,000 applications; 14,000 changes, 10,00 re-determinations
HIX: 4,000 applications, 190,000 web visits for changes /account review (varies based on time of year)*

Question 55: RFP Section # 2 | RFP Section Title Back ground | RFP Page #6

As per RFP, Go Live date for RIBridges application is summer 2016. Is RIBridges application has been released into production for Customer use?

Answer to question 55:

RIBridges is going live in September 2016.

Question 56: RFP Section # 3 | RFP Section Title General Scope of Work | RFP Page #6

For the 2017 fiscal year, for costing purposes, it is anticipated that there will be 4 releases – Does the 4 releases mentioned by RI, is planned to be deployed in UAT Environment as well. Also can you provide visibility on the typical intervals for each release including the capabilities involved in each releases?

Answer to question 56:

Please reference answers above as they relate to release timing. Specific release content has not yet been determined.

Question 57: RFP Section # 3 | RFP Section Title General Scope of Work | RFP Page #6

As per the information provided by RI State that UAT would probably start from October 2016. Before that happens, is there a transition phase involved wherein the vendor will be provided with functional knowledge and technical information on the system or capabilities being built?

Answer to question 57:

The State would provide technical information, but it would be the vendor's responsibility to acquire functional knowledge, i.e. familiarity with the business.

Question 58: RFP Section # 3 | RFP Section Title General Scope of Work RFP | Page #6

Will the State provide any SME support for any clarifications raised by the Vendor and what will be a typical turn- around time to receive the clarification?

Answer to question 58:

State policy and operational staff will be made available to vendor, as will knowledgeable Deloitte and/or other State vendor technical staff. Turnaround time will vary based upon the complexity of the request, but for typical questions, a turn-around time of 1 – 3 days is normal.

Question 59: RFP Section # 3 | RFP Section Title General Scope of Work | RFP Page #6

Looking at the RFP as a whole, we see that the need it only for Functional testing. Can you please clarify whether you envisage the UAT Support team to perform non-functional testing such as Accessibility testing or Performance testing, etc.? If so then can you please elaborate on the same?

Answer to question 59:

Accessibility testing capabilities are desired under the umbrella of User Acceptance Testing, and vendors are invited to describe their capabilities and methodology for this. Performance testing will be handled by the Systems Integrator and is out of scope for UAT.

Question 60: RFP Section # 3 | RFP Section Title: Specific Activities: Tasks/ Scope per UAT cycle / UA TC Creation and Test script execution co-ordination | RFP Page #7

RI State is currently using JAMA as the Test Management tool for now. In case if the current tool is subject to change, what will be the other tools that will be in place in replacement of JAMA? Also can you elaborate on other testing tools available to the UAT Support team (for automation, for test data management, etc.)

Answer to question 60:

See the replies to questions 4 and 9

Question 61: RFP Section # 3 | RFP Section Title: Specific Activities: Tasks/ Scope per UAT cycle / Defect Workaround, Business Process, and Training Support | RFP Page #7

Vendor will contribute to the creation and delivery of training for field and contact center staff content – can you please clarify whether this training mentioned in this section pertains to training as part of OCM (Org Change Management) or is this a training to enable the users to perform UAT Test Execution.

Answer to question 61:

Both. Primarily UAT Test execution, but because the UAT support vendor will develop a detailed knowledge of the new system functionality through preparation and testing support, they may also be called upon to provide feedback on training materials related to the functional training for field staff.

Question 62: RFP Section # 3 | RFP Section Title: Specific Activities: Tasks/ Scope per UAT cycle / Defect Workaround, Business Process, and Training Support | RFP Page #7

Vendor will contribute to the creation and delivery of training for field and contact center staff content - Can the State elaborate what kind of training materials needs to be delivered so as to provide training, is it a text based content in any word documents or in any form of Audio/Video mode.

Answer to question 62:

As above, creation of training content will not be the responsibility of the UAT vendor, however, the vendor will definitely be asked to review content created by others and provide feedback on ways to improve/modify the training to potentially make it more accurate and/or more relevant for field staff.

Question 63: RFP Section # 3 | RFP Section Title: Special Enhancement Activities | RFP Page #8

It's mentioned that vendor may be required to perform specific enhancement activities not already included under Tasks 1 through 6. Please elaborate on the specific enhancement activities and nature of it? Do you have a projection on how many of such special enhancement requests the team will get involved in a course of 1 year?

Answer to question 63:

An example of participation in specific enhancements requests could be development and loading of automated test scripts to facilitate regression testing. These special projects would be reviewed with the vendor in advance of beginning and either would be able to be accomplished by the proscribed 36 staff or would be subject to the same terms for increase in staff as other exception scope / work requests.

Question 64: RFP Section # 5 | RFP Section Title: Cost Proposal | RFP Page #11

The Cost Proposal section mentions about ramp-up and ramp-down of the staffing. We assume that this RFP is soliciting a Time and Material response? Please confirm.

Answer to question 64:

A Fixed Price response is being sought by the State, but with the acknowledgement that the uncertainty in scope at this time means that it will be administered in many ways as a Time & Material agreement as staffing is reduced or increased from the baseline agreed to Fixed Price as dictated by the scope of the work.

Question 65: RFP Section # 5 | RFP Section Title: Cost Proposal | RFP Page #11

For any ramp-up and ramp-down in team size, it is important on how the demand capacity is managed. It is very important that a clear cut projections on staffing is agreed upon fairly before so that any ramp-ups and ramp-downs do not impact the releases. What is the lead time provided for any team size changes?

Answer to question 65:

The State is expecting the vendor to provide recommendations.

Question 66: RFP Section # 5 | RFP Section Title: Cost Proposal | RFP Page #11

What do you see as the minimum team size and maximum team size for the UAT Support team in a year?

Answer to question 66:

The State is expecting the vendor to provide recommendations.

Question 67: Is there an approved or anticipated budget for this project? If so, what does the State anticipate allocating to these services?

Answer to question 67:

The State does not have an approved or anticipated budget for these services, but will be evaluating options based upon vendor responses.

Question 68: Does the State anticipate replacing CSG or using this engagement to supplement staff?

Answer to question 68:

At this time, CSG is anticipated to continue in its current role providing high-level organization and review of the UAT work. This is only at a level of 1 – 2 FTEs at any given point in time, however, and is not anticipated to increase beyond this level, unless CSG intends to submit a response to this RFP parallel to other vendors.

Question 69: What is the estimated number of test scenarios anticipated for this engagement? What is the breakdown by phase and/or application (the HIX system and RIBridges)?

Answer to question 69:

Test scenario numbers and breakdown by functionality will be dependent upon the content of releases; this is not known at this time.

Question 70: What is the estimated number of hours per go-live (or forward development) per application?

Answer to question 70:

Based upon the assumptions elaborated so far of: 36 staff, 2,080 hours per staff per year, and 4 releases per year, the average targeted hours per release would be: 18,720.

Question 71: The RFP mentions an expected go-live for RIBridges during the summer of 2016. What is the current status of this go-live?

Answer to question 71:

It is going live in September 2016.

Question 72: Are there any critical regulatory dates in conjunction with either system?

Answer to question 72:

There are a number of dates that are important by each program (too many specifics to list in a meaningful way here). The primary time-frame to be aware of is Open Enrollment (November 1st – January 31st) for commercial health insurance through the Exchange, as volumes and federal scrutiny both increase during this time-period.

Question 73: Is there a standard contract in connection with this RFP and/or similar engagements?

Answer to question 73:

The successful vendor is expected to work with the authorized agency to negotiate a contract during the tentative selection phase, which will incorporate the bid proposal, terms of this Request for Proposals, and the State's General Conditions of Purchase. The RFP and State's General Conditions of Purchase may be obtained at the Rhode Island Division of Purchases Home Page by Internet at www.purchasing.ri.gov