

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # ITD-170221
Addendum

Dated: 11/08/2017

The following is additional information regarding Request for Proposal # ITD-170221, titled "Project Quality Management for New Records Management System for Seattle Police Department" released on 10/11/2017. The due date and time for responses will remain as 11/16/2017 @ 1:00PM (Pacific). This addendum includes both questions from prospective proposers and the City's answers, and revisions to the RFP. This addendum is hereby made part of the RFP and therefore, the information contained herein shall be taken into consideration when preparing and submitting a proposal.

| Item # | Date Received | Date Answered | Consultant's Question | City's Answer | RFP Revisions |
|--------|---------------|---------------|--|---|---------------|
| 1 | 10/20/17 | 10/26/17 | Is there an incumbent vendor currently providing these services? | No | None |
| 2 | 10/20/17 | 10/26/17 | What is the budget for this project? | None specified | None |
| 3 | 10/20/17 | 10/26/17 | Can companies from Outside USA can apply? | Yes | None |
| 4 | 10/20/17 | 10/26/17 | Will we need to come over (Seattle) there for meetings? | Yes | None |
| 5 | 10/20/17 | 10/26/17 | Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada) | Possibly, but most tasks will require the consultant to be on-site. | None |
| 6 | 10/20/17 | 10/26/17 | Can we submit the proposals via email? | No. Please review the RFP for submittal instructions. | None |
| 7 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | The RFP references COTS implementation experience in Public sector (at least 1 of the 2), would you be open to our equivalent experience in a not-for-profit or Private sector? | No | None |
| 8 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | The RFP references COTS implementation experience. However, would you be open to considering experience in implementing custom software, integrating with existing COTS or a blend of COTS and custom development? | No | None |
| 9 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | a) What is the expectation as to when in the project lifecycle this will be performed? Week 1 of project? | PQA Work is performed throughout the project lifecycle. See Scope of work (5.1 Activities and Deliverables) | None |

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # ITD-170221
Addendum

Dated: 11/08/2017

| | | | | | |
|----|----------|---------|--|--|------|
| | | | <p>b) Is the expectation that this will be both a project risk assessment as well as a project health check?</p> <p>c) Are you requesting that this be a one-time or recurring activity?</p> | | |
| 10 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Please confirm that this activity represents the report coming out of the two activities – 1) Initial Assessment of Project State & Context and 2) Analysis for Quality Outcomes within Project Context | Yes | None |
| 11 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Please clarify expectations relative to the content of this communication plan. Will this be an addendum to communication plans that would be developed to support other project activities? What level of ongoing communication specific to quality support is necessary/expected? | This communication plan is how the PQA consultant will communicate with the project stakeholders during their engagement. This is *not* the project communication plan for internal project teams or the Organizational Change Management (OCM) Communication Plan. | None |
| 12 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | <p>a) Please elaborate on the scope of the quality management effort. Is it to include project deliverables and artifacts only? If not, what else is to be included?</p> <p>b) Is the project process improvement plan a set of improvement activities identified in the prior analysis? If not, what is the proposed scoped of this plan?</p> <p>c) Is there an expectation that there will be different sets of quality measures and</p> | The scope identifies the deliverables produced from the activities. In your proposal you can recommend additional or scope activities or deliverables. The scope of the improvement plan is based on the Initial Assessment of Project State & Context; Analysis for Quality Outcomes within Project Context; Findings & Recommendations. Regarding quality measures, the PQA consultant measure should appropriate to the item (artifact, or quality metrics for the QA product testing). | None |

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # ITD-170221
Addendum

Dated: 11/08/2017

| | | | | | |
|----|----------|---------|--|---|------|
| | | | definitions? (e.g. quality measure for design artifacts vs. quality metrics for QA testing) | | |
| 13 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | <p>a) There are references to both quality assurance activities and quality audits in this section. These are typically related but discreet activities. Is this your expectation as well?</p> <p>b) Is there an expectation that the resources conducting the quality audits will have a measure of independence from the on-going quality assurance activities?</p> <p>c) Some of the activities imply a measure of project risk management vs. classic quality assurance measures. Is the expectation that project risk management be in scope for this RFP as well as quality assurance activities?</p> | <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> | None |
| 14 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Can you elaborate more on the expected level of involvement related to these activities? What is the nature of the participation? What is the duration of this activity and what is the nature of feedback you are expecting? | See the outcomes of each activity for elaboration. The nature of the participation for assurance and audits is 'third party independent' (see section 3). Nature of duration based on the project plan milestones. The nature of the feedback is best practice recommendations against items of high risk, etc. | None |
| 15 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Is the expectation that the risk profile will be created at the outset of the project and refreshed on an ongoing basis? If so, what is the frequency of the refresh? Is this supposed to covered as part of the quarterly risk assessment only? | Yes. Please see outcomes of Analysis for Quality Outcomes within Project Context in section 5.1 (last bullet). | None |

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # ITD-170221
Addendum

Dated: 11/08/2017

| | | | | | |
|----|----------|---------|---|---|------|
| 16 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Risks and Issues tracking is typically and activity performed by project management on the client and system integrator team. Is this intended to replace or supplement the activities of those project managers? | The PQA consultant risk baseline is incorporated into the project's risk register and followed up on by the City's project manager and its stakeholders. | None |
| 17 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Are there any constraints to the functionality or configuration of SPD's instance of RMS based on the South Bay Consortium or will each participating agency have their own unique instance and configuration of Mark 43? | The Mark43 solution is a cloud software-as-a-service (SaaS). The Mark43 customer platform is shared by all its customers and therefore any features implemented into their RMS solution are available for all their customers to use. | None |
| 18 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Please define the compliance requirements for WMBE participation. Does not participating in the WMBE program disqualify a submission? | If the proposer is not a WMBE, then you must subcontract some of the work to a WMBE. If the proposer is a WMBE, they may perform 100% of the work themselves without subcontracting any of the work. | None |
| 19 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | We see in the proposal that we are required to provide project management experience for previous implementations of COTS solutions; we were curious if we are able to employ and use experience from a custom-built solution, which is what we would propose. | The project requires experience with COTS as stated in the minimum Requirements. | None |
| 20 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | The current minimum qualifications require a combination of QA and project management experience. Many experienced QA consultants started out as project managers but have only performed QA services for the past several years. Would you consider a) removing the requirement for project management COTS implementation experience, or b) revising the requirement to: "The consultant must have provided Project Quality Management consulting for at least 4 completed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The PQA consultant must have at least 7 years of project management experience. b) The requirement will not be revised. | None |

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # ITD-170221
Addendum

Dated: 11/08/2017

| | | | | | |
|----|----------|---------|---|--|--|
| | | | projects within the last 7 years on projects with organizational impact of 1500 or more implementing COTS based system in the public sector. All of these projects must have been performed for a public-sector client.” | | |
| 21 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | The insurance requirements document (Appendix A) attached to the RFP requires the QA contractor to obtain Technology Errors and Omissions insurance (in addition to General Commercial Liability Insurance) in the amount of \$1,000,000. We understand the need for Technology Errors and Omissions insurance for a vendor doing coding, but in our experience, it is both unusual and unnecessary for a QA consultant to purchase such insurance. Since none of our other clients require this, can this provision be a) removed, or b) addressed at the time of contracting? | Agreed, Technology Errors and Omissions insurance is not required for this project. | Technology Errors and Omissions insurance removed from the Insurance Requirements. |
| 22 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | What authority will be given to implement process improvements and recommendations? | The Project Steering Committee has authority to approved recommendations. Where the Project Steering Committee is undecided we have an Executive Steering Committee who can make the decision. | None |
| 23 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | How many stakeholders will we need to have access to for initial assessment interviews? | There are approximately 137 stakeholders on the project. The initial assessment should be with the project support team, the project leadership team, Project Steering Committee, Executive Steering Committee, and possibly some business subject matter experts ranging from approximately 34-80 depending on the topics of your assessment. | None |

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # ITD-170221
Addendum

Dated: 11/08/2017

| 24 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Will the project take a waterfall or agile approach? How experienced is your staff in using these project methodologies? | The project will take a waterfall approach with an agile style iteration for configuration and data conversion/migration. The project support team (project managers, workstream managers, and business analysts) have experience with project in general and mostly leaning toward waterfall. | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|---------|---|---|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|----|-------------------|----|--------------------|----|-----------------|----|--------------------|---|------------|----|------|
| 25 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | How many "parallel workstreams" are expected? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workstream 1: New RMS Tenant & Configuration • Workstream 2: Integration • Workstream 3: Data Conversion/Migration • Workstream 4: Employee Information Management Independence • Workstream 5: Data Extracting (likely to lag start-up dependent on some workstream 3 activities) | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 26 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | How many project team members are expected? | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Team Domain</th> <th>Count of Display Name</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Focus Groups</td> <td>36</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Intergovernmental</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project Governance</td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project Support</td> <td>19</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Technical Services</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Technology</td> <td>13</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Team Domain | Count of Display Name | Focus Groups | 36 | Intergovernmental | 15 | Project Governance | 25 | Project Support | 19 | Technical Services | 3 | Technology | 13 | None |
| Team Domain | Count of Display Name | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Focus Groups | 36 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Intergovernmental | 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Governance | 25 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Support | 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Technical Services | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Technology | 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Is there a defined timeline provided by the RMS vendor, and does the PM schedule reconcile with that? | The current schedule is preliminary (prior to Phase A which has 'correct scope' as the outcome). At the start of Phase B, the project intends to conduct work breakdown structure based on the Phase A outcomes along with Mark43 to ensure we both agree with the activities, dependencies, and durations. This work to produce the project plan and schedule is | None | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # ITD-170221
Addendum

Dated: 11/08/2017

| | | | | | |
|----|----------|---------|--|---|------|
| | | | | scheduled to start ^ finish through a workshop style effort the week of Nov 27 th . | |
| 28 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | When is Project Management Plan due to be completed? | The Project Management Plan will come together after the project plan and schedule are complete between Dec 4-15. | None |
| 29 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | What is the deliverable at the end of an "iteration"? | This question is too vague. Need clarification. | None |
| 30 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | What is the deliverable required for "offering assistance to improving implementation of processes"? | The outcomes of "offering assistance to improving implementation of processes" will be captured in the Monthly Audit Reports & Summary Presentations. | None |
| 31 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | To whom is this role accountable? | Directly to the Seattle Police Executive/Project Sponsors and indirectly to the Seattle IT Project Quality Manager. | None |
| 32 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Is there a governance committee overseeing the project? | Yes | None |
| 33 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | What measures will be in place to ensure consultant gains access to the information/people required to review? | Stakeholder analysis is complete and available. Project information is stored on the City's SharePoint Online (SPO). | None |
| 34 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | What is relationship of consultant to overall project manager? | The project manager works with the PQA Consultant to assist with identification of stakeholders and access to the project artifacts and deliverables. The project manager would also be interviewed and provides known risks to the PQA Consultant. | None |
| 35 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Is there a RACI built to delineate how the various project managers will share / divide responsibilities? | Yes. A RACI was built in August to identify responsibilities between the project manager and the workstream managers. | None |
| 36 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | What kind of appetite does team have for application of LEAN principles? | Cannot speak for every team member. Generally LEAN principles are not formally used; however, | None |

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # ITD-170221
Addendum

Dated: 11/08/2017

| | | | | | |
|----|----------|---------|--|---|------|
| | | | | with the project work and business processes transformations teams always approached with the business value and efficiencies. | |
| 37 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Related to scope management: How has configuration vs customization been defined by the vendor (Mark43)? | There is no customization. It is a software-as-a-service (SaaS) cloud solution on a shared platform that all the Mark43 customers use. The Mark43 RMS will be configured using Mark43 configuration methods. | None |
| 38 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | 5.1 question, Section 2 -- Analysis for Quality Outcomes within Project Context -- Analyze techniques for controlling cloud platform development and configuration outside of the NRMS project control. What is deliverable? | Quality Management Plan | None |
| 39 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | When is Baseline Risk Profile due? | That will be set after engagement and integrated into the project plan based on the timing of the activities and should be expected early in the engagement. | None |
| 40 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Do they have a DevOps process defined for continuous integration? | Absolutely. | None |
| 41 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Is there a document repository of the organizational-based processes? | During the project, it is expected to use SharePoint Online (SPO) and after transition, the repository will be setup under the business SPO sites or file servers. | None |
| 42 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | Are there multiple sets of best practices based on stakeholders? | Not sure what this question is getting at. There are structured processes based on the Seattle Police Manual for sworn. Varying processes occur in investigations depending on the unit where we expect to formalize the process of tracking the work. The Civilian units generally have unit manuals also based on policies. | None |

City of Seattle Request for Proposal # ITD-170221
Addendum

Dated: 11/08/2017

| | | | | | |
|----|----------|---------|---|---|------|
| 43 | 11/01/17 | 11/8/17 | At the initiation phase, will we have an opportunity to define key deliverables mapping to the activities required? | We are past initiation stage. We are in the planning stage. The PQA would likely not define key deliverables unless it is specific to the PQA scope. The PQA would recommend key deliverables or other missing components in the work breakdown structure and that is encouraged. | None |
|----|----------|---------|---|---|------|