Questions and Answers (Continued):

Question #7 1.1 The Bidder must demonstrate that they are the owner of the proposed Software as a Service (SaaS). Can we get a more detailed definition of "owner" in the above mandatory? Most Case Management solutions are built on top of Case Management Platforms from large ISV's. They are also most often hosted by large Cloud vendors. A clarification with more detail on the software platform and cloud platform would be appreciated.	**Answer #7** The Bidder must be the owner of the software platform. The data stored on the cloud platform must comply with safeguarding up to Protected B information and maintain confidentiality of information.
Question #8 2.1.1: Is this migration done once or is it done regularly? As part of the process we would do a onetime migration of all existing data. Once that is completed, is this feature still required?	**Answer #8** Data migration is only required for the OFOVC. It is a one-time migration of all existing data from the current case management system to the new case management system. There is no data migration needed for OIRSO.
Question #9A 2.1.3: Would it be possible to get screen shots of the current data capture screens? **Question #9B** Could we see some screenshots of the current system? Specifically, the data entry screens.	**Answer #9** Please see Attachment 1 to Questions and Answers for screen shots of the OFOVC's data fields in its current case management system. Please note that the OFOVC's existing case management system does not have sufficient data fields; therefore, the OFOVC is hoping to create more data fields in the new system to expand the information it collects (i.e., age, language, race, gender, offence, sensitive dates, etc.) which will allow better reporting. The screens shots being provided are the bare minimum and additional data entry fields are anticipated in new system. The screenshots are only available in English. There are no screenshots available for the OIRSO.
Question #10A 2.1.8: Is there a current reporting solution in place? **Question #10B**	**Answer #10** Please see Attachment 1 to Questions and Answers for screenshots of reports that can be pulled from the OFOVC's current case

RFP 1000033052

Software as a Service (SaaS) - Case Management System - Office of the Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime (OFOVC) and Ombuds and Informal Resolution Services Office (OIRSO)

2.1.8 & 2.2.24: Can we get some examples of current reports?	management system. Please note that the existing system does not have sufficient data fields for the OFOVC's current needs. The OFOVC is hoping the new case management system will have more data fields which will allow more depth and breadth to reporting.
	As noted in response to Question 9, the reporting capacity of the existing case management system is minimal and insufficient given the data fields are minimal and insufficient. The screen shots show minimum requirements for reports and the OFOVC hopes the new case management system will allow increased data collection and reporting capacity.
	There is no current reporting solution to provide details on for the OIRSO.
Question #11 2.2.9: What information is being gathered from the web form? What technology is being used?	**Answer #11** The OFOVC does not yet have an online or publicly available web form but intends to deploy one in the future under the new case management system. See Attachment 2 to Questions and Answers for a draft of the complaint form (available in English only). The OFOVC would like the new solution to support integration of e-forms and auto-populate to the new case management system. The OIRSO does not have a web-based form or draft.
Question #12 2.2.10: Can we get more details on some of your workflows?	**Answer #12** The OFOVC's current workflow, which is not automated within the existing case management system (but needs to be), is as follows: An Intake Officer receives/reviews all incoming phone calls and emails. These are triaged on the basis of urgency, and whether they are within the Office's mandate or not. The Office responds to inquiries and complaints, both of which can be in or out of mandate. If an inquiry or complaint is not in mandate, the Intake Officer reviews, tracks/logs, researches and responds by providing information about our mandate and appropriate referrals to organizations/agencies that can assist the inquirer. The draft response

	is reviewed by the Manager before being sent to the inquirer. Once responded to, the inquiry is closed.
	If an inquiry is in mandate, the workflow is similar to above. The Intake Officer reviews, tracks/logs, researches and responds by providing information about our mandate and appropriate referrals to organizations/agencies that can assist the inquirer. The draft response is reviewed by the Manager before being sent to the inquirer. Once responded to, the inquiry is closed.
	If a complaint is in mandate, the Intake Officer will advise the Manager who will assign to a Complaints Review Officer (CRO). The CRO will meet with the complainant, conduct research, analyze the information, and prepare correspondence for the agency that is the subject of the complaint. This will be reviewed and sent by the Manager. Once a response is received from the agency in question, the CRO will draft a response to the complainant. It's possible there are several emails, calls, meetings for an in-mandate complaint. Once resolved, the complaint is closed.
	The Intake Officer and CROs enter data into case files (case files are opened by inquirer name), and the Manager reviews and quality controls data entry / coding, and all outgoing correspondence to federal departments and complainants/inquirers. An inquirer may have multiple contacts over the years with the OFOVC; these are documented separately within a case file. Currently, all emails are sent to the Manager for review before being sent, and the OFOVC would like automated workflows with notifications in the case management system. We would like to see dashboards for each team member with active/open cases and we would like to have workflows that can show which stage of the process an inquiry/complaint is at (under review, consulting stakeholder, drafting response, referred to Ombuds, etc.). We would like automation of the workflow in the system so the manager receives a notification email when a document is ready for review.

	For the OIRSO:
	An Intake Officer receives/reviews all incoming phone calls and emails. These are triaged and assigned. The person assigned enters data into case files, enters all relevant information, closes the file once service is terminated. There might be multiple services for each case files.
Question #13 2.2.12: What determines if cases are similar?	**Answer #13** For the OFOVC: Cases are similar if multiple complainants write to the Office to inquire/complain – for example, multiple members of a family harmed by the same federal offender. The OFOVC would like the system to create connections between cases so if, for example, 5 complainants write to the Office about the same federal offender, the system can alert us that there is a connection/similarity (e.g., once the offender's name is entered into the system, if it's entered again in future, the system will recognize it and advise the user that there are other complainants in contact with our Office in this case). Cases could also be similar based on the subject matter being complained about. For example, if 10 complainants write to our Office about publication bans, the OFOVC would like the system to recognize who else wrote to our Office about this issue. This latter issue might be best identified via a report on trends. For the OIRSO: Cases would be considered similar if (and are not limited to): the same type of service they request, where the request is from is the same person, and the same trends per category.
Question #14 2.2.19: What are some examples of "Sensitive dates"?	**Answer #14** For the OFOVC: A sensitive date is the date of death of the victim, birth date of the victim, etc. OFOVC would enter the date in the sensitive date field based on what the complainant reports. The OFOVC would like the system to alert if/when there's a sensitive date

	upcoming when accessing a file. Ideally, the system would alert (to avoid having to check manually) before the OFOVC contacts a client to avoid reaching out on a potentially sensitive date.
	There is no definition/examples of sensitive dates for the OIRSO.
Question #15	**Answer #15**
2.2.21: How do you define that a file has been shared? How should the administrator be notified (email, in-system flag, etc.)?	An email notification to the Manager if/when a protected/confidential file (pre-identified as such) is viewed/accessed and shared by a team member outside of the system to prevent unauthorized access and ensure access is on a need-to-know basis. "Shared" would mean if any information is copied/downloaded from the system or shared with another team member in some capacity.
	Easy interface which details the files that are being shared (e.g., something similar to the sharing features in Google Drive, Dropbox, Onedrive)
Question #16	**Answer #16**
2.1 page 13 & Section 7 Annex A: In the written bid, do we need to discuss how we meet theMandatory Requirements for the Live Demo? What about all the requirements listed in Section 7 of Annex A.	In the written bid, Bidders must include the response to 1. Written Mandatory Technical Criteria and 3. Written Point Rated Technical Criteria. The 2. Live Demo criteria do not need to be submitted in writing. They are to be demonstrated during the Live Demo that will be scheduled if the bid is determined to meet the 1. Written Mandatory Technical Criteria.
	The requirements listed in Section 7 of Annex A are incorporated into the evaluation criteria. They will not be evaluated separately to determine the winning Bidder.
Question #17	**Answer #17**
Page 12: During the demonstration, do we need to show the items listed in Section 1. Written Mandatory Technical Criteria?	No, during the demonstration Bidders need to show the items listed in 2. Live Demo, 2.1 Live Demo Mandatory Technical Criteria and 2.2 Live Demo Point Rated Technical Criteria. The 1. Written Mandatory Technical Criteria and 3. Written Point Rated Technical Criteria need to be submitted in writing as part of the technical proposal.
Question #18	**Answer #18**

RFP 1000033052

Software as a Service (SaaS) - Case Management System - Office of the Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime (OFOVC) and Ombuds and Informal Resolution Services Office (OIRSO)

Page 35-36: Is there any overlap between OFOVC and OIRSO? Do they share any data or users? Are you looking to have a single installed instance of the application for both OFOVC and OIRSO where their data are isolated and not shared, or minimally shared? Or are you looking to have two complete separate installed instances of the application?	There is no overlap between the two Offices. They are completely separate and do not share data or users. The Offices have similar mandates, but different clientele, so the case management system / application could apply to both. It would be two separate installations of the application, though the data fields, workflows and reporting may be different in each Office.
Question #19 Page 38: Please describe how the optional OIRSO will be implemented? Will their implementation be included in the 16 weeks described on page 38.	**Answer #19** It will be implemented after the first installation with the OFOVC, and only if funding permits.
Question #20 Reference: **PART 7 - RESULTINGCONTRACT CLAUSES** 5. The Contractor MUST NOT utilize its Information Technology systems to electronically process, produce or store PROTECTED information until the CSP, PWGSC has issued written approval. After approval has been granted, these tasks may be performed at the level of PROTECTED B, including an IT Link at the level of PROTECTED B. Could JUS please clarify what is meant by "an IT Link at the level of Protected B"?	**Answer #20** An IT Link is a direct electronic connection between the Government's internal IT systems and the Contractor's.
Question #21 Reference: **1.1 The Bidder must demonstrate that they are the owner of the proposed Software as a Service (SaaS)** Our company is the owner of the Software asa Service but we will be partnering with another company for implementation, training, and support purposes. Is this acceptable to the Department of Justice?	**Answer #21** This is acceptable as long as the Department of Justice receives one submission in response to the RFP and both companies (as one submitting entity) are able to comply with the requirements (including security) identified in the solicitation.
Question #22 Reference: **ATTACHMENT 3 TO PART 4 – FINANCIAL EVALUATION - PRICING SCHEDULE** Under 1.4 Annual Licensing, Technical Support and Fees (for up to 20 users). Could you please clarify the exact number of users as it's unclear. The quantity says 5 under column A but the item description	**Answer #22** JUS wants an annual firm price for up to 20 users under 1.4 (regardless of how many users there actually are). The quantity is identified as five (5) because the initial contract period is for five (5) years. The price the Bidder provides should be a yearly firm price for up to 20 users, which will be multiplied by the five (5) years, to get the

says up to 20. So accurate pricing can be provided could you clarify the correct amount of users.	extended price for that component for the full initial period of the contract (firm price x quantity of 5 years).
Question #23 Reference: **ATTACHMENT 3 TO PART 4 – FINANCIAL EVALUATION - PRICING SCHEDULE** Under 2.12 Annual Licensing, Technical Support and Fees (for up to 7 users). Could you please clarify the exact number of users as it's unclear. The quantity says 5 under column A but the item description says up to 7. So accurate pricing can be provided could you clarify the correct amount of users.	**Answer #23** Please see Answer 22 above. This is the same situation, just the quantity is for up to seven (7) users in the firm price, instead of 20.
Question #24A To ensure the highest quality responses and to enable each bidder to fully answer each of the requirements, could we please request that the close date for the response being extended by 2 weeks? **Question #24B** We would like to request your consideration for an extension to June 18, 2024 to allow adequate time in designing and costing a secure Protected B environment. **Question #24C** We would be grateful if you reschedule the due date for submission to April 30th.	**Answer #24** JUS will grant a two-week extension. The amended closing date will be: Wednesday, May 8, 2024 at 2:00PM ET. Please see the Amendment 001 to the RFP that identifies the extended end date in red font on the front page.
Question #25 Under attachment 1 to part 4, section 1.1, the Mandatory Requirement – Written, states: "The Bidder must demonstrate that they are the owner of the proposed Software as a Service (SaaS)". For this requirement, is it sufficient that the bidder can demonstrate that the bidder is fully accountable for the proposed SaaS solution deployment, maintenance, management, service level agreements and any licenses and license agreement and future development of the solution?	**Answer #25** The Bidder must still demonstrate that they are the owner of the proposed SaaS Solution. What is identified in Question 25 is not sufficient on its own.

RFP 1000033052

Software as a Service (SaaS) - Case Management System - Office of the Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime (OFOVC) and Ombuds and Informal Resolution Services Office (OIRSO)