



Question	Answer
<p>1. Does SWIFT currently issue invoices? If not, where are invoices coming from today?</p>	<p>No SWIFT issues the payment from an invoice. Invoices are currently generated by the court interpreter and psych services system that is being replaced by the new product.</p>
<p>2. For requirement I-1.9 A. What kind of forms need to be submitted? B. Is it basic information? C. How would you want to see approval occur?</p>	<p>A. Interpreter application, Interpreter Data Form, Affidavit B. Yes –Basic contact information (name, address, etc), yes/no questions, resume type information (schools attended, languages interpreted, certificates, etc.) C. Forms submitted online with an electronic approval could be an electronic signature from the submitter or a version of approval that would indicate that the information provided on the form was complete, true and correct (i.e., checkbox populated)</p>
<p>3. A. Do interpreters belong to more than one agency? B. Can they work for an agency and also do independent work?</p>	<p>A. Yes B. Yes</p>
<p>4. With MNCIS & SWIFT, there will be considerable integration. Do you have development resources in IT that can help shoulder the load? Or are you expecting a turn-key estimate with the vendor and/or partner doing everything?</p>	<p>Our preference is that the vendor do the majority of the integration development and we would provide the subject matter expertise. Please describe the options you can provide for the integration work along with costs for each option.</p>
<p>5. Can you please elaborate on the feedback requirements?</p>	<p>A feedback form or survey could be completed by persons who were provided Interpreter services in court. They would rate their experience with the Interpreter.</p>
<p>6. What kind of feedback are you looking for and in what format?</p>	<p>Form or survey completed online which a person would rate the questions by 1-4. (Strongly disagree, disagree, etc), some</p>



		checkboxes and fill in fields. This information is sent on to the program coordinator.
7.	When it comes to misconduct and sanctions, can you please explain what you'd need in regards to that?	We need the ability to track when a complaint is filed against an Interpreter/Examiner, because they engaged in some type of misconduct. The program coordinator needs to be able to add/update/delete a misconduct type for an Interpreter/Examiner, add a note regarding the misconduct, and track whether an investigation was conducted. There is a Sanction type associated with each Misconduct type entered. The complaint can be submitted various ways; form from public website, email, phone call, etc.
8.	This RFP appears to be identical to an RFP issued in March of this year. Are there any materials differences in the content or submission requirements between the two RFPs? [Section I.A.]	<p>There are substantial changes to the previous RFP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following three appendices are now for informational purposes only and do not require a response to each requirement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> VI. Court Interpreter Services Program Requirements VII. Psychiatric Psychological Examiner Services Program Requirements VIII. Technical and Report Requirements • The questions in Appendix - V. Vendor Capabilities Questionnaire have been simplified and the vendor is allowed a wider range of methods to respond to the questions. • Requirements for Training and Education were removed from both of the following appendices: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> VI. Court Interpreter Services Program Requirements



		VII. Psychiatric Psychological Examiner Services Program Requirements
9.	Can the SCAO comment on why this RFP is being reissued? [Section I.A.]	SCAO was not satisfied with the responses received from the first RFP and hope to obtain a larger number of responses with a second RFP.
10	<p>A. Has the SCAO made any attempt to correlate individual requirements between the Examiner and Interpreter systems?</p> <p>B. In other words, has any analysis been done to identify where requirements fully or partially overlap between the two sets of requirements? [Appendices VI & VII]</p>	<p>A. Yes</p> <p>B. Initial analysis has been started</p>
11	<p>A. The users of the system(s) will be assigned user roles. Has any analysis been done regarding exclusivity or non-exclusivity of the roles?</p> <p>B. For instance, can a user who is an Interpreter also be an Examiner?</p> <p>C. Could a court staff person who is a Scheduler also be an Interpreter? [Appendices VI & VII]</p>	<p>A. Initial analysis has been completed on the roles</p> <p>B. Schedulers cannot be approvers, examiners are not the interpreters. Interpreter schedulers could be approvers of interpreter invoices but would not be an examiner. They may also be an approver of examiner invoices – the same court staff could be an approver for both programs.</p> <p>C. Yes</p>
12	Requirements I-1.120 and P-1.93 indicate that the new system must send a notification to MNCIS when an Interpreter or Examiner is added to or removed from the roster. MNCIS does not support an incoming roster maintenance transaction as is described in the requirement. Is the SCAO anticipating developing new services specifically for this project to support such a transactions? [I-1.120, P-1.93]	Yes
13	Multiple requirements refer to interactions with the State's SWIFT system. Has any analysis been done to map the requirements to current transaction types supported by SWIFT?	Initial analysis has been completed to map the transaction types