

Q&A P&CS RFP #003

The deadline to submit questions was November 7, 2014 at 2pm. The question period is now closed.

Q. Question 18 Are we providing information on the total inventory of computers, photocopiers etc. of all programs or the CDRC program only?

A. *The inventory reported should be that of the proposed CDRC program.*

Q. Section V. Required attached documents J. Insurance Certificates – are we required to attach insurance certificates with application? - Exhibit 1 states “Grant recipients will be required to maintain, during the term of the contract...” - or once we become a Grant Recipient?

A. *Attachment J on the Required Attachments Checklist is the insurance certificates listed in Exhibit 1, which states “Proof of workers’ compensation insurance and disability benefits insurance must be provided with the grant application” and that “Proof of applicant’s commercial general liability insurance coverage must be submitted with the grant application.”*

Q. I am writing with a question regarding the Community Dispute Resolution Centers in New York City RFP. Question 25, for existing providers, asks us to provide case statistics from fiscal year 2013-14. However, the corresponding Chart A doesn’t list FY 2013-14, but starts with 2014-15. Can you please clarify exactly what date ranges you would like for the case statistics and future projections?

A. *There was a typo in the originally issued RFP. The question was worded correctly but the chart was labeled inaccurately. The chart has now been updated to include FY 2013-14.*

Q. Please define the following terms: Resource development plan, Internal control procedures, Multi purpose agency.

A. *The definition of resource development plan has been added to the RFP as a footnote to Question 5. The text is “A resource development plan (RDP) is a planning document that clearly articulates how an organization will manage its fundraising function as well as how it will secure the funds needed to operate existing and future programming. All RDPs should state specific funding goals, provide a budget detailing the expenses needed to implement the plan, and explain the strategies that the organization will use to obtain resources from individual, corporate, foundation, and/or government funding sources. Some RDPs also include an organizational overview, case statements, historical review of past funding sources, and analysis of the current funding climate. When the CDRC is within an umbrella organization and both the CDRC and umbrella organization have resource development plans, include that which refers to the CDRC specifically. If your organization has a resource development plan for only the overall agency, please indicate such, and then complete the answer.”*

The definition of internal control procedures has been added to the RFP as a footnote to Question 12. The text added is, “Internal controls procedures are systematic methods such as reviews, checks and balances instituted by an organization to conduct its business in an orderly and efficient manner; safeguard its assets and resources; deter and detect errors, fraud and

theft; ensure accuracy and completeness of accounting data; produce reliable and timely financial and management information; and ensure adherence to agency policies and plans.”

The definition of multi purpose agency has been added to the RFP as a footnote to Question 14. The text added is, “Multi-purpose indicates that the agency operates two or more discrete programs whose administrative costs are shared by one organizational entity. For instance, an organization operates a CDRC program and a CASA program, and splits administrative costs between the two contracts.”

Q. In Question #20, is there a typo? Shouldn't this be compared to the responses in question #19 rather than #18?

A. *Yes, it should be compared to question 19. This change has been made to the RFP.*

Q. This is our first RFP for the State instead of the City. How should we respond to questions regarding caseload when we cannot predict the City's caseload?

A. *Applications should be written to reflect the services that the applicant can reasonably anticipate delivering.*

Q. Followup: Since applicants don't know if they will receive funding from New York City, how can they assess future matching funds?

A. *This is a future timeframe application, so any future funding numbers are estimates. Use a good faith estimate of funding you can reasonably expect to apply to the operation of the proposed program.*

Q. Regarding application review, do you anticipate local stakeholders being invited to review or reviewing applications?

A. *Our typical practice is to invite local stakeholders to serve on review teams. We cannot predict whether or not these stakeholders will be able to serve, and cannot say with certainty whether or not the ultimate review team will include these local stakeholders.*

Q. When you do have information on who might join these committees, can you let us know?

A. *Time allowing, we will make an effort to update the Q&A document to include this information if review teams are finalized by November 7.*

Q. What is the acceptable or permissible level of communication with UCS after November 7, 2014?

A. *Reminder: Until 11/7/14, the **only** communication on RFP related issues is written questions to Amelia Hershberger at ahershbe@nycourts.gov. Questions may not be posed to other people or in other formats. After the question deadline, no further questions will be entertained. For current CDRC contractors, UCS staff will continue to provide its usual level of technical assistance, and can respond to questions from current contractors as long as they are not related to any part of the RFP or could be used to respond to any question within the application. Everyone must have the same access to ask questions regarding the RFP to ensure a fair process.*

Q. Once the [New York City] Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice issues their concept paper [for their upcoming RFP] in November, it may impact our responses to your proposal, and will it push boundaries on how we can talk to the ADR Office?

A. *We can't speak to what New York City may or may not include in their RFP, and cannot provide technical assistance on how you might respond to the currently issued RFP. As stated above, UCS can and will continue to provide its usual level of technical assistance with that exception.*

Q. Please explain the use of the terms "bid" and "application." Are we supposed to put in for a low price? Is that generic nomenclature coming from the state?

A. *This is an RFP for a grant contract, meaning there is a set amount of funding for each catchment area and we are asking for applications that propose a program based on that funding amount, not the lowest bid. The evaluation instrument enclosed in the RFP explains how applications will be rated.*

Q. Regarding computer software and specifically the new iteration of case reporting software that is planned for rollout in 2015, we may not know exactly what program we plan to use, so how do we account for this in our application?

A. *Use your best good faith estimate of what you propose to do for the contract period based on the information you have at this point in time.*

Q. The last RFP issued by New York City RFP had a "best and final offer" process asking CDRCs to submit further information. Is that a practice you anticipate doing?

A. *We reserve the right to request additional information if necessary, but do not do so as a matter of course.*

Q. In creating an application that responds to our community, its needs and what we plan to do, some of our responses are dependent on our non-UCS matching fund sources and their directives for types of cases and other factors. Some of those funding sources may be temporary. I'm looking for some confirmation that identifying these needs and prioritizing our intentions in light of available funding will be acceptable given that our plans may shift later on depending on what matching funds we actually receive.

A. *We understand the available amount of resources in this RFP are not sufficient to meet all of the needs of your communities. Read the rating tool because it clearly explains how applications will be evaluated (e.g., nothing in that tool states a preference for one case type over another). The application is asking that applicants propose a program based on reasonable expectations of delivery. Some elements of that program are unlikely to change based on matching fund source (for example: outreach, volunteer intake, case management services).*

Q. Could the proposal influence the level of funding or is the funding static?

A. *There are two elements to this: first, all funding is dependent upon appropriation by the legislature. The amounts articulated in the RFP are estimated funding amounts for April 1, 2015-March 31, 2016. Second, any requests for additional funding in future years would take place outside of this RFP process.*

Q. Would creative proposal affect how money is awarded? Can we put in for our dream project?

A. This is a grant RFP where the funding is set, UCS is asking for applications that create the most effective program with the funding available. Again, look to the enclosed rating tool to see how decisions will be made.

Q. Will there be an opportunity to sit down after a contract is awarded to negotiate future year budgets?

A. While the contract to be awarded will be for a five year multi year term, the RFP asks only for a 12 month budget. The budget should be for that period only and does not imply a static budget for all years within the five year term. Future annual budgets will be negotiated annually.

Q. This RFP looks similar to the RFPs issued for CDRCs outside of New York City. Are there any differences?

A. The only New York City specific change is the addition of the revenue category for the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice in Question #4. A change was also made to Question #3 to ask for the county of residence of the board members, and the rating tool reflects that change. This is not necessarily an exhaustive or complete list of all differences between RFPs issued previously and this one.

Q. In Question 21, the application asks "For each of the last three calendar years" – should this read fiscal years? Calendar year 2014 is not complete. If it is calendar years, should the years be 2011, 2012, 2013 (and not include 2014)?

A. The question correctly refers to calendar years, but the application has been updated to reflect that the calendar years that should be included are 2011, 2012 and 2013.

Q. Section V. Budget – Can you please clarify if the budget narrative for each non-personal item in our budget should be included as a separate tab in the Excel budget form, or as a separate Word-version narrative?

A. The budget narrative should be included on a separate sheet, not on the Excel budget form. The format of the narrative (Word or Excel) is at the discretion of the applicant.

Q. Question 25. The instructions state "Use Chart B to project which dispute resolution processes will be utilized." Can you please clarify if a simple 'check mark' will suffice for this table?

*A. No. Use Chart B to project the **number** of each ADR process to be utilized.*

Q. In Chart A, under Question 25, we see listed "Child Permanency" as well as "Permanency". We would like to confirm if these both refer to the same case type, or if there is a distinction between them.

A. These are the same case type, and Child Permanency has been removed from the chart for clarity.

Closing Comment: Included in this RFP are Exhibit 3, Evaluation Tool and Exhibit 9, General Guidelines for Proposal Writing. We encourage you to review this information.