1) Regarding the Advisor Pre-proposal, what is meant by the "and the online testing of the proposed LMS solution". What is required by the Vendor for this portion?

   Response: The Government needs to access the functionality of the proposed LMS with the script provided in Section J.

2) During the Advisory Pre-Proposal stage, will the Judiciary evaluate each system on their own, with no assistance (beyond written documentation) from the proponents' staff, or will this evaluation be conducted with the active participation of the Proponents' technical team?

   Response: See #3

3) During the Advisory Pre-Proposal stage, will the Judiciary evaluate each system on their own, with no assistance (beyond written documentation) from the proponents' staff, or will this evaluation be conducted with the active participation of the Proponents' technical team? Could the Judiciary please provide additional details about the proposed methodology that will be used to evaluate competing systems at this stage (e.g. online demonstrations by vendor, free-to-roam "sandbox" environment for Judiciary use only, free-to-roam "sandbox" environment with vendor guidance, etc.)

   Response: a) No, however, the Government will contact the POCs provided in accordance with the RFP or if there is a problem accessing the system.

   b) *On-Line LMS Demonstration*: The offeror shall provide the judiciary with an online testing environment that gives the judiciary a hands-on way to determine the performance of the proposed LMS in accordance with the attached script, Attachment 2. The offeror may provide a link, website address or instructions on how to access the on-line testing environment in their response.

4) Could the Judiciary provide additional information about the tasks that its staff will expect to complete during the Advisory Pre-Proposal Stage?

   Response: See Attachment J for the Script.

5) During the Advisory Pre-Proposal stage, if only written documentation is allowed, we note that in order to ensure the success of the Judiciary's experience evaluating competing systems, additional preparation time may be required due to the delay of the final RFP. Could the deadline for the Advisory Pre-Proposal Stage be extended?

   Response: The Advisory Pre-Proposal Stage (Technical Demonstration Capability and Security Proposal) is extended to February 3, 2020 by 10:00am ET.

6) Our understanding of the Advisory Pre-proposal submission is that the **written portion** should contain **only** responses to the requirements listed in "Section 8.0 LMS Security?" Please confirm that this would be the only expected written contents of the Advisory pre-proposal response (along with a cover letter and other identifying information).

   Response: See Section L.2 (b).

7) Regarding the LMS evaluation portion of the Advisory pre-proposal submission, is the Government's expectation that this be delivered in the style of a virtual/on-site product demonstration OR are you requesting access to a Sandbox version of the LMS? What are the evaluation criteria for the LMS Advisory submission? How long will the evaluation periods be, how will they be scheduled, and will the RFQ timelines be adjusted to allow for the evaluation period?

Response: a) The Government is not seeking a demonstration from the offerors. The Government is seeking access to an on-line version as stated in Section L.2 of the RFP. b) The evaluation period for the on-line evaluation from February 4th – 11th. Each offeror will be contacted by the evening of February 3rd to set-up date and time.

8) Regarding 3.*0.c) LMS needs to be scalable for an unlimited number of users and educational assets.* Would the government provide baselines and/or ranges for number of users (qty) as well as expected size (GB) of current on-solution library of artifacts / content / documents / resources / etc.? What is the approximate number of active users (with an Active User defined as a user who takes one or more courses in the course of a year) that will make use of the AOUSC's LMS?

Response: a) Baseline for users is answered below. The current content catalog houses content (artifacts/documents/resources) roughly 1100 learning programs, which includes Skillsoft programs.

b) We anticipate an immediate need of up to approximately 20,000 single user (person IDs).

9) Regarding *4.0.b) Deactivate discontinued Skillsoft courses and related offerings.* Can the government expand on what is being asked for here? Deployment of offerings on the new platform would presumably exclude any deactivate offerings, so this should be a non-issue.

Response: While we would certainly deploy only active offerings on the new platform, it is highly likely that courses will need to be maintained (deactivated and removed) over the course of the contract. The requirement refers to ongoing maintenance of Skillsoft assets.

10) Regarding *4.0.d)Migrate the current LMS database a new solution incorporates the existing catalog of all available educational assets with course numbers, names and descriptions (content to be created and maintained by the AOUSC) with only active/available offerings displayed.* Typically, in a system migration, in addition to all actual offerings in the catalog, only historical completion records (including user profiles and course/offering information) is migrated. With respect to historical data, is this the expectation of the government. Can you please elaborate on the volume of data that needs to be migrated to your new LMS? Approximately how many completion or enrollment records need to be included as a result of this migration?

Response: There are about 80,000-person records including about 40,000 inactive (separated) records and approximately 500,000 transcript records at an average 10 transcripts per person out of the 40,000 active users plus 100,000 historical records migrated from other sources.

Will you also require that existing course content be migrated, or do you only require that existing enrollment and completion records be moved from the incumbent system to your new LMS?

Response: Yes, we anticipate existing course content being migrated.

11) What is the scope of the integration between the envisioned LMS and the Skillsoft platform? Do you expect the LMS to only present Skillsoft content as part of a course, or do you foresee the need for information to flow from Skillsoft to your new LMS and vice versa?

Response: We anticipate that the integration between the LMS and Skillsoft will enable the national level catalog to display all Skillsoft offerings, allow registration and capture course completion. In addition, the LMS should accept Skillsoft course completion records and store these in individual transcripts.

12) What is the scope of the integration between the envisioned LMS and JENIE?
Response: About 80,000 person records.

What information will be pushed from JENIE to the LMS,
Response: JENIE pushes person records from HRMIS to the LMS,

and what information will be pulled from JENIE to the LMS?
Response: Nothing will be pulled from JENIE to the LMS.

What methods (e.g. SFTP, REST API) are available to integrate your LMS platform with JENIE?
Response: REST API/Web Services.

What is the underlying platform (e.g. LDAP, PeopleSoft, SAP, etc.) that powers the JENIE system?
Response: JENIE is a proprietary system.

13) What is the scope of the integration between the envisioned LMS and your HRMIS?
Response: About 80,000 person records.

What information will be pushed from HRMIS to the LMS, and what information will be pulled from the HRMIS to the LMS?
Response: 80,000 records will be pushed/pulled by JENIE from HRMIS to the LMS.

What methods (e.g. SFTP, REST API) are available to integrate your LMS platform with the HRMIS?
Response: REST API/Web Services.

What is the underlying platform (e.g. PeopleSoft, SAP, etc.) that powers the HRMIS system?
Response: PeopleSoft.

14) Please provide a link or documentation with further information regarding the Judiciary Information Security Framework (JISF) requirements and criteria.

Response: The JISF requirements are based on NIST SP 800-53 and 800-37, it is basically a tailored version of NIST SP 800-53 and NIST SP 800-37. They are tailored to fit the independent nature of the courts so instead of saying "The system owner must, the JISF says the system owner should".

15) Regarding the Past Performance Questionnaire, will one completed questionnaire be sufficient?   Please clarify the due date for questionnaire to be received by the Administrative Office of US Courts.

Response: See Section L.2 (c)

16) When are the past performance client questionnaire responses due?

Response: See Section L.1

17) Three of our clients submitted reference questionnaires to AOUSC in July in conjunction with RFP USCA19Q0056. Will that information suffice for the current reference questionnaire?

Response: No, USCA19Q0056 was canceled. New submissions are required.

18) In what format would you like the security information presented on Jan. 15: a formal mini-proposal in PDF form, or would a letter or email suffice?

Response: See Section L.1

19) Is there a preferred GWAC?

Response: This RFP was solicited as open market.