

Is the contract budget for the whole duration of the contract or is it an annual budget?	The budget is for the whole duration of the contract. Please note the change in the amended RFQQ recently sent to potential bidders.
Should we assume the contract will be issued as Time & Materials	Yes.
If we submit our electronic copy by the deadline (May 31st 4:00pm), may the 2 original hard copy versions be sent Fed Ex on the 31st to be received by PSP on June 1st	The submission deadline is changed to 4:00 p.m. PDT June 14, 2011. Puget Sound Partnership should receive all versions of your proposal by this time and date.
<p>On Page 14 under "Identification of Costs (Scored)", it's mentioned that all hourly rates and total cost PER TASK should be quoted.</p> <p>I am assuming that the Tasks refer to the items listed under Objective on Page 3-4 Numbers 1-5. Does the PER TASK refer to the general numbers of tasks (1-5) or each individual bulleted item under the numbers 1-5</p>	The tasks are those bulleted items that require a 'deliverable' to Puget Sound Partnership underneath each number listed on pages 3 and 4 of the RFQQ.
<p>Much of the wording of the RFP directly or indirectly points to the results chains approach to developing performance goals and indicators. Though the RFP states that the "resulting outcome map(s) integrate, to the extent possible, with results chains (i.e., outcome maps) previously developed by the Partnership", the language specific to this approach in the requirements under Task 1, and the specific experience required, suggest that the PSP is looking for someone with specific experience in the results chain approach, versus other accepted methods of arriving at an evaluation framework for stewardship and public outreach/collaboration programs. Is this a fair statement?</p>	Yes
<p>More specifically, will proposers who have directly worked with the results chains approach (and with the PSP in using this approach) be given preference in the scoring of proposals?</p>	<p>Submittals from firms who have worked previously with PSP will not receive scoring preference. Submittals demonstrating direct experience with the tasks described under Section 1.2 - Objective will likely score higher than those that do not. Submittals proposing alternative methods to those described in Section 1.2 - Objective will not be summarily rejected, however, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate how any proposed alternative will meet the needs of PSP.</p>
<p>he latest document I am finding related to the results chains and evaluation frameworks developed so far is a 2009 Tech memo, Using Results Chains to Develop Objectives and Performance Measures for the 2008 Action Agenda. Is there any more recent documentation on the effectiveness and results of this approach when applied to the measurement of other aspects of the Action Agenda since 2008/2009?</p>	<p>The document, "Using Results Chains to Develop Objectives and Performance Measures for the 2008 Action Agenda," is cited only as an example for the immediate purposes of this RFQQ. The degree to which results chains developed under this contract will integrate with earlier work, and how that will happen, will be determined after a qualified firm is selected.</p>
<p>It appears there is a gap in the work between the first year and the last year – can you explain this?</p>	<p>PSP anticipates there will be a surge in the work for the first year, maintenance and technical support the second and third year, and then another surge of work the fourth year.</p>
<p>Say more about the timeline – especially the first</p>	<p>PSP wants the work to begin immediately. The</p>

three tasks.	negotiated work plan with the contractor will drive the timeline. We anticipate seeing the majority of the work in the first year.
Are there any decision points in the first 3 months?	PSP would like to see the development of a logic model in the first 3 months.
Please describe the structure at Puget Sound Partnership and if there are any committees involved in this work.	PSP has three primary panels/committees we work with: The Eco-System Coordinating Board, the Leadership Council, and the Science Panel. All 3 are briefed on progress and strategies to be implemented to move the Action Agenda forward. There is also a Social Science Panel that is advisory to the Science Panel – the evaluation structure will be coordinated with this panel. We also work with Lead Organizations (other state agencies that have a primary role and responsibility in Puget Sound’s health). We will need to see how the evaluation dove-tails with these agencies.
What is the budget breakdown by percentage for each year?	PSP has no pre-conceived idea of how the budget should be broken down. The funding is iterative. If we were to guess, we would anticipate 75 – 80% of the funds would be used in the first year, with the remaining used year’s 2 – 4.
Is there any interim reporting prior to 2014?	PSP intends to gather data needed for the evaluation. We currently do not know what the metrics are yet. The analysis of the data and what it means to the larger program will generate a report.
What role would the upcoming Action Agenda Update have on this work?	There should be no significant structural changes to the Action Agenda or to this body of work. We anticipate the Near Term Actions may change some. The evaluation work is looking at the overall Stewardship Program.
Is there any previous evaluation work to build on? Any existing data sources? Do we need to build in additional data collection?	There is no previous evaluation – this is a new program. The <i>Results Chain</i> work was not for this program. The successful contractor will help us develop the best measures to use, but there is a separate RFQQ that will be forthcoming specifically for data collection and public opinion surveys. We do have some unobligated resources that could be directed to additional data collection if needed.
Do you expect the firm to develop the Logic Model and present it or develop it with stakeholders?	PSP expects the latter – we see it is important to have key stakeholders involved and have it be a collaborative process.
Do you expect to develop a work group for the evaluation work?	PSP is flexible on how the process unfolds. PSP personnel and the contractor staff will work closely together, but we don’t have any pre-conceived idea of how often we meet. Applicants should budget the time of people according to the tasks. We are looking for a robust evaluation framework that has legitimate points of engagement. For some tasks or stakeholders, it may mean engaging more frequently; for others

	it may only be periodic.
Who is the audience for the evaluation framework?	The evaluation framework is more for internal purposes, to help PSP steer the program direction. The product(s) will go beyond PSP and EPA, most likely to the boards and Leadership Council, the Executive Director, and possibly to the Governor and Legislature.
Do you have an estimate of the number of indicators?	PSP has no pre-conceived number for the indicators. One challenge is to determine what progress PSP is making AND what progress 500+ partners are making.
Are the partner agencies measuring their own indicators?	We want to understand what they are doing, establish accountability to and for them using funds distributed by PSP, and be able to demonstrate the value added by PSP actions.
Is having a contractor from the Puget Sound area a priority?	No. The contractor must be able to conduct the services efficiently and effectively.

State of Washington
Puget Sound Partnership
Tacoma, Washington

Request for Qualifications and Quotations
RFQQ No. PSC-2011-10

Questions and Answers