City of San Antonio

ADDENDUM IV

SUBJECT: Request for Competitive Sealed Proposal for Land Development, Permit, Inspection & Compliance Software, (RFCSP 14-039, 6100004961), Scheduled to Open: December 5, 2014; Date of Issue: September 16, 2014

FROM: Paul J. Calapa
Procurement Administrator

DATE: November 7, 2014

THIS NOTICE SHALL SERVE AS ADDENDUM NO. IV - TO THE ABOVE REFERENCED REQUEST FOR COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 011, RESTRICTIONS ON COMMUNICATIONS:

Question 1: Please provide examples of the currently existing process workflows.

Response: The To-Be Process workflows have been provided as an Appendix to the RFCSP. Additionally, a number of As-Is process workflows have been developed, but vendor's focus should be on the To-Be state.

Question 2: With regard to incoming/outgoing documents, are there "registration numbers" assigned to each individual document?

Response: Documents do not receive individual "registration numbers." They could be labeled with the permit/case number.

Question 3: With regard to the notifications that are sent to applicants (e.g. email and SMS are mentioned as notification channels). Are these notifications "informal" notices or "official" notices with a need for acknowledgment of receipt?

Response: Development Services does not have a requirement for emails/SMS to have an acknowledgement receipt. Note: we send notices related to Building Standard Board cases by certified mail.

Question 4: With regard to the workflow component with the streamlined processes in the New System, what is the total number of processes that exist in the current system? How many are license processes, permit processes, inspection processes, etc.

Response: High-level business processes are identified as an Appendix to the RFCSP. There may be unique business rules and workflow according to license type, inspection type, and permit type. This will be identified by the vendor during requirements gathering phase. The City is open to streamlining existing workflow and processes, so an As-Is assessment will not necessarily equal that in the To-Be state.

Question 5: With regard to "The workflows used to perform these functions are often complicated consisting of many steps crossing to and from several departments and requiring input from different sources, including the applicant, various City agencies, and several outside agencies." Will the City please provide a relation to the processes that currently exist and their complexity?

Response: High-level business processes are identified as an Appendix to the RFCSP. There may be unique business rules and workflow according to license type, inspection type, and permit type. This will be identified by the vendor during requirements gathering phase. The City is open to streamlining existing workflow and processes, so an As-Is assessment will not necessarily equal that in the To-Be state.

Question 6: Please clarify if you are looking for a complete individual system solution or, is it possible to define and propose a solution based on multiple systems that are integrated and that will require custom developments in order to comply with the City's requirements.

Response: The City is seeking the best-of-breed solution that includes integration with multiple products/technologies. Any required custom development should be clearly indicated in the proposal and responses to the requirement matrices.

Question 7: In regards to licensing, does the city have any corporate agreement with SAP, including SAP RE, PM, RMS, DMS or mobility modules, in order to optimize the number and cost of licenses?

Response: The City's SAP licenses cover SAP ERP Business Suite, Industry Specific (Public Sector), PPS, and BW with Licenses being categorized and accounted for as the following User Type groups:

User Type	Number of Licenses
mySAP Professional (Cat. II)	1500
mySAP Limited Prof. (Cat III)	1000
mySAP Employee (Cat. IV)	7500
mySAP Business Suite ESS User	2500

Question 8: Respondent has completed the Vendor Registration on the City's procurement website and have been assigned a COSA Supplier #. Does this fulfill the requirement in Attachment I – Signature Page to complete the Certified Vendor Registration Form?

Response: Yes.

Question 9: Section 4.7 Vendor Solution Response Requirements – See Attachment A from pages 43 to 60 seems to be the same as section RFCSP Attachment A from pages 96 to 113, with only a change in the numbering. Is there a reason for this duplication?

Response: These deliverables are to be developed and delivered by the vendor as part of their implementation efforts.

Question 10: Please confirm whether the deliverables described in Sections 4.7.4.10 and 4.7.4.11 (on page 53 of 130) and 4.7.8.10 and 4.7.8.11 (on page 106 of 130) are to be submitted as part of the proposal or during the actual implementation.

Response: The APEX (ACC/IAS Cert Mgmt) solution no longer requires replacement or integration; this system is being consolidated and will become obsolete.

Question 11: In Section 4.7.4.12. Deliverable Reviews and Acceptance on page 60 of 130, the City uses the term Respondent as synonymous with Contractor. As we understand, a Respondent must first sign a contract to become a Contractor and then the rules of the Contract would apply. Please confirm that the description in this section applies to the vendor of choice after a contract is put in place. This same section states that "approval of a Respondent's work product does not relieve the Respondent from liability for defects, errors or omissions in the work product that may be discovered after such approval". Is the intent of the City to make the vendor of choice liable forever?

Response: The term "Respondent" refers to a Vendor who submits a response to the RFCSP, the term "Contractor" refers to the Respondent that is both selected through the RFCSP evaluation and approved by the San Antonio City Council. The section that states approval of a Respondent's work product does not relieve the Respondent from liability for defects, errors or omissions in the work product that may be discovered after such approval" does not require a Contractor to be "liable forever," it requires a Contractor to be responsible for defects, errors or omissions in the work product up until the time that acceptance testing is successfully concluded, at which time warranties, maintenance and support agreements become effective. In addition, State law regarding Statutes of Limitations would also apply.

Question 12: The section on "Ownership and Licenses" on page 61 of 130 implies that the software the chosen vendor provides cannot be protected under a Copyright. However, if the software is not "produced in the course of the work required" then the Respondent Copyright should apply. Please confirm.

Response: Software produced specifically for the City of San Antonio is done so as a "work-for-hire." Customizable off-the-shelf software retains copyrights previously being asserted.

Question 13: Is the expectation that all legacy applications listed in Table 4 (on page 14 of 130) will have their data converted in the new system? Are there any additional sources of legacy data that will need to be converted? Can you provide table, column and record counts for all sources to be converted?

Response: Yes, the expectation is that data in the legacy applications listed in Table 4 on page 14 of the RFCSP will converted to the new system. There may be additional sources of legacy data that will also need to be converted.

Estimated # of tables and approximate record counts:
Hansen: ~1500 tables, ~60M records
ECCO: ~4 tables, ~15M records
LDS: ~57 tables, ~200 records
TPLT: ~3 tables, ~1.1M records

Question 14: On page 63 of the RFCSP V3, it states:

"Respondent shall submit one original hardcopy, signed in ink, and twelve (12) hardcopies of the proposal and one (1) compact disk (CD) containing an Adobe PDF version of the entire proposal to include a softcopy of the completed Excel workbooks for Functional, Technical, and Pricing Attachments in its native Excel file format, in a sealed package clearly marked with the project name, "LAND DEVELOPMENT, PERMIT, INSPECTION & COMPLIANCE MANAGEMENTSOFTWARE", RFCSP 6100004961, on the front of the package. See Section 4.7 Vendor Solution Response Requirements and Section 010- SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS in this RFCSP."

Question: Would the City like hard copies of only the proposal which is the contents of Attachment A, or the excel workbooks (Attachments for Functional, Technical and Pricing) as well? Due to the size of the excel spreadsheets, the presentation of information in print format is not ideal for easy reading. Can we submit them only on the CD in their native form, and not in hard copy format?

Response: The City requires hardcopies of all required documents including attachments in addition to the soft copies on CD.

Question 15: How many SAP ERP licenses does the city of San Antonio currently own?

Response: The City's SAP licenses cover SAP ERP Business Suite, Industry Specific (Public Sector), PPS, and BW with Licenses being categorized and accounted for as the following User Type groups:

User Type	Number of Licenses
mySAP Professional (Cat. II)	1500
mySAP Limited Prof. (Cat III)	1000
mySAP Employee (Cat. IV)	7500
mySAP Business Suite ESS User	2500

Question 16: Section 3.2.4 and 4.6 (page 12 and page 41) references "several ancillary systems" for current state of the environment. Can COSA provide a list of the ancillary systems that would need to be included in the "new system" and the platform these systems are hosted? In addition, which ancillary systems will need to support the Functional Group Release referenced in section 4.6..

Response: The ancillary systems are smaller, supporting applications (i.e., spreadsheets and access databases). The selected vendor will be required to identify all ancillary, supporting systems and determine the best timeline for incorporating the functionality into proposed solution.

Question 17: Table 5. Zoning and Land Use Management references a "variety of excel spreadsheets and access databases" used to track work. Will these systems need to be converted into the "new system" or are these systems tracking work activities?

Response: The excel spreadsheets and access databases would be incorporated into the new solution.

Question 18: Table 6. Internal System Integration references ID 29 Legacy Content (Certificate of Occupancy/Permits) this was prior to the Hansen implementation. Is the intent of COSA to convert this data or to integrate with the Legacy System? What platform is the Legacy Permitting solution on?

Response: The Legacy Content is a mainframe platform and is expected to be converted to the new system.

Question 19: Table 6. Internal System Integration references ID 30 APEX (ACC/IAS Cert Mgmt) can COSA provide additional details on the APEX system and its current requirements? Is there a requirement to integrate with the APEX system or convert data so the certifications are associated to the records?

Response: The APEX (ACC/IAS Cert Mgmt) is no longer to be included as a system needed for replacement.

Question 20: The Use Cases references Metropolitan Health District coordination with DSD on plan reviews, is the intent of the "new system" to allow Metropolitan Health District assess to the system for the plan review and mark-up or to pass information to the Digital Health system for plan approval?

Response: Metro Health District (MHD) will be given access to the new system for plan review capabilities. Additionally, Hansen currently interfaces with MHD for inspection information (Hansen sends DHD assignment and date of inspection requirement; DHD sends Hansen a pass/fail for the inspection).

Question 21: Table 7. External System Descriptions, ID 34 GUMB, does COSA require integration w/LAGAN system only through GUMB or are Web Services available in the COSA infrastructure to integrate with the LAGAN system?

Response: GUMB is the City's integration middleware platform and the proposed solution should integrate with LAGAN through GUMB. The City may consider an alternative integration solution proposed by the vendor.

Question 22: Table 7. External System Descriptions, ID 34 GUMB, does COSA require integration w/LAGAN system only through GUMB or are Web Services available in the COSA infrastructure to integrate with the LAGAN system?

Response: Historic Preservation Case Management System is a web based application and is expected to be integrated (not replaced) with the new system.

Question 23: Figure 8. New System Conceptual Solution Module references an Interactive Voice Recognition, does COSA current support an IVR integration if so, will this system need to integrate with "new system" or does COSA request proposed solution to support IVR?

Response: There is not an IVR solution utilized by DSD. Vendors may propose an IVR solution as optional but this not a mandatory requirement.

Question 24: The Use Cases references SAWS coordination with DSD on plan reviews, is the intent of the "new system" to allow SAWS assess to the system for the plan review and mark-up or to pass information for plan approval?

Response: SAWS will be given access to the new system for plan review capabilities.

Question 25: (Reference Section 3.1.2, page 26) The Use Case documentation references a DSD's central addressing repository, is the intent of the "new system" to replace this central addressing repository or integrate with the DSD's central addressing repository?

Response: This is a future-state use case, not a reference to an existing process. The use case references the ability to validate a submitted application against a central addressing repository (the system of record for addressing; a single source of truth for an address). Vendors should reference only Table 8 for requirements for systems integration and replacement. The use cases provide high-level business context for the functional requirements.

Question 26: Section 4.6 Proposed Implementation Plan, identifies four Functional Groups (1-4) for the prescribed implementation approach with a description of functionality included in each grouping. Can COSA provide additional details around the four groupings to include application/permit types, reports and integration points for each grouping?

Response: The City has proposed the four functional groupings to communicate its desire for an incremental development/release of the solution. The City is interested in the vendors to provide details on the best approach to achieve this objective based on their experiences implementing the proposed solution with other clients of similar size and scope. Detailed requirements gathering would be part of the scope for the vendor for that implementation phase.

Document Change Notation 1: On Page 124 of the RFCSP, Attachment F_V2 has been revised and posted as **ATTACHMENT F_V3.**

The following changes have been made to Attachment F v3:

1. All worksheets have been unlocked with the exception of the first tab, Instructions.

2. Two additional instructions (10 & 11) were added to the Instructions tab to clarify vendor's responsibility to maintain cost worksheet content/structure and verify all formula calculations accurately reflect their proposed costs.

Document Change Notation 2: **RFCSP 6100004961_V4** is now the authorized version of this solicitation.

Paul J. Calapa
Procurement Administrator
Finance Department – Purchasing Division