City of San Antonio

ADDENDUM I

SUBJECT: Request for Competitive Sealed Proposal for Land Development, Permit, Inspection & Compliance Software, (RFCSP 14-039, 6100004961), Scheduled to Open: November 21, 2014; Date of Issue: September 16, 2014

FROM: Paul J. Calapa
Procurement Administrator

DATE: October 14, 2014

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

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

Question 1: When reviewing the bid documents, we found the word "hosted" in the following areas of the Published RFCSP bid document and nowhere else in any of the other bid documents:

a. Section 4.3.2 - "The proposed future state solution will be hosted and managed in the City's data center."
b. Section 4.7 and Attachment A - "The City of San Antonio is seeking proposals for a City hosted solution that is based on a highly configurable COTS product that reduces dependence on IT system administrators to support changes to the system."

Please clarify how the City is using the word "hosted" in the above two statements? Does the City have a preference for a hosted, on-premise solution? Is the City open to a cloud-based Software as a Service (SaaS) vendor-hosted solution that cannot be hosted in the City's facilities? How will both cloud and on-premise solutions be graded and evaluated against the other?

Response: The City's specification states that the infrastructure that supports the system(s) will be physically located on the City's premise and will be managed by the City's Information Technology Services Department. Responses that include contrary specifications will be evaluated and scored accordingly.

Question 2: Support service levels are generally defined by the service provider and based on the level of support purchased by the customer. Please clarify if the support service levels are negotiable based on the service provider chosen?

Response: The support service levels are negotiable; however, note that your solution must be capable of supporting the service levels represented in the Technical Requirements, Attachment H (G189-G207). Proposals for support service levels will be evaluated as a component of the proposed plan.

Question 3: Did the City use any respondent(s) to help develop the RFCSP? If so, will the City please share the name of the respondent(s)?

Response: Yes, the City of San Antonio is working with Gartner.

Question 4: Does the City have a budget allocated for this project? If so, will the City provide the dollar amount?

Response: The City would prefer to take a collaborative approach with the selected Respondent to develop a definitive and comprehensive plan that meets the City's requirements. The City prefers a breakdown of all components listed and a breakdown of optional items (as requested in Attachment F) that would optimize the scope/proposed plan.

Question 5: Did the City evaluate solutions that could meet its requirements through respondent demonstrations leading up to the RFCSP release? If so, what types and names of solutions and respondents were evaluated (vendor-hosted and on-premise)?

Response: The City did not have any formal respondent demonstrations during the time period leading up to the RFCSP release.

Question 6: On page 62 of the Published RFCSP document Section 008 Proposal Requirements, it states "...If Respondent is proposing as a team or joint venture, provide the same information for each member of the team or joint venture." Please clarify what is meant by "the same information?"

Response: This statement in Section 008 of the RFCSP refers to various attachments in which the Respondent is expected to provide general information regarding the proposing organization, such as Attachment B, Attachment C, Attachment D, Attachment I, Financial Information and Signature Page as well as other areas of the proposal where general business/organization information is required. In other words, if a prime respondent is proposing a partnership or joint venture with another firm, the City requires that all partners submit all the same Attachments by the team or joint venture partners.

Question 7: Regarding Attachment I - Signature Page, it specifies that "the Respondent, and co-respondent, if any, must complete City's Certified Respondent Registration (CVR) Form prior to the due date for submission of proposals," and lists a website where this form can be accessed yet the form cannot be found directly. Will the City please provide the actual CVR Form to a direct link to download?

Response: Respondent, and co-respondent, if any, must complete City's Certified Respondent Online Registration (CVR) Form prior to the due date for submission of proposals. The CVR Form is only available online and may be accessed at: http://www.sanantonio.gov/purchasing/ or the direct link at: http://www.sanantonio.gov/purchasing/saeps.aspx

Question 8: After review of Section 4.7 and Attachment A, we found that the RFCSP does not provide a definition or expectations of the term, "City Hosted Solution," and in order to reduce dependence on IT system administrators to support changes to the system and other immediate support needs, would the City of San Antonio consider a vendor hosted highly configurable COTS solution or is a vendor hosted solution not being considered?

Response: The City's specification states that the infrastructure that supports the system(s) will be physically located on the City's premise and will be managed by the City's Information Technology Services Department. Responses that include contrary specifications will be evaluated and scored accordingly.

Question 9: After review of the Section 010, Escrow Requirement, the RFCSP does not clearly define requirements or attributes of an agreeable third party. Can you please provide those requirements or attributes?

Response: The respondent's proposed escrow service will be evaluated as part of the proposed plan.

Question 10: Section 009, Changes to RFCSP does not provide any time guidelines in the event that the RFCSP is changed after a proposal has been accepted by the COSA. In this event is the previously accepted proposal deemed unacceptable and if so will the timeline and notifications outlined in section 4.7.4.12 P60 of V1.pdf be enacted?

Response: No, Section 009, Changes to RFCSP explains that changes to the RFCSP, only applies to changes made during the solicitation period. It is the responsibility of the Respondent to ensure the response addresses changes made to the RFCSP during this period. The City will assume that all proposals received are based on the final version of the RFCSP as it exists on the day proposals are due. Section 4.7.4.12 only applies to the awarded Respondents and it only applies to the deliverables of the resulting agreement.

Question 11: The RFCSP does not provide definition or expectations of the formatting of the requested attachments, for example, Attachments are restricted from editing or changing document format, are they required to meet the same guidelines outlined for the "proposal"?

Response: The formatting requirements in Section 010 do not apply to the Attachments. Attachments F, G and H can be completed in their native format (Excel), printed and tabulated accordingly.

Question 12: Attachments are not formatted in a way that will allow them to properly be included in the printed proposals as requested in Section 008 Proposal Requirements.

Response: The formatting requirements in Section 008 are to provide guidance and structure in your Response. The formatting requirements in Section 010 do not apply to the Attachments. Attachments F, G and H can be completed in their native format (Excel), printed and tabulated accordingly.

Question 13: In regards to data migration, since it is necessary to migrate historical records, what volume of records is expected?

Response: The actual volume of records that will be migrated into the new solution has not yet been determined.

Question 14: Do any of the existing systems to be integrated with the new system have non standard or proprietary integration methods?

Response: All integrations are standards-based. The City expects system integration to be a collaborative effort with the City's programmers taking the lead on the legacy systems and the respondent taking the lead on the new system(s).

Question 15: Is English the only language required for user interface?

Response: The City does not have a requirement for supporting languages other than English at this time. However, the City may be interested in supporting other languages in the future. Respondents are encouraged to describe any language localization capabilities that may be available at no cost to the City with your proposed solution. However, if there is an additional cost for this option, do not include this cost in the pricing schedule. Please list the cost separately in the proposed plan as an optional feature.

Question 16: Is supplying Mobile PDA's and Tablets included in contract?

Response: No, mobile devices and tablets are not part of this RFCSP.

Question 17: Is there a concurrent schema of users for the use of the software? (i.e. anticipated ratio of internal vs. external users of the system).

Response: No. However, City expects to have more external users (customers) using the system vs. City staff.

Question 18: What is the expected level of functional support service? (i.e. English, 8x5, English 24x7, etc.)

Response: The expected level of functional support includes English and 8x5.

Question 19: What is the expected level of technical support service? (i.e. English, 8x5, English 24x7, etc.)

Response: The expected level of technical support includes English 24x7.

Question 20: As it related to the Project Management Team, is it necessary to have a local project team?

Response: A project of this scope and scale would benefit from a project team working locally with the City of San Antonio. Responses that include alternative project staffing proposals will be evaluated and scored accordingly.

Question 21: Should our response include the cost of telecommunications and VPN infrastructure?

Response: All hardware and infrastructure costs should not be included in the pricing proposal. However, all required hardware and infrastructure requirements necessary to support the proposed solution needs to be clearly defined in the proposal response.

Question 22: Is it acceptable to include travel, allowance and accommodation costs for our personnel in our Proposal?

Response: All proposed costs shall be inclusive of all Respondent's costs including, but not limited to, staffing, administrative overhead, travel, lodging, and any other expenses that may be incurred by the Respondent. The City of San Antonio will not separately reimburse the Respondent for any expenses beyond what the Respondent includes in their pricing proposal. This same verbiage has been included in the RFCSP as well as the Price Schedule.

Question 23: As it relates to the required training, is general material for training provided by COSA?

Response: The term "general material" is not descriptive enough to provide an objective response. The City of San Antonio will provide training rooms.

Question 24: As it relates to the required training, is it acceptable to give remote training using WebEx or similar (WebEx connection would be provided by Respondent)? If so, what percentage is acceptable?

Response: No, all training to be performed in person.

Question 25: Can we receive a version of Attachment's G, H with the cells unlocked so we can insert our responses directly into the spreadsheet?

Response: All applicable cells for both attachments are enabled for editing; however, the respondent must "enable edits" in the workbook. There is one tab (GIS) on the Technical Requirements matrix where the black dividing lines are not editable, but it is not material and will not affect the respondents' ability to provide comments on the required line items.

Question 26: The space to address questions in the Experience, Background, Qualifications Section in Attachment B is too small. Can the answers be provided in a separate document and this document be referenced in Attachment B?

Response: Yes, responding to the Experience, Background and Qualifications questions in a separate document is acceptable, as long as this section is referenced as Attachment B in your proposal response.

Question 27: Could a respondent be mentioned in more than one response or be part than more than one consortium?

Response: The RFCSP does not preclude a respondent from working with multiple Prime Respondents and/or serve in a Prime Respondent capacity as long as the proposed solution addresses the business needs, objectives, and requirements as described in the RFCSP.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 007, PRE-SUBMITTAL CONFERENCE:

On October 3, 2014, the City of San Antonio hosted a Pre-Submittal Conference to provide information and clarification for the Land Development, Permit, Inspection & Compliance Software RFCSP. Below is a list of questions that were asked at the pre-submittal conference. The City's official response to questions asked is as follows:

Question 28: Can respondent submit questions on a rolling basis and will they be answered by COSA on a rolling basis?

Response: Yes, the City will work on the answers as the questions are submitted and answers become available. In other words, you are not limited to the number of times you submit your questions, as long as you submit them prior to the deadline of October 20, 2014 at 2:00 pm. Our goal is to provide you responses as soon they are available.

Question 29: How will we be notified that an Addendum is posted?

Response: Addendums will be posted in the Centralized Respondent Registration System (CVR) or you can email William Flint at William.flint@sanantonio.gov for a copy.

Question 30: I understood that if there is a change to the RFCSP we won't be able to see the previous version?

Response: Yes, that is correct. Only the most current version of the RFCSP will be posted; however, all changes will be clearly summarized in the addendum.

Question 31: If there is a delay in receiving the responses to the questions can we voice our concerns about a deadline extension after the question deadline?

Response: It is the intent of the City to allow potential respondents time needed to submit a high quality, comprehensive proposal and will consider allotting respondents additional time based on the nature and justification of such request.

Question 32: Will the list of respondents attending be posted?

Response: Yes. The list of attendees is attached to this Addendum.

Question 33: Will CD's be the only electronic format accepted?

Response: Yes. The CD must include an Adobe PDF version of the entire proposal and a softcopy of the completed Excel workbooks for Functional, Technical, and Pricing Attachments in its native Excel file format.

Question 34: How will we know if the RCSP is the final version?

Response: All versions are identified by the version of the document posted, i.e. version 1, version 2, etc. In other words, the last version is not designated as "final version."

Document Change Notation 1: On Page 65 of the RFCSP language has been added to address **Travel and Related Expenses** as indicated in highlighted blue within RFCSP 6100004961 v2.

Document Change Notation 2: On Pages 63, 64, and 130 of the RFCSP language has been added to address **submission requirements** as indicated in highlighted blue within RFCSP 6100004961 v2.

Paul J. Calapa
Procurement Administrator
Finance Department – Purchasing Division

RFCSP 14-039, 6100004961, Land Development, Permit, Inspection & Compliance Software,
Pre-Submittal Conference

Vendor Name	Point of Contact
WebEx Attendees	
3DI	Carlos Culebro
Claudepte Mayfield Consulting	Susan and Jennifer
Infotech & Consulting Inc	Jason Huang
Federal IT Consulting	Mike F
Davenport Group	Fred Mutter
Computronics	Melinda Dieter
Computronics	Dean Sargent
My permit Now/SC Planning and Dev. Commision	Ryan Hutchinson Ted Jenkins, Luke Spencer, Todd Anthony
Henley Payne Technology & Science Corporation	Valencia Hicks
Sistema Technologies	Mario Ramirez
CSDC Systems	Marco
Onsite Attendees	
Indra	Steve Stillman
Deloitte	Bryan Cloar
Tyler Technologies	Craig Dixon
Oracle	Roy Bowen
Oracle	Jerry Adams
Oracle	Chris Lim
Oracle	Jill Djordjevic
Oracle	Larry Huck
Monad Solutions	William Pessoa
ESRI	Veronica Schindler
Accela	Drew Arnold
Smart Cycle	Keith Beastrom
Sistema Technologies	John Lujan
Sistema Technologies	Joe Valle
Perficient	Mark Remington