

Attendance and Sub-Contracting

Question C1.

Section number:	I. Overview
Paragraph number	N/A
Page number	2
Text of passage being questioned	“Written Questions Due No Later Than (NLT) Date: Wednesday, July 18, 2012 by 4:30 p.m. EDT”
Question	Based on the complexity and volume of the RFP requirements and the current pending request for an extension of the proposal due date, the vendor respectfully requests a one-week extension of the due date for written questions in order to allow all vendors sufficient time to develop a comprehensive solution and compliant proposal.

Response: The purpose of the deadline on questions is so that the bulk of the technical ones are asked in advance of the mandatory pre-bid meeting with enough time to research or formulate technical answers. The questions will be read and answered in the pre-bid meeting. The pre-bid meeting also gives vendors the opportunity to ask additional questions or for additional verification. If a vendor submits a question after the cut off it will not disqualify them, however if the question requires an in-depth answer it may not be fully answered by the pre-bid meeting.

Question C2

Question: Would the State consider granting an extension *(to the proposal due date)*?

Response: Not at this time.

Question C3.

The vendor is interested in responding to your RFP for a CAD/RMS system for the State of Delaware. Would it be possible to phone into this pre-proposal conference as opposed to in person attendance?

Response: No, Delaware requires a physical presence in the mandatory pre-bid meeting, however the person representing the vendor does not need to be an employee of the vendor, only an authorized representative who can understand the technical answers. In one case we had a local consultant represent an out of state company. However the consultant signed in on the sign in sheet as representing the interested vendor, not the consulting firm he was employed by.

Question C4.**Section Number:** I Overview**Paragraph Number:** 3**Page Number:** 2

Text of passage being questioned: A mandatory pre-bid meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, July 25th, 2012, 9 a.m. EDT in the **Main Conference Room**, 303 Transportation Circle, Dover, DE 19901.”

Question: Part 1 - If the prime contractor is in attendance for the mandatory pre-bid conference, does each of the potential subcontractors under that prime need to be in attendance as well in order to be eligible to participate in the bid response?

Part 2 - Also, given the state of video conferencing tools such as Webex, Join.me, etc., would the State of DE consider creating an environment like those mentioned above to enable maximum attendance by all vendors that may be from geographically dispersed areas of the United States, and deem that as “Mandatory Attendance”?

Response Part 1: No, if you are not the prime contractor you will not be submitting a proposal of your own and need not register for or attend the pre-bid meeting. The prime contractor will submit a proposal that will include your input and will register you as a sub-contractor in the proposal using Attachment 6 on page 35 of the RFP and as a Word document in Addendum 1 Q&A. However, the pre-bid meeting is a public meeting and anyone may attend so you're welcome to join us.

Response Part 2: Please see the response to question C3.

Question C5.

Page 11, paragraph 12: The prime contractor must be the joint venture's contact point for the State of Delaware and be responsible for the joint venture's performance under the contract, including all project management, legal and financial responsibility for the implementation of all vendor's systems. Should the prime contractor we are bidding with and who will be in attendance need to register us as a team member or is that not necessary since the prime's registration and attendance is all that matters?

Response: Please see the response to question C4, part 1.

Question C6.

Will a small business enterprise like ours be able to submit a proposal on our own for just a portion of the solution, such as LE RMS, and then if the State of DE likes our solution and proposal, be able to roll-up under a designated prime contractor that they State may select? If that is the case, I then would assume we would need to be in attendance at the conference in order to qualify?

Response: On pages 11 & 12, the boilerplate provides the definitions of primary vendor and sub-contractor. In paragraphs 12b and 13 it states that the primary vendor takes the responsibility for the contractual performance and will manage any subcontractor relationships. The primary vendor is required to disclose subcontractor relationships in their proposal. Therefore the state will not be selecting

modules from multiple vendors and assigning them as sub-contractors to a primary vendor. Although the boilerplate allows for multiple vendor selection, our intent is to select one vendor. If after the proposals are reviewed, it becomes necessary to select multiple vendors, then each vendor will be a primary vendor for their part of the project.

Sub-contracting vendors may participate in multiple joint venture proposals, so if your business specializes in one type of work you may want to consider partnering with multiple joint ventures.

Multiple Source Contracting

Question C7.

Section Number: 17 State's Right to Award Multiple Source Contracting

Paragraph Number: 1

Page Number: 14

Text of passage being questioned: "Pursuant to 29 del. C. 6986, the State of Delaware may award a contract for a particular professional service to two or more vendors if the agency head makes a determination that such an award is in the best interest of the State of Delaware".

Question: Given the state of advanced tools and technology as well as universal adoption of standards, such as NIEM, within the Public Safety Industry, will the State of DE equally weight a true, "Best of Breed" implementation that can be achieved under the auspices of a prime contractor, whereby the applications of CAD, RMS, Mobile, Fire, etc. are selected purely based on their merits of the individual applications and individual solution providers, and selected by the practitioners that will utilize it, even though they may not be from one COTS vendor? If so, is there a mechanism to mix and match various solutions proposed by various different vendors as part of the response, while still rolling the project up under one responsible prime contractor as part of a negotiating session? (Multi-part awards). Additionally, and along this same topic, can a small business enterprise that has certain capabilities, e.g., Law Enforcement RMS submit a bid by itself for only certain parts of the RFP, and then roll-up under the prime contractor selected for the overall project, provided that the committee likes the capabilities, technology utilized and approach used by the small business enterprise as part of both the initial rollout and ongoing sustainment of the system?

Response: Please see the response to question C6.

Scoring and Evaluation

Question C8.

2.3 Proposer References

If proposer cannot meet the reference requirements will they be eliminated from consideration?

Response: No it will not disqualify the vendor because it is not part of the minimum requirements. However it is part of the scoring criteria so if a vendor does not have appropriate references they will probably get a lower score.

Question C9.

Section Number: II. Scope of Services

Paragraph Number: 1

Page Number: 3

Text of passage being questioned: “The purpose of the project is to replace the existing Computer Aided Dispatching, Records Management System (Law Enforcement and Fire) and Mobile Data system in use at multiple PSAPS and agencies throughout the State of Delaware with a Commercial off The Shelf (COTS) solution.” (&) “The goal is to have a single vendor provide a system that is (or can be) used by all agencies.”

Question: *As a point of general clarification on the type of solution this RFP is calling for in this section as well as restated and/or inferred in other sections of the RFP:* Given the amount of capability being requested and assuming the probable fact that most likely no single vendor (perhaps other than those assembled under a prime contractor and especially a small business vendor) can provide all or most of this functionality, or at least not all individual components of the solution equal to others in capability, will you be more inclined to award, with all factors considered, to a vendor that has the most capability out of the box as it pertains to the requirements checklist, in a “COTS” offering, versus a vendor or team of vendors, under a prime contractor, that can provide similar capabilities in a semi-COTS or custom offering, but offer a more collaborative and tailorable approach to the project, both initially and long-term?

In other words, will a *technologically superior platform and project methodology approach* that empowers and enables the end users to have more control of their own capability (vs. being dependent on the applications software provider for any routine modifications such as screen changes, field re-labeling, etc.), but has, for example, only 60% of the requirements being requested (Semi-COTS or custom) in the RFP, be equally weighted as compared to one that says it can provide most of these capabilities out of the box, all factors considered, so long as the remainder of the requirements be built out and delivered as part of the project?

Response: Scoring will be performed based on the requirements of the RFP. Required Response Format (RFP Section 1.3) identifies the types of responses that are to be provided. It is not clear from the question what constitutes a Tailorable solution. A solution that is configurable (vs. custom code) will be scored with the understanding that the functionality currently exists. Custom code would imply that the functionality needs to be developed, thus a response of “Will Comply with Modification” would be

appropriate. The solution that provides the best value in terms of overall compliance and price will be scored the highest.

Question C10.

Section Number: 2.3 Proposer References

Paragraph Number: 1

Page Number: 1

Text of passage being questioned: “The Offeror must be able to reference at least 5 sites comparable in size and structure utilizing the software that is being proposed.”

Question: Will references that are not similar in size, but similar in operation in reference to CAD/RMS, etc., but perhaps utilize more advanced technologies and tools be rejected and/or impacted via the weighed criteria specified on pages 16-17, even though in general all agencies perform the Public Safety mission (NRF/NIMS/ICS as examples) with some degree of uniformity and cohesiveness, and if the vendor complies with delivering the stated requirements as part of the project?

Response: References give the reviewers an opportunity to score the vendor's capability to undertake this project. Therefore references for larger or more complex protects (e.g. Baltimore, Philadelphia, or Washington DC) will be scored higher than 1 or 2 position dispatch offices would be.

Proposal Format and Preparation

Question C11.

Section number	1.3 Required Response Format
Paragraph number	1
Page number	Appendix A, page 4
Text of passage being questioned	A paragraph-by-paragraph response of the technical specifications shall be provided indicating compliance with every described requirement, specification and function included in this RFP. Offerors shall review all of the requirements in the RFP and respond to each paragraph therein using the following responses:
Question	Vendor request confirmation that the “paragraph-by-paragraph” response is intended for Appendix A only? Or is the State requesting a paragraph-by-paragraph response to the RFP in its entirety?

Response: No the proposal does not need a “paragraph-by-paragraph” response to the RFP in its entirety. Only Appendix A needs be answered that way (see question C12). If the vendor submits a proposal, they are acknowledging the boilerplate

language. Paragraph 9 on page 10 of the RFP discourages overly lengthy and costly proposals.

Question C12.

Section number:	Appendix A, 1 GENERAL INFORMATION
Paragraph number	1.2 Proposal Organization and Format
Page number	4
Text of passage being questioned	The RFP sections which should be submitted or responded to are: Response to general requirements (See Appendix A, Section 2 of this RFP) Organizational qualifications Staff qualifications and Facilities References
Question	In the first bullet item above, the contents of Appendix A, Section 2 of the RFP are specified as containing instructions or requirements to be responded to in the proposal section “Response to general requirements.” The contents of Appendix A, Section 2 of the RFP are listed as the next 3 bullet items in the list above. Please clarify the expected contents of the proposal section “Response to general requirements.” May vendors use this section to respond to requirements in the following RFP Sections? I. Overview, II. Scope of Services, III. Required Information, IV. Professional Services RFP Administrative Information

Response: The RFP Sections I through IV identified above do not require a point-by-point response, however the Attachments 2 through 5 must be provided in the proposal response. Attachment 6 will be required if subcontractors are used. Attachments 7 and 8 will be provided by the winning vendor. The response to Appendix A Sections 2 through 7 require point-by-point responses which can be provided in line with the requirement.

Question C13.

Section number	1.2 Proposal Organization and Format
Paragraph number	1, second bullet; sixth bullet
Page number	Appendix A, page 4
Text of passage being questioned	Proposals shall be organized and presented in the order and by the number assigned in the RFP. Each response should be preceded by the section number and language of the RFP and any applicable addenda. Proposals must be organized with the following headings and subheadings. Each heading and subheading should be separated by tabs or otherwise clearly marked. The RFP sections which should be submitted or responded to are: Response to general requirements (See Appendix A, Section 2 of this RFP) Response to technical requirements (See Appendix A, Section 3 of this RFP)
Question	Please clarify if the State requires a response to Appendix A, Sections 4 – 7? Additionally, for each section that does require a response, please clarify the type of response required from the vendor, i.e., narrative response to <i>each</i> requirement <i>and</i> sub-requirement. For example, if comply, will comply be sufficient? Or additional information required?

Response: Please see paragraph 1.3 in Appendix A. A response of "fully compliant" indicates that the functionality currently exists and no further explanation is needed. If the solution requires Custom code which implies that the functionality does not currently exist and needs to be developed, a response of "Will Comply with Modification" would be appropriate and could require additional information, similar to the response of "Partially Compliant".

Question C14.

Question: Would the State please provide Microsoft Word version of the RFP?

Response: The State has provided Appendix A as the file Appendix A - Scope of Work and the required attachments in the file Addendum 1 - Q&A. Vendors are cautioned that the bulleted numbering in the tables in Appendix A can renumber when Word spellchecks or repaginates.