

Q and MDE Response 6/6/2014 for TORFP U00B4400022 Permit Modernization

Q

On Page 31 of the RFP, the value “450” appears in both the Total for Base Year and the Total for Option Year 1. It was our intention to price as shown on Page 30 (by deliverable) and then break that out into the hours per labor category for the form on Page 31. However, this would presumably exceed the 450 total hours as indicated in Column B. Could you please confirm which of the following steps we should take to provide pricing in the correct fashion:

MDE Response: Attachment 1, Price Proposal (Fixed Price by Deliverable), page 30, is for pricing for the Fixed Price deliverables listed on the pricing form. There is no need to break out the fixed price deliverable using the pricing form on page 31.

The purpose of Attachment 1, Price Proposal (T&M Work Orders) on page 31 is to be used in conjunction with Section 2.12.3, Work Order Process for T&M Work Orders. As noted in Section 2.12.3, MDE may request additional services via the Work Order Process. For the purpose of this solicitation, the bidder should use the pricing sheet on page 31 to identify any labor categories and labor rates that may be required to respond to a Work Order Request under this contract. The scope of work would in general be related to any additional work that may have not been identified or overlooked in the scope of work of the TORFP. The 450 hours should not be changed to allow for consistency in the evaluation of the pricing bids from the contractors.

1. Price as necessary / appropriate on Page 30. Using the cost total on Page 30, organize hours into labor categories to match the firm's approach. **This process means Page 30 total and Page 31 Total for Base Year will match.**
2. Price as necessary / appropriate on Page 30. Using the guide of 450 hours for Year 1 services, provide an example of how the firm will allocate hours. This will not serve as the final budget, but will indicate to evaluators which labor categories will be most in-demand for services and how that impacts pricing. **This process means Page 30 total and Page 31 Total for Base Year will NOT match.**

Q and MDE Response 6/12/2014 (2) for TORFP U00B4400022 Permit Modernization

1. Could you please provide a listing of the 12 programs to be included in the UI enhancements? Would it be possible to get point of contacts for the 12 programs at this stage of the submission?

MDE Response: A listing of the 12 Programs is attached. MDE cannot provide contact for the 12 Programs at this time.

2. Of the 12 MDE programs, could you indicate which has the highest concentration of users?

MDE Response: The Programs under the Water Management Administrations has the highest concentration of users at this time.

3. Could you please tell us who developed and implemented the TEMPO system? Have there been any related applications developed recently, by the original developer or otherwise? If so, then when and by whom?

MDE Response: The TEMPO system was developed and implemented by CGI Technologies, Inc. To MDE's knowledge, there are no related applications developed recently.

4. Does MDE have / will MDE be providing the existing user guides or system architecture?

MDE Response: MDE will provide any existing documentation that is relevant to the project.

Q and MDE Response 6/12/2014 for TORFP U00B4400022 Permit Modernization

1) Page 21, Section 2.11 Retainage states “The TO contractor shall submit a separate invoice for the retainage release no earlier than the end of the warranty period.” Please clarify the duration and terms of the Warranty Period.

MDE Response: MDE will be sending corrected language for this section in the TORFP that will remove any existing language regarding a warranty period and will substitute language for submission of a final invoice for retainage. The new language will read:

“The TO Contractor shall submit a separate invoice for the retainage release for final payment and shall be clearly marked as “FINAL” and submitted when all work requirements and deliverables have been completed and no further charges are to be incurred under the TO Agreement. The TO Contractor shall track the cumulative retainage amount and display this amount on the invoices, until the retainage is released by the TO Manager.”

2) Page 26, Letter G, TO Contractor and Subcontractor Experience and Capabilities: Can the offeror provide additional examples of customer engagements/contracts that are in process in addition to the three requested?

MDE Response: Yes.

3) Page 20, Sections 2.8.4.3 - 2.8.4.6 – Please confirm if the deliverables outlined in Sections 2.8.4.3 - 2.8.4.6 are to be written for the future TORFP and not for the current Task Order U00B4400022?

MDE Response: The deliverables on page 20 are for the current TORFP #U00B4400022.

4) Attachment 10 Non Disclosure Agreement (Offeror) appears to be missing information from MDE for the blank line in the second paragraph. What should the Offeror fill in there?

MDE Response: A corrected Attachment 10 will be distributed.

5) Is Attachment 5 required to be signed by the proposed individual at the proposal stage or at the interview stage?

MDE Response: Attachment 5 should be signed at the Proposal stage.

Q and MDE Response for TORFP U00B4400022 Permit Modernization

Q: On the table on page 31, there is 450 hours listed in column B for the “Total for Base Year” line item as well as 450 hours listed for “Total for Option Year 1” line item. Can you please confirm if these numbers are intended to be in column B, or if this is a typo?

MDE Response: Yes, the hours are intended to be in column B.

As noted at the top of Page 31:

"The total class hours (Column B) are not to be construed as “guaranteed” hours; the total number of hours is an estimate only for purposes of price proposal evaluation. Allot the total hours across any labor categories that the Master Contractor might use to fulfill work orders in support of this TORFP."

Q: Regarding the schedule of Deliverables in TORFP section 2.8.4 on pages 19 and 20:

Deliverables are due at NTP +15, +45, +150, and +250 business days. This schedule leaves gaps of 5 months between the 2nd and 3rd delivery dates, and another 5 months between the 3rd and 4th delivery dates. Would the MDE consider shortening those gaps by agreeing to interim deliverables based either on specific milestones or percentage of completion of the Functional Requirements Document and the TORFP? Closing the gaps will improve the contractor’s cash flow, given that invoices may be submitted only upon completion and acceptance of deliverables, as stipulated section 2.12 on page 22 of the TORFP. And it would also benefit the project by adding control points for better quality management.

MDE Response: Please refer to Section 2.8.4, which states: "The TO Contractor may propose other subtasks, artifacts, due dates or deliverables to improve the quality and success of assigned tasks."

Q: Regarding Requirement ID # 2.8.4.4 on page 20:

The requirement calls for delivery of preliminary human resource estimates for the TEMPO modernization project at NTP +15 business days. We believe that the value of estimates made so early in the schedule is questionable. Although the requirement does refer to the estimates as “preliminary”, we suggest that moving the deliverable to later in the schedule will greatly improve its validity. Would MDE consider changing the delivery date to perhaps NTP + 120 business days?

MDE Response: Please refer to response to Question #1.

Q: Regarding paragraph 2.12.3.A on page 22:

The TORFP specifies that MDE may request additional contractor resources in “pre-approved Labor Categories”. Can MDE please provide some information about the types of services that may potentially be requested so that we can propose relevant labor categories?

MDE Response: The types of additional services would relate to scope for tasks that may have been overlooked in Section 2, Scope of Work of the TORFP, that become apparent as the project is executed.