![do it logo] **do it**

S T A T E   O F   M A R Y L A N D

DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

MARTIN O'MALLEY
Governor

ANTHONY BROWN
Lieutenant Governor

ELLIOT SCHLANGER
Secretary

Question and Answer No. 4
Request for Proposals (RFP)
Central Collections Unit (CCU)
Debt Collection Information System (DCIS)
RFP # F50B2400052

Ladies/Gentlemen:

This list of questions and responses is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above referenced RFP. The statements and interpretations contained in the following responses to questions by potential Offerors are not binding to the State, unless an addendum expressly amends the RFP. Nothing in the State's response to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the State of any statement or interpretation on the part of the vendor.

24.   Attachment E – The State indicates in the Prod Software and PA Eval Software tabs Named user license requirements. Can the State elaborate on total number of concurrent users that it would require vs. named users as software using concurrent licenses is typically cheaper to procure?

Response:
The Offeror should price the named user licenses as unique licenses. The State will assign a license to a user based on the user's role. If the Offeror proposes concurrent license pricing, the Offeror must explain in the Assumptions column that concurrent license pricing was used and why this is advantageous to the State. The State has modified Attachment E, Table A and Table B, to allow Offeror's to propose either Concurrent License pricing or Enterprise License pricing for their proposed Web Interface Solution for the Client and Debtor Web Interfaces.

25.   Attachment E – If a vendors' COTS software has a bundled approach to its software vs. modules that is indicated under the section DCIS Model or Suite; how should the vendor indicate that the base COTS product includes multiple of the modules and there is no additional charge for them? And can the State elaborate if the number of users under the DCIS Module or Suite are truly unique users?   If a Vendor is providing a bundled approach would it only need to account for 25 named users as that is the highest number of users indicated in this section? Or is it a sum of all those numbers -145 named users for the evaluation software? If it is 145 named users can the State indicate how many concurrent users the 145 named licenses would translate to?

Response:
If an Offeror has a bundled approach to its software, the instructions for the Software Cost tables should be followed. The instructions state: "Where one or more items/functions are bundled/batched together, only list the price on one line item and note in the 'Assumptions' column what items/functions are included in the integrated pricing. For example, if Offeror has a total package which includes all functions/applications, then the Offeror should state all functions/applications that are included in the package price as 'Integrated COTS Solution' adding assumptions to clearly explain where a cost has

been integrated and where the cost would be a separate charge." Regarding the number of unique users, the State, under Table B – PA Eval SW Cost, is seeking a total of 25 named user licenses that can perform various functions within the system. If separate licenses are needed for a particular function, the Offeror should provide the number identified in the table for that specific module, tool or function.

26.   Attachment E – # of licenses needed. Can the state elaborate further on each of the line items in Attachment E that indicates number of users? Specifically and in general is it possible for a named license that is say needed for Collections under the DCIS section be the same person who needs a license for the file generator for Enterprise licensing tool? Or has the state identified truly unique licenses for each of these categories?

Response:
Each line item in Attachment E represents the maximum number of named user licenses for that module/tool. The Offeror should price the named user licenses as unique licenses. The State will assign a license to a user based on the user's role.

27.   Attachment E – If the vendor is not proposing a module or suite that is not part of the base software how should that be accounted for in the pricing tables? To ensure objective pricing and evaluation would the State consider requiring vendors to price out all modules for the Production Software and the costs associated with those integrations (whether the State chooses to integrate or not) to ensure pricing evaluations are done on a level playing field. For example, Vendor A COTS software includes collections, Reports, Letters, Application Administration, and Accounting and has a cost of XX dollars. Vendor B COTS software only includes Collections and reporting and costs YY dollars. Neither are required to price out the other modules so the State has no way of evaluating either the base systems as they are vastly different or the base systems plus integrations.

Response:
Offerors are required to indicate and include in their pricing all software necessary to meet the requirements of this solicitation as detailed in Attachment I.1 – Functional and Technical Requirements. This includes separate COTS products that may be in addition to the core COTS software package of the Offeror. If Offerors do not provide the ability to perform the requirement and do not include a separate product to meet the State's requirement they would indicate "N" in Attachment I.1. As a result of not meeting the State's requirement, Offerors would receive a lower technical score. In an effort to ensure that the State is comparing like product offerings, please see the State's response to question #21 and Amendment #2 where the State has now added Table M to Attachment E – Pricing to cover all "Optional Software". This allows Offerors to provide information on other products that interface or complement the Offeror's software and provides value-add to the Offeror's overall solution.

28.   The State has indicated the Production Software may be procured up to 3 years after the first award under a separate RFP. Can the State elaborate on how long the Production Software costs in this proposal will be valid for or should vendors take into consideration future costs?

Response:
As referenced in the Section 1.4 – Contract Duration, the contract resulting from this solicitation could total up to thirteen (13) consecutive years. The State intends to award the Notice To Proceed (NTP) for Production Software under this solicitation at the time that the implementation process is initiated. It is incumbent on each Offeror to determine how they bid the Production Software costs in Attachment E, Table A, knowing that the implementation process may not begin for up to three (3) years from contract award.

29.   Will the State consider removing the Production Software costs from this procurement since it is not related to this procurement?

Response:
No, the State requires the Production Software costs as part of its Evaluated Price, because it is the State's intent to procure the additional Production licenses under this solicitation.

30.   Although the deadline has been extended by one week currently, would the State consider 1 additional weeks extension? This request is based on the very complex nature of the pricing matrix being for evaluation software that is part of this procurement and production software costs which are not part of this procurement.   In order to ensure strict compliance additional time would be very helpful.

Response:
See response to Question #29 regarding the following comment: "production software costs which are not part of this procurement". Regarding the extension request, Amendment #3 issued July 11, 2012 extended the deadline for receipt of proposals to July 26, 2012 at 2:00 pm local time.