Amendments to RFP

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER ONE

Department of Administration
Division of Admin Services
PO Box 110208
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0208

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER **DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: August 5, 2010**

RFP TITLE: Statewide Administrative Systems Replacement Project

DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS: 1:30pm, Alaska Time, October 1, 2010.

The State does not require this amendment to be signed and returned with proposals.

This Amendment is issued to make the following change and answer a question posed by a potential Offeror. Please note that the State will issue additional amendments to answer questions and subsequent amendments will continue the Question and Answer numbering as started below; for example, the next amendment that answers questions will start with "Q2."

CHANGE TO RFP:

1. Please note that a day reference in the RFP Section 1.02 timetable is incorrect. Please **delete** "Wednesday, August 17, 2010" referenced in the date column for the Best Value Educational Meeting and Pre-proposal Conference and **replace** with "Tuesday, August 17, 2010."

QUESTION/ANSWER

Q1. For a State implementation customer, we have completed Phase 1 (Core Human Resources, Financial and Procurement Functionality has been fully implemented and is in production for all 160 agencies within the State) but have not completed Phase 2 (Additional functionality for a subset of the 160 agencies is not in production). Since the core functionality is in production for 160 agencies does this qualify as a reference for the State of Alaska RFP?

A1. No, please refer to RFP Section 7.03, under "Obtaining the PPI," Item 3, which requires references from projects that are 100% implemented and in production status. The PPI scoring methodology takes into consideration the number of returned surveys from only those projects that are 100% implemented and in production status and Offerors that have completed more projects will receive more credit.

All terms and conditions not modified by this amendment remain in full force and effect.

Staci Augustus, CPPB, Procurement Officer
staci.augustus@alaska.gov
Phone: (907) 465-5656 TDD: (907) 465-2205
FAX: (907) 465-2194

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER TWO

RETURN THIS AMENDMENT TO THE ISSUING OFFICE AT:

Department of Administration
Division of Admin Services
PO Box 110208
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0208

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER **DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: August 11, 2010**

RFP TITLE: Statewide Administrative Systems Replacement Project

DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS: 1:30pm, Alaska Time, October 1, 2010.

Important Note To Offerors: In order for your proposal to be considered responsive, this amendment, in addition to your original proposal and other required documents, must be signed, dated, and received by the issuing office prior to the time set for receiving proposals.

This Amendment is issued to make the following changes and replace the originally issued Attachment/Exhibit E.

Please note that the numbering of the changes has continued from the previous amendment.

CHANGES TO RFP:

2. The State has determined that a normalization of an Offeror's cost proposal will not be performed during the best value evaluation process. It is the Offeror's responsibility to provide a solution that includes **all** of the components and associated costs (excluding server hardware and applicable operating system costs), which includes Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) over a ten year period as requested in Exhibit E.

   The RFP has been amended in the following sections, as shown, to remove reference to any cost normalization performed on an Offeror's cost proposal. Please note that changes to the RFP sections are listed below with deletions shown as a ~~strikethrough~~ and additions identified as ***bold italic***.

2.13 Five Percent Alaskan Bidder Preference 2 AAC 12.260 & AS 36.30.170

An Alaskan Bidder Preference of five percent will be applied to the ~~normalized~~ cost proposals prior to evaluation. The preference will be given to an Offeror who:

(a) holds a current Alaska business license;
(b) submits a proposal for goods or services under the name on the Alaska business license;
(c) has maintained a place of business within the State staffed by the Offeror, or an employee of the Offeror, for a period of six months immediately preceding the date of the proposal;
(d) is incorporated or qualified to do business under the laws of the State, is a sole proprietorship and the proprietor is a resident of the State, is a limited liability company organized under AS 10.50 and all members are residents of the State, or is a partnership under AS 32.05 or AS 32.11 and all partners are residents of the State; and
(e) if a joint venture, is composed entirely of entities that qualify under (a)-(d) of this subsection.

Alaskan Bidder Preference Affidavit
In order to receive the Alaskan Bidder Preference, proposals must include a statement certifying that the Offeror is eligible to receive the Alaskan Bidder Preference.

2.14 Formula Used to Convert Cost to Points AS 36.30.250 & 2 AAC 12.260

The distribution of points based on cost will be determined as set out in 2 AAC 12.260 (c). The lowest cost proposal will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be determined through the method set out below. In the example below, cost is weighted as 25% of the overall total score.

EXAMPLE

Formula Used to Convert Cost to Points

[STEP 1]
List all ~~normalized~~ proposal prices, adjusted where appropriate by the application of the 5 percent Alaskan Bidders preference and any other applicable preferences.

Offeror #1	-	Non-Alaskan Offeror $40,000
Offeror #2	-	Alaskan Offeror $42,750
Offeror #3	-	Alaskan Offeror $47,500

7.04 Cost (250 Points)

Offerors must submit their cost proposal as Exhibit E. Offerors must itemize costs for ***all*** application software, system software, professional services by required deliverable, other one-time expenses, annual maintenance, ongoing expenses, required servers and other technical components, and staffing rates. ***Cost will be evaluated based on the ten-year total cost of ownership provided by Offerors in Exhibit E. If any proposal has a ten-year total cost of ownership*** ~~(calculated as described above)~~ ***that exceeds 50% above or below the average ten-year total cost of ownership of all proposals, the State reserves the right to not consider the proposal.***

The server hardware for a traditional licensed proposal must be listed in Exhibit E, Table D – Required Servers; however no associated cost is required and this component of the Offeror's solution will not be factored into the ten-year total cost of ownership. As stated in the instructions for Table D an Offeror submitting a hosted ("cloud") proposal does not need to complete Exhibit E, Table D – Required Servers.

The cost proposal may not be amended by the Offeror as a result of increased understanding gained during the Pre-award Phase. It may only be amended by scope changes proposed by the State during the Pre-award Phase. Schedule extensions will not justify cost increases at any time during the Pre-award Phase or the implementation period of the project.

Scoring of Cost
~~Cost will be evaluated based on a ten-year total cost of ownership. Prior to scoring the cost proposals, Pacific Technologies, Inc. (PTI), the State's procurement consultant, will normalize costs to determine total cost of ownership. PTI will adjust proposed costs as needed to remove the cost of third-party software licenses that the State may already have, or other system components that already exist within the State's architecture – and as such, the State would not need to purchase as part of the new administrative system. Similarly, PTI will add the costs of all necessary third-party software required to be purchased by the State to implement the Offeror's proposed solution as well as State resources, identified in Exhibit D4, required for the implementation.~~

~~The State is open to considering a software-as-a-service, "cloud computing" option. Offerors proposing these solutions will have their cost proposal reduced by the amount of expected long-term labor savings. The cost estimates are being analyzed at the time of the RFP release, and the amount will be provided as an amendment to the RFP.~~

~~Normalization adjustments to an Offeror's cost will be discussed and clarified with the Offeror for agreement. The State reserves the right to determine the final normalized total cost of ownership to be used in the evaluation process.~~

~~If any proposal has a ten-year total cost of ownership (calculated as described above) that exceeds 50% above or below the average ten-year total cost of ownership of all proposals, the State reserves the right to not consider the proposal.~~

~~The cost proposal may not be amended by the Offeror as a result of increased understanding gained during the Pre-award Phase. It may only be amended by scope changes proposed by the State during the Pre-award Phase. Schedule extensions will not justify cost increases at any time during the Pre-award Phase or the implementation period of the project.~~

The cost proposals will be evaluated against each other regardless of the solution type (traditional licensed software or hosted model). The State will not adjust, in any manner, an Offeror's cost proposal.

The lowest cost proposal will receive the maximum number of points allocated to cost. The point allocations for cost on the other proposals will be determined through the method set out in Sections 2.13 and 2.14, including applicable Alaskan Bidder Preference as described therein.

In the example below, Offeror 2 is awarded the maximum points for cost as their final ~~normalized~~ cost is the lowest.

Cost Scoring Example

	~~Cost Offered~~	~~Normalized Cost~~ *Offered*	5% Alaskan Bidder Preference Discount	Final ~~Normalized~~ Cost	Award Points
Offeror 1	~~$1,250,000.00~~	$1,162,500.00	($58,125.00)	$1,104,375.00	242.74
Offeror 2	~~$1,075,000.00~~	$1,128,750.00	($56,437.50)	$1,072,312.50	**250.00**
Offeror 3	~~$1,500,000.00~~	$1,410,000.00	($70,500.00)	$1,139,500.00	235.26
Offeror 4	~~n/a~~	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Offeror 5	~~$1,375,000.00~~	$1,416,250.00	n/a	$1,416,250.00	189.29
Offeror 6	~~$1,195,000.00~~	$1,171,100.00	($58,555.00)	$1,112,545.00	240.95
Offeror 7	~~$1,425,000.00~~	$1,439,250.00	($71,962.50)	$1,367,287.50	196.06
Offeror 8	~~$1,155,000.00~~	$1,178,100.00	n/a	$1,178,100.00	227.55

Points shall be awarded to each Offeror based on the formula outlined in Section 2.14 and will be included in the Offeror's total score for Filter 2.

Attachment/Exhibit E – Cost Proposal

The Offeror's cost proposal shall include all costs associated with the performance of the resulting contract, including, but not limited to: administrative overhead, transportation, lodging, and per diem costs sufficient to pay for all staff required to be on-site in Juneau, Alaska. Should the State require travel by contractor staff to other locations, these travel costs from Juneau will be the responsibility of the State and will be reimbursed in accordance with State travel policies as provided in Alaska Administrative Manual (AAM) 60 - Travel.

The State will use these forms ~~as well as a cost normalization process as set out in Section 7.04 of the RFP~~ to evaluate costs. ~~The cost of State personnel contained in Exhibit D4 will also be taken into consideration in determining the Total Cost of Ownership.~~

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER TWO

Offerors shall fill out the applicable tabs in this workbook – which in total will comprise an Offeror's cost proposal – in the format set out below. These cost forms apply to both the traditional licensed software modules and hosted models ("cloud") proposals. Offerors should not submit any other materials, except as instructed, as they will not be considered in the cost evaluation.

NOTE: Attachment/Exhibit E have been revised and the originally issued versions on the State's Online Public Notice website have been replaced. Only the instructions for Attachment/Exhibit E have been revised, all other content remains unchanged.

All terms and conditions not modified by this amendment remain in full force and effect.

IMPORTANT:
This is a **mandatory return** Amendment because it constitutes a material change that requires interested parties to understand and acknowledge. Please complete the information below and return this document with your proposal.

_____
Name of Company

_____ _____
Authorized Signature Date

Staci Augustus, CPPB
Procurement Officer

Phone: (907) 465-5656 TDD: (907) 465-2205
FAX: (907) 465-2194

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER THREE

RETURN THIS AMENDMENT WITH PROPOSAL TO THE ISSUING OFFICE AT:

Department of Administration
Division of Admin Services
PO Box 110208
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0208

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER **DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: August 27, 2010**

RFP TITLE: Statewide Administrative Systems Replacement Project

DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS: 1:30pm, Alaska Time, October 1, 2010.

Important Note To Offerors: In order for your proposal to be considered responsive, this amendment, in addition to your original proposal and other required documents, must be signed, dated, and received by the issuing office prior to the time set for receiving proposals.

This Amendment is issued to make the following changes and provide responses to questions submitted by Offerors for clarification.

Please note that the numbering of the changes and questions has continued from the previous amendment.

CHANGES TO RFP:

3. The RFP has been amended in the following sections, as shown, to clarify content of the solicitation. Please note that changes to the RFP sections are listed below with deletions shown as a ~~strikethrough~~ and additions identified as ***bold italic***.

1.04 Budget

Department of Administration, Division of Finance, estimates a budget of between $30 and $35 million dollars for completion of this project to implement the solution. If a competitive procurement determines the cost to be higher, the department may request additional funding or reduce the scope of the implementation.

Although the State is soliciting proposals for a fully integrated ERP solution, the State envisions a phased approach for the different modules with related software and maintenance payment schedules based on the implementation timeframe for each module.

1.14 Subcontractors

Subcontractors may be used to perform work under this contract. If an Offeror intends to use subcontractors, the Offeror must identify in the proposal the names of the subcontractors and the portions of the work the subcontractors will perform.

The Offeror must provide the following information (refer to Attachment *A1* ~~A4~~) concerning each prospective subcontractor with their proposal:

(a) complete name of the subcontractor;
(b) complete address of the subcontractor;
(c) type of work the subcontractor will be performing;
(d) percentage of work the subcontractor will be providing;
(e) evidence that the subcontractor holds a valid Alaska business license; and
(f) a written statement, signed by each proposed subcontractor that clearly verifies that the subcontractor is committed to render the services required by the contract.

An Offeror's failure to provide this information will cause the State to consider their proposal non-responsive and reject it. After contract approval, the Contractor may substitute a subcontractor for another only at the discretion and prior written approval of the State project directors.

1.25 Glossary

Term	Definition/Description
Cloud	***Style of computing where scalable and elastic IT-related capabilities are provided as a service using internet technology.***

2.07 Minimum Requirements

Offerors must propose a fully integrated software solution that encompasses at least financial, procurement, and human resources administrative functions in order to be deemed responsive.

In addition, an Offeror's proposal must demonstrate that their proposed solution meets at least 80% of the functional requirements, as defined by a check in the 'Meets' column of Exhibit F. The State will conduct a scripted Vendor Demonstration as an initial task in the Pre-award phase whereby responses to requirements will be confirmed.

3.01 Contract Type

The contracts resulting from this RFP will be for:

1. ~~Licensing and~~ Implementation of software solution: Firm fixed price contract with no adjustments.
2. ***Licensing and*** Ten Year Maintenance and Support: The initial four-year contract will be a firm fixed price; CPI adjustments may be requested at the beginning of each of the three two-year renewals.

4.03 Statewide Administrative Systems Replacement Project

The State envisions employee and vendor self-service as two outcomes of this project. Linking the procurement and payment processes using a unified vendor file will be a substantial business process change affecting a broad number of State employees; as will a central customer file for tracking ***accounts receivable and*** revenues ~~received~~. Automating manual processes will require evaluating existing processes against best practices, and focused change management efforts.

The State is currently on a change management learning ~~with the ongoing~~ curve with the ongoing implementation of ASSET. We are establishing a change management team and dedicating the resources necessary to make that implementation successful. The lessons learned on this project will translate directly into the implementation of

the Statewide Administrative Systems. The State has no certified Change Management Professionals on staff. The Contractor is expected to bring organizational change management expertise for the software implementation to the project to assist the State's assigned change management resources.

5.01 Overview

The State of Alaska, Department of Administration, is soliciting proposals on behalf of all State agencies to license and implement a comprehensive, integrated, statewide administrative system. This solution is required to interface with several applications currently used by the State as listed in Attachment I.

The State anticipates procuring the following products and services as part of the Statewide Administrative Systems Replacement project:

1. An integrated finance, procurement, human resources, and payroll application, including:
   a. General ledger
   b. Fund accounting
   c. Budget compliance and enforcement
   d. Accounts payable and disbursements
   e. Purchasing and e-procurement, including vendor self-service
   f. Accounts receivable and revenue collections
   g. Grant and contract management
   h. Project accounting
   i. Cost allocation/labor distribution
   j. Fixed assets
   k. Human resources management, including personnel actions
   l. Payroll
   m. Position control
   n. Benefits administration, including employee self-service
   o. Budget development ~~and compliance monitoring~~
2. Comprehensive implementation services, including:
   a. Project management
   b. Discovery and business rules documentation
   c. Business process design and software configuration
   d. Technical architecture and infrastructure design
      i. Solutions that propose a licensed product must comply with the State's standards and hardware specifications, including production, quality assurance, development, and fail-over environments that comply with State standards provided in Attachment N
   e. Communication and change management support
   f. Data conversion
   g. Interface development
   h. Custom reports development
   i. Custom workflow development
   j. Custom forms development
   k. Application testing
   l. User and technical operations training
   m. Knowledge transfer to State personnel

n. Post go-live stabilization

3. Associated process re-engineering services
4. Ten years of software maintenance

The State is interested in a solution that is configurable to accommodate complex business rules for finance, procurement, and human resources management, and proposes minimal customization necessary to meet the State's functional requirements in Attachment F. Offerors should use these requirements to determine the modules proposed in order to address the functional scope of the effort. In addition, the State is expecting the Contractor to analyze existing business processes and recommend business process changes where the State could benefit by adopting best practices.

Due to labor resource constraints, the State has a strong preference for a phased implementation, with the financial and procurement modules implemented first, ~~and the~~ ***followed by*** human resources modules ***and potentially budget development*** ~~following, and~~ ***with*** minimal overlap between the phases. The State does not have mandated or required "go-live" dates ~~for either phase~~.

Although the State is soliciting proposals for a fully integrated ERP solution, the State envisions a phased approach for the different modules with related software and maintenance payment schedules based on the implementation timeframe for each module.

5.02 System Sizing

Current Functional Statistics

Operating Budget	**Count**	**Frequency**
Operating Budget FY 2011	$7.3 billion	Not applicable
Accounts Payable	**Count**	**Frequency**
Active Vendors	48,000	Ongoing
Accounts Payable Checks	300	Daily
Employee Reimbursement Checks	100	Daily
Asset Inventory	**Count**	**Frequency**
Total Assets/Inventory Items	50,000	Ongoing
Contract Management	**Count**	**Frequency**
Current Contracts	15,000	Annually
General Ledger	**Count**	**Frequency**
Active Funds	400	Ongoing
General Ledger Journal Entries	12,000	Monthly
HR/Payroll	**Count**	**Frequency**
Number of Active Employees	21,075	Not applicable
Employee Bargaining Units	13	Not applicable
~~Number of Retirees/Pensioners~~	~~36,900~~	~~Not applicable~~
Payroll Disp*b*ursements	20,000	Bi-weekly
Payroll Direct Deposits	16,500	Bi-weekly
~~1099Rs~~	~~40,500~~	~~Not applicable~~
W-2s	25,000	Annually
Purchasing	**Count**	**Frequency**
Purchase Orders	300	Daily
Number of Active P-cards	6,500	Not applicable
P-card transactions	260,000	Annually

5.03 Maintenance and Support

The State requires the Offeror to propose an ongoing maintenance and support program that meets the following parameters:

1. Standard service hours – Monday-Friday 8:00 am to 5:00 pm Alaska standard time, excluding State holidays. During these times, while the maintenance and support program is in effect, Contractor will provide minimum service levels and timelines as follows:

    a. Type A Malfunction – Contractor will respond to all reported Type A Malfunctions within 30 minutes of receiving notification of the Type A Malfunction. Correction of this type of Malfunction will begin immediately. Contractor will assign qualified technical staff for continuous work until the reported Malfunction has been resolved. If such a problem is not resolved within eight hours after receipt of a Type A Malfunction notice from State, Contractor will escalate its efforts toward resolution by adding staff and/or sending technical/support staff to the State's location.

b. Type B Malfunction – Contractor will respond to all reported Type B Malfunctions within two hours of receiving notification of the Type B Malfunction. This type of Malfunction will be corrected within two business days.

c. Type C Malfunction – Contractor will respond to all reported Type C Malfunctions within four hours of receiving notification of the Type C Malfunction. This type of Malfunction will be corrected by Contractor within five business days.

2. After hours service – Monday-Friday before 8:00 am and after 5:00 pm Alaska standard time, on weekends, and State holidays. During these times, while the maintenance and support program is in effect, Contractor will provide minimum service levels and timelines as follows:

   a. Type A Malfunction – Contractor will respond to all reported Type A Malfunctions within two hours of receiving notification of the Type A Malfunction. Correction of this type of Malfunction will begin immediately. Contractor will assign qualified technical staff for continuous work until the reported Malfunction has been resolved. If such a problem is not resolved within the sooner of 16 hours after receipt of a Type A Malfunction notice from State, or within eight hours after the start of the next State regular business day, Contractor will escalate its efforts toward resolution by adding staff and/or sending technical/support staff to the State's location.

   b. Type B Malfunction – Contractor will respond to all reported Type B Malfunctions within two hours after the start of the next regular State business day. This type of Malfunction will be corrected within one business day after that start.

   c. Type C Malfunction – Contractor will respond to all reported Type C Malfunctions within four hours after the start of the next regular State business day. This type of Malfunction will be corrected within five business days after that start.

3. Malfunction classifications – "Malfunction" means a defect of the licensed software that degrades its use. Three levels of malfunction classifications are:

   a. Type A Malfunction – This is an error, bug, or discrepancy that delays or inhibits the primary functionality of the licensed software or a Malfunction that has the potential to corrupt licensed software data.

   b. Type B Malfunction – This is a defect of the licensed software that degrades its use, including defects that cause the software to produce incorrect results.

   c. Type C Malfunction – This is a defect that causes only minor impact on the use of the software. This includes all Malfunctions that are not considered Type A or Type B.

New releases of the licensed software will be provided to the State at no additional cost as specified in Section 3.1 of Appendix C to Attachment H.

6.01 Instructions Overview

All submittal documents must be on standard 8½" x 11" paper. The templates provided as attachments to the RFP must be used, including 10-point Arial font. Modifications to the format of this template (e.g., altering font size, altering font type, adding colors, adding pictures etc) may result in the Offeror's entire proposal being found non-responsive. The proposal should be stapled, ***binder clipped, or paper clipped*** (and not bound) to facilitate easy handling, photocopying, and reading by the PEC. No faxed or emailed proposals will be considered. The proposal must be received by the date and time specified in the "Deadline for Receipt of Proposals" subsection 1.01. Late submittals will not be considered.

7.04 Cost (250 Points)

Offerors must submit their cost proposal as Exhibit E. Offerors must itemize all costs for application software, system software, professional services by required deliverable, other one-time expenses, annual maintenance, ongoing expenses, required servers and other technical components, and staffing rates. Cost will be evaluated based on the ten-year total cost ~~of ownership~~ provided by Offerors in Exhibit E. If any proposal has a ten-year total cost ~~of ownership~~ that exceeds 50% above or below the average ten-year total cost ~~of ownership~~ of all proposals, the State reserves the right to not consider the proposal.

The server hardware for a traditional licensed proposal must be listed in Exhibit E, Table D – Required Servers; however no associated cost is required and this component of the Offeror's solution will not be factored into the ten-year total cost ~~of ownership~~. As stated in the instructions for Table D an Offeror submitting a hosted ("cloud") proposal does not need to complete Exhibit E, Table D – Required Servers.

The cost proposal may not be amended by the Offeror as a result of increased understanding gained during the Pre-award Phase. It may only be amended by scope changes proposed by the State during the Pre-award Phase. Schedule extensions will not justify cost increases at any time during the Pre-award Phase or the implementation period of the project.

7.12 Cost Reasonableness

To ensure the optimum use of public funds, the State will review the cost reasonableness of the prioritized Offerors in the following manner:

1. If the highest ranked Offeror's ten-year total cost ~~of ownership~~ is within the State's means and within 5% of the next highest ranked Offeror's ten-year total cost ~~of ownership~~, the State will invite the highest ranked Offeror to the Pre-award Phase.

2. If the highest ranked Offeror's ten-year total cost ~~of ownership~~ is within the State's means, but the highest ranked Offeror's ten-year total cost ~~of ownership~~ is more than 5% greater than the second highest ranked Offeror's ten-year total cost ~~of ownership~~, the State reserves the right to invite the second highest ranked Offeror to the Pre-award Phase.

3. If the highest ranked Offeror's ten-year total cost ~~of ownership~~ exceeds the State's means, the State reserves the right to invite the next highest ranked Offeror whose ten-year total cost ~~of ownership~~ falls within the State's means.

7.13 Pre-award Phase

The Pre-award Phase will be evaluated as a pass/fail for the Offeror that has been invited to participate in this Filter.

At any time during the Pre-award Phase, if the State is not satisfied with the progress being made with the invited Offeror ***or determines that the Offeror's Exhibit F Software Functionality and Technical Requirements have been misrepresented***, the State may terminate the Pre-award Phase activities with that Offeror. The State may then commence a new Pre-award Phase with the next highest ranked Offeror.

EXHIBIT D4: IMPLEMENTATION ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Complete the table below by estimating both the State's and Offeror's labor effort for each required deliverable described in Section 5.04 of the RFP. This information will clarify the expected roles, responsibilities and time required for implementing the proposed solution and help the State more accurately evaluate the Offeror's proposal. ~~The cost of the estimated State labor effort will be included in the Total Cost of Ownership for evaluation.~~

Attachment/Exhibit F Software functionality and Technical Requirements

A number of duplicate requirements (25) were identified in Attachment/Exhibit F which have been removed. The duplicate entries are listed below with the deleted requirement identified with a ~~strikethrough~~.

Duplicate	ID Num	Requirement Area	Requirement Subcategory	Requirement Name	Requirement
1	~~4259~~	~~Financial~~	~~(CAFR) Accounting~~	~~General Ledger~~	~~System shall allow users to process transactions online real time or in batch mode.~~
1	5118	System and Technical	General	General	System shall allow users to process transactions online real time or in batch mode.
2	0102	Budget	Control/Execution	Accounting Control	System shall provide **edits that restrict expenditures based on available fund and appropriation balances** ~~a fund inquiry screen that displays the available fund budget and actual balances~~ (original appropriations, adjusted appropriations, **lapse** ~~release~~, estimated revenue, **actual** revenue, **encumbrances**, and expenditures).
~~2~~	~~1382~~	~~Financial~~	~~Cross Cutting~~	~~TANAB for Funds and all Structures~~	~~System shall provide a fund inquiry screen that displays the available fund budget and actual balances (original appropriations, adjusted appropriations, estimated revenue, and expenditure) for all structures.~~
3	3289	Payroll	Payroll Accounting	Taxes	System shall maintain all employee information required for W-2 reporting in both print and electronic media formats for federal, state, and local taxing authorities.
~~3~~	~~3292~~	~~Payroll~~	~~Payroll Accounting~~	~~Taxes~~	~~System shall maintain all employee information required for W-2 reporting in both print and electronic media formats for federal, state, and local taxing authorities.~~
4	4030	Procurement	Contracts	Word Processing	System shall provide ability to create/edit/save documents with standard word processing functionality such as spell-check, view, insert, format, tables, etc.
~~4~~	~~4441~~	~~Procurement~~	~~Vendor~~	~~Word Processing~~	~~System shall provide ability to create/edit/save documents with standard word processing functionality (e.g., spell check, view, insert, format, tables, etc.).~~
5	4099	Procurement	Inventory Management	General	System shall provide a variable length free-form character field available for describing special handling requirements, including but not limited to: *hazardous material classification; *storage requirements; *special clothing requirements; *special instructions for handling and disposal; *spill response; *shelf life; and *notification requirements. System shall provide a variable length character field showing requirements for maintaining or servicing item and also allow for link to Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) information system.
~~5~~	~~4115~~	~~Procurement~~	~~Inventory Management~~	~~General~~	~~System shall provide a variable length free-form character field or notepad, to describe special handling requirements, including but not limited to:~~ ~~*Hazardous material classification;~~ ~~*Storage requirements;~~ ~~*Special clothing requirements;~~ ~~*Special instructions for handling and disposal;~~ ~~*Spill response; and~~ ~~*Notification requirements.~~
6	4195	Procurement	Purchase Orders	Delivery Date	System shall provide ability to specify and track (e.g., identify, record, inquire, report) a delivery date.
~~6~~	~~4258~~	~~Procurement~~	~~Purchase Requisitions~~	~~Delivery Date Tracking~~	~~System shall provide ability to specify and track (e.g., identify, record, inquire, report) a delivery date.~~

~~7~~	~~5004~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Access Control~~	~~Screens~~	~~System shall limit display on system menus to the application module, function and screen options to which the user has access. "Graying out" options is not permitted by the security rules and does not meet this requirement.~~
7	5232	System and Technical	Security	Access Control	System shall limit display on system menus to the application module, function and screen options to which the user has access. "Graying out" option not permitted by the security rules ***and*** does not meet this requirement.
~~8~~	~~5006~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Access Control~~	~~Single Password~~	~~System shall allow the user to logon once to access all applications available to that user.~~
8	5230	System and Technical	Security	Access Control	System shall allow the user to logon once to access all applications available to that user.
9	5036	System and Technical	Data Extracts and Interfaces	XML Support	System shall provide an integrated data mapping facility for system data, at the field level, to or from data fields contained in a formatted XML document.
~~9~~	~~5037~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Data Extracts and Interfaces~~	~~XML Support~~	~~System shall provide integrated support for XML including the ability to send and receive system data in XML format.~~
10	5103	System and Technical	General	Backup/Recovery	System shall provide for automatic daily incremental back-up of all system files with periodic full back-up of the complete system.
~~10~~	~~5273~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Security~~	~~Disaster Recovery~~	~~System shall provide for automatic daily incremental back-up of all system files with periodic full back-up of the complete system.~~
11	5105	System and Technical	General	Backup/Recovery	System shall allow the recovery of the last completed unit of work to ensure file/data integrity for all in-process transactions.
~~11~~	~~5270~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Security~~	~~Disaster Recovery~~	~~System shall allow the recovery of the last completed unit of work to ensure file/data integrity for all in-process transactions.~~
12	5111	System and Technical	General	Documentation	The vendor shall provide electronic documentation of the as-built system. Examples include, but are not limited to: * system flowcharts; * system narratives; * program flowcharts; * program narratives; * functional flowchart; * business procedural documentation; * source code and/or full documentation of customizations; * user manuals; * crosswalk of files and tables; * entity relationship diagrams; * data dictionary; * database layout; * system administration procedures; ~~and~~ * system ***backup***/recovery plan; ***and*** * ***system disaster recovery plan***.
~~12~~	~~5138~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~General~~	~~System Documentation~~	~~Vendor deliverables shall include system documentation that includes at a minimum, but is not limited to the following delivered in four hard copies, one editable electronic copy in its original source file and a PDF version:~~ ~~* System flowcharts;~~ ~~* System narratives;~~ ~~* Program flowcharts;~~ ~~* Program narratives;~~ ~~* Functional flowchart;~~ ~~* Business procedural documentation;~~ ~~* Source code and/or full documentation of standard Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) and standard user exits;~~ ~~* User manuals (electronic and hard copies);~~ ~~* Screen layouts;~~ ~~* Report layouts;~~ ~~* Crosswalk of files and tables used to programs;~~ ~~* Entity relationship diagrams;~~ ~~* Data dictionary;~~ ~~* Database layout;~~ ~~* Database set-up procedures;~~ ~~* System implementation and update procedures;~~ ~~* System administration procedures;~~ ~~* System backup and recovery plan; and~~ ~~* System Disaster Recovery Plan.~~
13	5120	System and Technical	General	General	Any middleware/business logic component shall be a commercially available product and require prior State approval.
~~13~~	~~5136~~	~~System and~~	~~General~~	~~Middleware~~	~~Any middleware/business logic component of the system shall be a~~

		~~Technical~~			~~commercially available product.~~
~~14~~	~~5236~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Security~~	~~Access Control~~	~~System shall provide access restriction capability. Examples include but are not limited to:~~ ~~* Applications;~~ ~~* Screens and tables;~~ ~~* Data elements;~~ ~~* Functions (add, change, delete, inquiry, etc.);~~ ~~* Electronic documents (electronic approvals);~~ ~~* Business event;~~ ~~* Organizational unit; and~~ ~~* Accounting period (prior, current, etc.).~~
14	5237	System and Technical	Security	Access Control	System shall provide access restriction capability. Examples include, but are not limited to: * Applications; * Screens and tables; * Data elements; * Functions (e.g., add, change, delete, and inquiry); * Electronic documents (electronic approvals); * Business event; * Organizational unit; and * Accounting period (e.g., prior and current).
15	5239	System and Technical	Security	Access Control	System shall provide online inquiry into the security table. The security table shall be encrypted and not allow for viewing of password information.
~~15~~	~~5240~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Security~~	~~Access Control~~	~~System shall provide online inquiry into the security table. The security table will be encrypted and not allow for viewing of password information.~~
16	5241	System and Technical	Security	Access Control	System shall provide role based multi-level security controls.
~~16~~	~~5242~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Security~~	~~Access Control~~	~~System shall provide role based multi-level security controls.~~
17	5249	System and Technical	Security	Access Control	System shall provide the ability to restrict access to the application database(s) from outside the application programs.
~~17~~	~~5250~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Security~~	~~Access Control~~	~~System shall provide the ability to restrict access to the application database(s) from outside the application programs.~~
18	5255	System and Technical	Security	Access Control	System shall require a user whose password has expired to change the password prior to accessing the system.
~~18~~	~~5304~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Security~~	~~Password~~	~~System shall require a user whose password has expired to change the password prior to accessing the system.~~
19	5256	System and Technical	Security	Access Control	System shall restrict access to the database, maintain database process controls, and log all database transactions.
~~19~~	~~5257~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Security~~	~~Access Control~~	~~System shall restrict access to the database, maintain database process controls, and log all database transactions.~~
20	5261	System and Technical	Security	Audit Trail	System shall provide an audit trail of user access and unauthorized attempts to access the system.
~~20~~	~~5265~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Security~~	~~Auditing~~	~~System shall provide an audit trail of user access and unauthorized attempts to access the system.~~
~~21~~	~~5262~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Security~~	~~Audit Trail~~	~~System shall provide an automated audit trail of, and the ability to selectively report on, changes, additions, deletions, deactivations for all transactions/business events/records, profiles and source tables, which would include at a minimum date, time and user ID.~~
21	5266	System and Technical	Security	Auditing	System shall provide an automated audit trail and the ability to selectively report on changes, additions, deletions, deactivations for all transactions/business events/records, profiles and source tables, including date, time, user id and terminal IP address.
~~22~~	~~5293~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Security~~	~~Password~~	~~System shall ensure that each user ID defines a password with a minimum length of eight (8) alphanumeric characters.~~
22	5294	System and Technical	Security	Password	System shall ensure that passwords have a minimum length of eight (8) alphanumeric characters.
23	5295	System and Technical	Security	Password	System shall mask password entry so passwords cannot be viewed while being entered.
~~23~~	~~5296~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Security~~	~~Password~~	~~System shall mask password entry so that passwords cannot be viewed while being entered.~~
24	5298	System and Technical	Security	Password	System shall provide ability to disable log-on capabilities if unsuccessful password entry is attempted after a parameter-driven number of unsuccessful attempts. System shall provide the ability for automatic notification of security administrator upon disabling log-on capabilities.
~~24~~	~~5299~~	~~System and~~	~~Security~~	~~Password~~	~~System shall provide the ability to disable log-on capabilities if~~

		~~Technical~~			~~unsuccessful password entry is attempted after a parameter-driven number of unsuccessful attempts. The system shall provide the ability to automatically notify the security administrator upon disabling log-on capabilities.~~
25	5301	System and Technical	Security	Password	System shall provide the ability to establish multiple table driven timeframes for which selected passwords will expire if not changed.
~~25~~	~~5302~~	~~System and Technical~~	~~Security~~	~~Password~~	~~System shall provide the ability to establish parameter-driven, multiple timeframes for which selected passwords will expire, if not changed.~~

END CHANGES TO RFP

The questions below are from the best value and pre-proposal presentations held on Tuesday, August 17th, along with written questions received by the procurement officer through Tuesday, August 24th. The response to questions from both presentations is provided as the answer with any clarification proceeded with **Clarification.**

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

Q2. If the system implementer documents personnel for the following positions, does that accomplish the minimum requirement for Attachment D? Project Manager, Technical Lead, Finance/Procurement Functional Lead, Business Process Reengineering Lead, and Training Lead.

A2. While those personnel are the minimum, the State also expects proposals to identify all other "functional types" of staff with substantial hours on the project. A named resource does not have to be associated with a 'functional type' staff. Please refer to Attachment/Exhibit D1.

Note: The original question referred to key resources that were presented during preliminary best value sessions, the stated question lists key resources that are contained in the RFP Section 7.08.

Q3. Does the State of Alaska have a preferred hardware vendor? Reference Section 5.02 of the RFP.

A3. Please refer to Attachment N for the State's information technology standards. The State will work with the Pre-award vendor to identify any hardware that the State will purchase to support a licensed solution.

Q4. Even though it is not listed in Section 1.10 of the RFP, the assumption is that an Offeror is not precluded from submitting a proposal where the State purchases the software, but the software is hosted on the vendor's hardware.

A4. See questions Q41 and Q43 for response.

Q5. What does the 30 - 35 million dollar budget documented in Section 1.04 include? For instance, does it include software and hardware purchase along with 10 years of support?

A5. Section 1.04 provides an estimated budget for completion of this project to implement the solution. The implementation would include the software and hardware purchase, but not the ten years of support.

Q6. Per Attachment B, page B5 and B6, does the state require original reference Evaluator signature or is electronic reference Evaluator signature acceptable?

A6. See question Q21 for response.

Q7. Could the State please provide a deadline for submission of clarification questions or is the deadline noted in Section 1.07 ten days prior to the deadline for receipt of proposals?

A7. The deadline for submission of questions is ten days prior to the deadline for receipt of proposals.

Q8. Can the State please provide additional clarity for Section 1.10-Alternate Proposals. If the Offeror plans to submit an alternate proposal (a traditional license model proposal as well as a hosted model proposal), is the Offeror required to submit complete proposals (Exhibits A-F) for each proposal?

A8. Per Section 1.10, the paragraph following the two options states, "Each proposal must be a complete proposal that stands alone for evaluation and must be submitted separately as described in Section 1.01."

Q9. Could the State please confirm that the Sample Systems Configuration document requested in Exhibit D2 should be attached immediately behind the Exhibit D2 form?
A9. Yes, please attach the Sample Systems Configuration document immediately behind Exhibit D2.

Q10. Can an additional deliverable row for 'Other Deliverables' be added to the 27 Deliverable listed in Exhibit D4 as is included in Exhibit E, Table E?
A10. Yes.

Q11. Should the subcontractor's written statement mentioned in Exhibit A1 be attached immediately behind Exhibit A1, or behind Exhibit A4, or in some other location in the response?
A11. Please attach subcontractors' written statements immediately behind Exhibit A1.

Q12. In the instructions to Attachment E, Table A-Application Software Costs, there is a reference to Tab 4. Should this reference be Table I?
A12. Yes, please use Exhibit E, Table I on Tab 4 for a cloud solution and Exhibit E, Table H on Tab 4 for a traditional licensed solution. Only one of these tables should be submitted with a proposal.

Note: Exhibit E, Table J on Tab 4 must be completed regardless of the type of solution.

Q13. On which form does the subcontractor information requested in RFP section 1.14 belong?
A13. Please provide the information requested in RFP Section 1.14 in Exhibit A1, in the area identified for subcontractors.

Note: Section 1.14 has been corrected in Amendment Three to reference the correct location for subcontractor information as Exhibit A1.

Q14. Where in the proposal response should the Supplemental Response Document referenced in Exhibit A4 be included?
A14. The supplemental response documents should be included in the referenced exhibit, for example, Subcontractor forms should be included in Exhibit D1.

Q15. Duplicate requirements appear to be listed in Attachment F - Software Functionality and Technical Requirements.
A15. Yes, a number of duplicate requirements (25) were identified in Attachment/Exhibit F which have been removed in Amendment Three.

Q16. Requirement 5305 states - System shall provide the ability to install security patches in compliance with State Security Policies. How is a copy of the State Security Policies obtained for review?
A16. Please refer to Section 4.04 Useful Information and instructions contained in the State of Alaska Enterprise Security Plan section.

Q17. Can the State please provide clarification on Section 3.01 Contract Type. Section 3.01 lists two contracts that will result from this RFP.
1. License and Implementation of the software solution
2. Ten Year Maintenance and Support.

However, Attachment G is a standard agreement form for services and Attachment H is a software license and maintenance agreement form. Does the State intend to use Attachment G and Attachment H as the contract

types and does the State intend to execute Attachment G with the System Implementer and Attachment H with the software vendor.

A17. Section 3.01 Contract Type has been modified as part of Amendment Three to reflect:
1. ~~License and~~ Implementation of software solution
2. ***Licensing and*** Ten Year Maintenance and Support

Attachment G - Standard Implementation Services Agreement will be used for (1.) Implementation of software solution, while Attachment H - Standard Licensing and Maintenance Agreement will be used for (2.) Licensing and Ten Year Maintenance and Support.

Q18. We are seeking confirmation that the state intends to exclude Maximus from bidding on the state-wide ERP as stipulated in Maximus' contract with the State of Alaska under RFP Number 2003-0200-3511.

A18. See question Q33 for response.

Q19. If an Offeror does both software and implementation, can they use the same reference in the Past Performance Information (PPI)?

A19. Yes, if an Offeror is both the software developer and the system implementer for a software product then a single reference can be used on both Exhibit B3: Software Product Questionnaire and Exhibit B4: System Implementer Questionnaire. The single reference must be listed on both the Software Vendor Reference List and System Implementer Reference List in Exhibit B2: Reference List; and a separate survey questionnaire completed for each as the questions are different.

Q20. Are you associating a period of time that a module must be in production in order for the client to be a reference in the Past Performance Information (PPI)?

A20. No, if a module is live and the client is using it solely for administrative processing then the module is considered in production status and the client may be used as a reference for PPI.

Clarification: All modules within a systems implementation contract must meet this criteria in order for any of them to be used as a reference for PPI.

Please refer to Amendment 1 Q1.

Q21. Is electronic signature acceptable for the survey questionnaires in Exhibit B5 and B6?

A21. No, an electronic signature is not acceptable. RFP Section 7.03 states, "All returned surveys MUST be completed and signed by the past client."

Q22. Is any consideration given to a PPI references size, budget, employees, etc?

A22. No, not during Filter 1. This type of information will be evaluated in the Strategic Fit component of Filter 2.

Q23. If in the Project Approach the Offeror discloses that they are a consulting arm of the software vendor, is that too much information? We see that as a differentiator.

A23. An Offeror may disclose this information if the statement conforms to RFP Section 7.05 which states, "In order to minimize any bias, the Project Approach must NOT contain any names that can be used to identify the Offeror (company name, personnel names, past project names, product names or any other identifying information)."

Q24. In past experience has there been a feedback loop from the PEC to proposals? The page limit on Strategic Fit does not provide much space to thoroughly explain an Offeror's point.

A24. While the State has the ability to ask clarifying questions that the PEC might request, as stated in RFP Section 2.06, an Offeror should not expect this to occur.

Q25. Originally an HR/payroll resource was listed as a functional area to be interviewed. Is this still the expectation?
A25. Due to the State's preference to implement financial and procurement modules first, followed by the HR/payroll module(s), it would not make sense to interview HR/payroll resources at this point when they may not be available when the next implementation phase occurs.

Q26. If we propose specific implementation personnel for this implementation and they are unavailable at the time of implementation, would that affect the selection?
A26. Yes, if the proposed individuals are not available then that would affect the selection.

Clarification: A significant advantage of the best value process is that these key resources are available during the Pre-award Phase and implementation time period.

Q27. What if proposed key resources are no longer employed by the Offeror?
A27. In the case where a key resource is no longer employed by the Offeror then RFP Section 3.12 applies, "Any change of the project team members named in the proposal must be approved, in advance and in writing, by the State project manager."

Q28. Interviews for the project are scheduled in October while the start date is July. This is challenging for vendors to guarantee availability of personnel.
A28. The start of the project for key resources is really in January for the Offeror invited to the Pre-award Phase. Other members of the project team will join the effort in July, or perhaps sooner depending on how the Pre-award Phase progresses.

Q29. Was one of the five projects that were kicked out during the Pre-award Phase a software (IT) project?
A29. No, it was a service project.

Q30. Is it normal to provide the Offeror invited to the Pre-award Phase with all of the other Offerors' risks? Will the RAVA plans be available to all Offerors?
A30. Yes, as stated in RFP Section 1.13 the State will disclose <u>only</u> the risks identified on the individual Risk Assessments to the Offeror in the Pre-award Phase. All Offerors will have an opportunity after the Notice of Intent to Award to request a copy of any proposal received by the State.

Q31. Will the State be accepting exceptions to Terms and Conditions (T&C)?
A31. Yes, however any full repudiation of T&C would result in a proposal to be deemed non-responsive.

Clarification: Offeror must submit all exceptions to the State's Terms and Conditions in Exhibit D Strategic Fit.

Q32. For Exhibit B4, the System Implementer Survey Questionnaire, is the State seeking public sector projects where the implementer specifically implemented the software solution being proposed for the State of Alaska?
A32. As stated in RFP Section 7.03, "The Offeror is responsible for selecting past clients for the submission of each of their critical components' performance ratings. The Offeror is encouraged to only submit highly satisfied references." A survey questionnaire from a public or private sector client is acceptable.

As stated in Exhibit B2 Reference List, "The reference lists should include the firm's and individual's best, <u>relevant</u> past contracts."

Q33. The State has engaged multiple vendors in the Statewide Administrative Systems Replacement project initiative since 2002 from business case creation to preparation of this RFP (e.g. PTI, Wostmann & Associates Inc., Maximus). Can the State please clarify which vendors are specifically precluded in responding to this RFP?

A33. The State's current Procurement consultant (Pacific Technology Inc.) and Quality Assurance consultant (Wostmann & Associates) are precluded from responding to RFP 2010-0200-9388. This RFP did not result from consulting services performed by Maximus under RFP 2003-0200-3511, and as such Maximus may respond to this RFP.

The business case which Maximus helped the State create was completed over seven years ago and is available at http://fin.admin.state.ak.us/dof/sysrepl/business_case.jsp and is public information.

Q34. At the Bidder's Conference, the State indicated that the same individual can be proposed for multiple key staff roles. Can the State please confirm?

A34. If an Offeror believes a single resource for multiple key staff roles is advantageous then an Offeror may include this approach in their proposal. An interview with specific questions for each of the five functional areas listed in RFP Section 7.08 will be conducted and each interview will receive a separate score.

Q35. Our solution has been implemented in a number of large public sector sites and our experience is that the number of concurrent users averages 10% of the named users. We do not want the State of Alaska to have to needlessly spend money to acquire more hardware than is necessary to meet the performance standards listed in the RFP. Would the state consider revising the 2,000 concurrent user requirement listed in Section 5.02?

A35. No, the State declines to revise RFP Section 5.02 System Sizing.

Q36. Since the video-taped interviews will be included in the contract, will that make them part of the public record with no confidentiality protection? If that is the case, will a response of Trade Secret or Company Confidential be scored as a complete and compliant answer?

A36. Yes, as stated in RFP Section 1.13, "All proposals and other material submitted become the property of the State of Alaska . . . AS 40.25.110 requires public records to be open to reasonable inspection."

The PEC will score the Interviews based upon the information provided during the interview and an Offeror's written proposal. Also applicable to the Interview, an Offeror has the option to prevent public disclosure under RFP Section 1.13, "Trade secrets and other proprietary data contained in proposals may be held confidential if the Offeror requests, in writing, that the procurement officer does so, and if the procurement officer agrees, in writing, to do so."

Q37. At the time of the interviews we may have existing contracts that prohibit responding to questions that identify the client and / or the work being performed to support the client; will a response to that effect be scored as complete and compliant?

A37. The PEC will score the Interviews based upon the information provided during the interview and an Offeror's written proposal.

Q38. We would like to confirm that for the System Implementer references, only references from the Prime Offeror will be allowed.

A38. No, the Past Performance Information (PPI) is not limited to the Prime Offeror and must be collected for the proposed Software and System Implementer.

As stated in RFP Section 7.03, "The State will be analyzing Past Performance Information (PPI) on the critical components that are proposed by each Offeror. The information will be in the form of a reference. The critical components that will be evaluated for this RFP include:

(a) Software Offeror
(b) System Implementation Offeror"

Q39. Can you please clarify if the State will accept electronic signatures on the PPI Questionnaires?

A39. See question Q21 for response.

Q40. Is a list of bidder's conference attendees available?
A40. Yes, the list of attendees at the best value and pre-proposal conferences held on Tuesday, August 17th is available at http://fin.admin.state.ak.us/dof/sysrepl/schedule.jsp for reference.

Q41. Are the two types of solutions in RFP Section 1.10 the only ones that the State will consider?
A41. Yes, the State is seeking proposals that offer one of the two solution models.

Clarification: An Offeror may propose an alternate solution through the Value Added section of their proposal.

Q42. Since there may be a significant price difference between traditional and hosted models, how will proposals be scored with respect to price?
A42. Amendment Two removed reference to "normalization" of prices associated with an Offeror's proposal. Therefore, there will be no cost adjustments to an Offeror's cost proposals and costs will be evaluated against each other as submitted by the Offeror.

Q43. Can you clarify the use of the terms "software as a service", "cloud", and "hosted solution?"
A43. Amendment Three adds a definition for "cloud" in RFP Section 1.25, "***Style of computing where scalable and elastic IT-related capabilities are provided as a service using internet technology***."

The State is seeking proposals that offer one of the two solution models:

1. Traditional licensed software models, under which the State will purchase, house, and operate the hardware/software; and
2. Hosted models, under which the Offeror hosts and operates the software and supplies the software as a service.

Clarification: An Offeror may propose an alternate solution through the Value Added section of their proposal.

Q44. Will the State reimburse Offerors for Pre-award expenses?
A44. No, the State will not reimburse expenses for the Pre-award Phase.

Q45. Can you clarify the difference between a subcontractor and joint venture?
A45. A subcontractor is when the contractual relationship is with the Prime Offeror, and the State has no contractual relationship with that subcontractor.

A joint venture is when two or more companies join together for an opportunity and one is identified as the Prime Offeror, or prime contractor.

Either type requires specific information that is referenced in RFP Sections 1.14 Subcontractors and 1.15 Joint Ventures, respectively. Further, one party is identified as the Prime Offeror and has the contractual relationship with the State.

Q46. With regard to subcontractors, what role does the subcontractor fulfill in completing the documents submitted with an Offeror's proposal?
A46. It is up to the Offeror to determine the level of involvement of the subcontractor(s) in completing the components of an Offeror's proposal, as detailed in the RFP, including Attachment A.

Q47. Under RFP Section 1.24, what federal requirements is the State aware of?

A47. We don't know of any federal requirements.

Clarification: The statement provided during the pre-proposal conference was not a complete response as it related only to the proposal. The State is aware of several federal requirements that apply to what is requested in this RFP, including IRS regulations, OMB Circulars and labor laws. The Contractor will be responsible for ensuring that all federal requirements are met in the solution.

Q48. To receive the Alaska preferences, must the Prime Offeror hold an Alaska Business License? What about a joint venture?

A48. To apply for the Alaska preferences, RFP Section 2.11 states, "At the time the proposals are opened, all Offerors (including all joint venture partners) must hold a valid Alaska business license and any necessary applicable professional licenses required by Alaska Statute." Further, to be responsive to the RFP, Offerors, including all joint venture partners and subcontractors must have a valid Alaska Business License.

Q49. In RFP Section 2.17, there are references to two different time frames for protests, can you clarify?

A49. There are two different protest types; one refers to the protest of RFP content, which requires a written protest to be filed with the Procurement Officer at least ten days prior to the deadline for receipt of proposals. The other refers to a protest of the award of a contract or the proposed award of a contract, which requires a written protest to be filed with the Procurement Officer no more than ten days after the Notice of Intent to Award has been issued.

Q50. Clarify the State's intent in RFP Section 4 relating to the Change Management professional and how it correlates to one of the five key resources.

A50. The Business Process Reengineering Lead key resource (Change Management professional) will be responsible for change management and enterprise readiness coordination.

Q51. Section 5.02 does not exactly line up with Section 5.01, can you clarify?

A51. The State has provided sizing information based on existing applications, areas that do not map directly to Section 5.01 indicate deficiencies in our current administrative systems.

Q52. Section 5.01 lists bullet M Budget Development and Compliance monitoring, which conflicts with Attachment I that states the current budget system is viable for ten years, can you clarify?

A52. Section 2.07 lists the minimum system requirements as three modules, financial, procurement, and HR/payroll. The State intends to procure a comprehensive solution and implement functional modules as necessary and budget allows.

Clarification: The State's current accounting system provides budget compliance and enforcement functionality. Amendment Three reorganizes RFP Section 5.01, products and services, as follows:

1. An integrated finance, procurement, human resources, and payroll application, including:
   a. General ledger
   b. Fund accounting
   c. Budget compliance and enforcement
   d. Accounts payable and disbursements
   e. Purchasing and e-procurement, including vendor self-service
   f. Accounts receivable and revenue collections
   g. Grant and contract management
   h. Project accounting
   i. Cost allocation/labor distribution
   j. Fixed assets
   k. Human resources management, including personnel actions

l. Payroll
m. Position control
n. Benefits administration, including employee self-service
o. Budget development ~~and compliance monitoring~~

Although the State is soliciting proposals for a fully integrated ERP solution, the State envisions a phased approach for the different modules with related software and maintenance payment schedules based on the implementation timeframe for each module.

Q53. Current Functional Statistics table in Section 5.02 references 1099R and retirees/pensioners, which does not match Section 5.01, can you clarify?
A53. It is not the State's intent to include retirees/pensioners as part of the scope of this RFP.

Clarification: Amendment Three removes the reference to the 1099R and retirees/pensioners.

Q54. Can the State clarify the type of binding that is allowed for proposal submission?
A54. The Offeror's proposal should not be that large and we don't want any kind of binding.

Clarification: Amendment Three revises Section 6.01 to state, "The proposal should be stapled, ***binder clipped, or paper clipped*** (and not bound) to facilitate easy handling, photocopying, and reading by the PEC."

Q55. Section 7.04 contains language referring to a 50% above or below the average ten year cost. Typically Tier II solutions are priced lower than Tier I solutions, how will that language affect a Tier II solution?
A55. The State is open to either a Tier I or II solution; disqualification will not be based on this factor alone.

Clarification: As stated in Section 7.04 and as revised in Amendment Three, "Cost will be evaluated based on the ten-year total cost ~~of ownership~~ provided by Offerors in Exhibit E. If any proposal has a ten-year total cost ~~of ownership~~ that exceeds 50% above or below the average ten-year total cost ~~of ownership~~ of all proposals, the State reserves the right to not consider the proposal."

Q56. Is the State going to also consider the cost of upgrades to licensing and implementation services that typically occur over a ten-year period?
A56. Yes, in Exhibit E, Tab 4, Tables H (traditional licensing), I (cloud), and J, an Offeror must include all costs associated with software maintenance for a ten-year period in its cost proposal.

Clarification: Amendment Three revises Section 5.03 to state, ***"New releases of the licensed software will be provided to the State at no additional cost as specified in Section 3.1 of Appendix C to Attachment H."***

Q57. Will the State publish the total cost of ownership calculation?
A57. If you are referring to normalization as a component of total cost of ownership, then no, Amendment Two eliminated the normalization of an Offeror's cost.

Clarification: In Amendment Three, the phrase "total cost of ownership" has been revised to "total cost." An Offeror's cost proposal must include total costs for a ten-year period as specified in Exhibit E.

Q58. Can you clarify whether the client interviews and the demonstrations will be on consecutive days?
A58. The interviews and demonstrations will not be scheduled back to back for a specific Offeror.

Clarification: There are two separate components, interviews and client demonstrations, which will be held separately and scheduled to allow adequate time for Offeror participation in both components.

1. The State intends to schedule interviews for Offerors on consecutive days, one Offeror in the morning and one in the afternoon. Interviews will be conducted in Juneau, Alaska and the named key resources must be present as stated in Section 7.08, Important Note.

2. The State intends to schedule client demonstrations, as stated in Section 7.09, for Offerors on consecutive days, one Offeror in the morning and one in the afternoon. Travel to Juneau is not expected for the client demonstrations as the State anticipates these to be conducted as on-line meetings.

Q59. In Section 3.10, it talks about ten years of additional maintenance and support; can the State clarify total cost of ownership and particularly the terms of the contract?

A59. There are two different contracts that result from this RFP, Attachment G: Standard Implementation Services Agreement (System Implementer) and Attachment H: Standard Licensing and Maintenance Agreement (Software).

Clarification: In Amendment Three, the phrase "total cost of ownership" has been revised to "total cost." An Offeror's cost proposal must include total costs for a ten-year period as specified in Exhibit E. In addition, Amendment Three revises Section 3.01 to state, "The contracts resulting from this RFP will be for:

1. ~~Licensing and~~ Implementation of software solution: Firm fixed price contract with no adjustments.
2. ***Licensing and*** Ten Year Maintenance and Support: The initial four-year contract will be a firm fixed price; CPI adjustments may be requested at the beginning of each of the three two-year renewals."

In addition, Amendment Three revises Section 1.04 to state, "***Although the State is soliciting proposals for a fully integrated ERP solution, the State envisions a phased approach for the different modules with related software and maintenance payment schedules based on the implementation timeframe for each module.***"

Q60. Could you provide additional information regarding the sample configuration document that you have asked for in D2?

A60. The State is looking for a sample that illustrates an Offeror's methodology to documenting business processes, system configuration, or design. Exhibit D2 states, "An excerpt sufficient to demonstrate the typical contents, quality, and detail of your proposed deliverable will suffice."

Q61. Can you clarify if there is a page limitation to Exhibit D2 and D3?

A61. Exhibit D2 states, "Please note that your Sample System Configuration Document cannot exceed three pages (excluding these instructions)."

Exhibit D3 does not have a page limitation; however any full repudiation of Terms and Conditions would result in a proposal to be deemed non-responsive.

Q62. In Section 1.25, can you provide a definition of vendor within the Offeror definition, including whether it includes subcontractors/joint ventures?

A62. The State uses the term "Offeror" up until a contract is signed by all parties and at which point the Offeror would then become the "Contractor." The State has referenced "vendor" in the RFP when referring to a single business entity in the context of doing business with the State.

Q63. In PPI, I am assuming that only the prime system implementer can submit references and that doesn't change at all with a joint venture relationship, can the State clarify?

A63. I would agree to that.

Clarification: The answer provided during the pre-proposal conference was not accurate. The Past Performance Information (PPI) is not limited to the Prime Offeror and must be collected for the proposed Software and System Implementer.

As stated in RFP Section 7.03, "The State will be analyzing Past Performance Information (PPI) on the critical components that are proposed by each Offeror. The information will be in the form of a reference. The critical components that will be evaluated for this RFP include:

(a) Software Offeror
(b) System Implementation Offeror"

Please refer to Q38.

Q64. Will the State provide a list of Alaskan firms that may be interested in taking an implementation role in the project with a prime software vendor?
A64. No, it is up to the Offeror to determine and seek a relationship. The State has no role in fostering a business relationship for Offerors responding to this RFP.

Q65. Regarding Exhibit E, Tab 3, Table E, I assume that the blended rate is for all services not just a specific service, is that correct?
A65. No, the blended rate is calculated by a formula within the spreadsheet for each listed service (Implementation Function) by taking the total cost for each Implementation Function and dividing it by the hours for that Implementation Function. There is no blended rate for all services.

Q66. What is the procedure for submitting further questions and will the response be posted on the website or through an amendment?
A66. RFP Sections 1.01 and 1.07 instructs Offerors to submit questions in writing (email preferred staci.augustus@alaska.gov) to the Procurement Officer. Responses to questions will appear in an official amendment. RFP Section 1.09 states amendments will be posted to the State's Online Public Notice website and provided to interested parties who have registered with the Procurement Officer.

Q67. Does the State anticipate responding to questions once a week?
A67. The State intends to release amendments when necessary based on the number and complexity of questions and clarifications. Potential Offerors are encouraged to submit questions and clarifications as soon as possible.

Q68. With respect to mandatory return amendments, should an Offeror return those prior to the submission of its proposal or should an Offeror return those with its proposal?
A68. In Exhibit A1, Offerors should identify and acknowledge mandatory return amendments and submit the signed amendments as part of their proposal.

END OF QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER THREE

All terms and conditions not modified by this amendment remain in full force and effect.

IMPORTANT:
This is a **mandatory return** Amendment because it constitutes a material change that requires interested parties to understand and acknowledge. Please complete the information below and return this document with your proposal.

_____
Name of Company

_____ _____
Authorized Signature Date

Staci Augustus, CPPB
Procurement Officer
mailto:Staci.augustus@alaska.gov
Phone: (907) 465-5656 TDD: (907) 465-2205
FAX: (907) 465-2194

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER FOUR

RETURN THIS AMENDMENT WITH PROPOSAL TO THE ISSUING OFFICE AT:

Department of Administration
Division of Admin Services
PO Box 110208
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0208

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER **DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: September 10, 2010**

RFP TITLE: Statewide Administrative Systems Replacement Project

DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS: 1:30pm, Alaska Time, October 1, 2010.

Important Note To Offerors: In order for your proposal to be considered responsive, this amendment, in addition to your original proposal and other required documents, must be signed, dated, and received by the issuing office prior to the time set for receiving proposals.

This Amendment is issued to make the following changes and provide responses to questions submitted by Offerors for clarification. The RFP has been amended in the following sections, as shown, to clarify content of the solicitation. Please note that changes to the RFP sections are listed below with deletions shown as a ~~strikethrough~~ and additions identified as ***bold italic***. **Please note that the numbering of the changes and questions has continued from the previous amendment.**

CHANGES TO RFP:

4. The numbering of Section 5.04 has been adjusted to identify deliverable 24 as Technical Operations Manual deliverable and subsequent deliverables are renumbered accordingly to match Attachment/Exhibit E.

Go-Live and Post Implementation Stabilization Provide the State with licensed and functioning software configured to meet the State's business needs, loaded with the State's data per the Conversion Plan, and interfaced with other State systems per the Interface specifications. Develop technical and business documentation to support the State's operation and use of the licensed software. Provide technical support after Go-Live.	**23. Go-Live and Stabilization Plan** The Go-Live and Stabilization Plan will consist of a detailed task plan, including a readiness checklist and resource assignments, to support moving the Licensed Software into Productive Use. It will include a data load and conversion plan and a contingency plan in the event that the Go-Live fails. It will also include a stabilization plan that details Contractor's commitments to stabilization and the transition to full support by State staff. ***24.* Technical Operations Manual** An online manual to guide State IT staff in the technical procedures necessary to operate and maintain the licensed software after implementation customized to the State's configuration. **~~24.~~ *25.* Business User Manual** An online manual to guide end users in the functionality, features and workflow offered by the application, customized to the State's configuration. **~~25.~~ *26.* Configured and Licensed Software in Productive Use** Implemented Licensed Software in Productive Use. **~~26.~~ *27.* Stabilization Services** The Contractor provides technical support after Go-Live for an agreed-upon period of time, including identifying and correcting problems.

5. The State will pay for modules as they are implemented and has made the following changes to reflect this expectation:

1.02 Contract Term and Work Schedule

The contract term and work schedule set out herein represents the State of Alaska's best estimate of the schedule that will be followed. If a component of this schedule changes, the rest of the schedule may be shifted as appropriate.

The length of the contract will be from the date of award, with work to begin approximately July 1, 2011 for the timeframe identified in Offeror's proposal. The contract may be renewed, at the sole discretion of the State of Alaska, for up to ten additional years for maintenance and support of the implemented solution. The maintenance and support contract renewals will be structured in the following increments: four years, two years, two years, and two years. The Offeror must ensure that licensing and maintenance for this period is provided to the State per the Cost Proposal Forms in Attachment E. ***Note that the State will NOT purchase software prior to the initiation of the implementation effort for that software. For example, the State will not purchase the human resources modules until the associated services begin.***

3.08 Payment Procedures

The State will make payments on a deliverable-based payment schedule, as negotiated with the Contractor and contingent upon State acceptance of written documents, software, and services delivered by the Contractor. At the State's option, a Delivery Expectation Document (DED) and a structured walkthrough may be required for each deliverable. The State's initial list of deliverables is contained in Section 5.04 and is subject to the results of the Pre-award Phase and negotiation of a final contract.

Each billing must consist of an invoice with accepted deliverables identified. No payment will be made until the invoice has been approved by the State project manager.

Note that the State will NOT purchase software prior to the initiation of the implementation effort for that software. For example, the State will not purchase the human resources modules until the associated services begin.

7.04 Cost (250 Points)

Offerors must submit their cost proposal as Exhibit E. Offerors must itemize all costs for application software, system software, professional services by required deliverable, other one-time expenses, annual maintenance, ongoing expenses, required servers and other technical components, and staffing rates. ***The cost of each module, regardless of its implementation date, must include ten years of licensing and maintenance pricing.*** Cost will be evaluated based on the ten-year total cost provided by Offerors in Exhibit E. If any proposal has a ten-year total cost that exceeds 50% above or below the average ten-year total cost of all proposals, the State reserves the right to not consider the proposal.

The server hardware for a traditional licensed proposal must be listed in Exhibit E, Table D – Required Servers; however no associated cost is required and this component of the Offeror's solution will not be factored into the ten-year total cost. As stated in the instructions for Table D an Offeror submitting a hosted ("cloud") proposal does not need to complete Exhibit E, Table D – Required Servers.

The cost proposal may not be amended by the Offeror as a result of increased understanding gained during the Pre-award Phase. It may only be amended by scope changes proposed by the State during the Pre-award Phase. Schedule extensions will not justify cost increases at any time during the Pre-award Phase or the implementation period of the project.

6. In addition, the instructions for RFP Attachment/Exhibit E, Tab 4, Table H-Recurring Costs have been modified to reflect that each module must include ten years of licensing and maintenance pricing as follows:

Attachment/Exhibit E, Tab 4, Table H-Recurring Costs:

In Table H, please list all ongoing costs for each applicable component proposed in your response. In each item category name the specific element that the fee covers and briefly describe the maintenance terms. ***The cost of each module, regardless of its implementation date, must include ten years of licensing and maintenance pricing.***

In Table H, list all ongoing costs for each applicable component proposed in your response. In the 'Application Software' column, complete one row for each major implementation grouping. For instance, there might be separate rows for Finance, Human Resources, and Budget. In the 'Item' column, list the modules included in that grouping and briefly describe the associated maintenance terms. In the '1st Pymt' column, provide the due date for the first maintenance payment, considering the overall implementation schedule. Note that the State will NOT purchase software prior to the initiation of the implementation effort for that software. So, the State will not purchase the human resources modules until the associated services begin. In the next four columns, provide the total maintenance cost for the periods referenced. Accordingly, the 'Years 1-4' cell should contain the Offeror's fixed price for the first four years of maintenance, the 'Years 5-6' cell should contain the fixed price for the next two years, etc. The 'Total' column calculates automatically and does not require data entry.

In the 'System Software' column, complete one row for each major system software component. For instance, there might be a row for the database management system to support the finance implementation. In the 'Item' column, list the elements included in that grouping and briefly describe the associated maintenance terms. In the '1st Pymt' column, provide the due date for the first maintenance payment, considering the overall implementation schedule. Note that the State will NOT purchase system software prior to the need for its use. So, the State will not purchase the database licenses necessary to run the human resources modules until necessary. In the next four columns, provide the total maintenance cost for the periods referenced. Accordingly, the 'Years 1-4' cell should contain the Offeror's fixed price for the first four years of maintenance, the 'Years 5-6' cell should contain the fixed price for the next two years, etc.

Attachment/Exhibit F Software Functionality and Technical Requirements

A number of requirements (11) have been clarified or deleted in Attachment/Exhibit F. The affected requirements are listed below with a ~~strikethrough~~ denoting deletions and ***bold italic*** representing additions to the language of a requirement.

Action	ID Num	Requirement Area	Requirement Subcategory	Requirement Name	Requirement
Delete	~~3030~~	~~Payroll~~	~~Cost Collector~~	~~Labor Distribution~~	~~System shall support a labor distribution process based on:~~ ~~*Random moment time study results;~~ ~~*Document counts;~~ ~~*PRs issued;~~ ~~*Filled positions;~~ ~~*Hours of service;~~ ~~*Case counts;~~ ~~*Quarterly average of hours spent in specified areas;~~ ~~*Type of claims paid;~~ ~~*Penetration rates; and~~ ~~*Other study data.~~

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER FOUR

Action	ID Num	Requirement Area	Requirement Subcategory	Requirement Name	Requirement
Revised	3234	Payroll	Payroll Accounting	Leave	System shall calculate lump sum leave pay out based on ~~leave run out~~ ***bargaining unit specific business rules for employment termination.***
Revised	3267	Payroll	Payroll Accounting	Payment	System shall calculate multiple cash in percentages of eligible pay and eligible positions ***to fund employer working reserve.***
Delete	~~1525~~	~~Financial~~	~~Manufacturing~~	~~General~~	~~System shall facilitate reporting for each program, project, or fund.~~
Delete	~~1526~~	~~Financial~~	~~Manufacturing~~	~~General~~	~~System shall support allocating overhead costs (i.e., administrative, sales, or warehouse) to various programs or jobs.~~
Delete	~~1527~~	~~Financial~~	~~Manufacturing~~	~~General~~	~~System shall support item pricing using a cost plus scheme.~~
Delete	~~1528~~	~~Financial~~	~~Manufacturing~~	~~General~~	~~System shall support job order as well as process costing.~~
Delete	~~1529~~	~~Financial~~	~~Manufacturing~~	~~General~~	~~System shall support setting the price of an item without regard to the cost of production.~~
Delete	~~1530~~	~~Financial~~	~~Manufacturing~~	~~General~~	~~System shall track the physical location of the item.~~
Delete	~~1531~~	~~Financial~~	~~Manufacturing~~	~~General~~	~~System shall track the sales by customer, salesman, or territory.~~
Revised	5028	System and Technical	Data Extracts and Interfaces	General	System shall ***provide a method to update all data for individual records or groups of records.*** ~~permit updates to all data for individual and multiple groups.~~

END OF RFP CHANGES

The questions and responses listed below represent all written questions received by the procurement officer through Thursday, September 9, 2010.

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

Q69. In Attachment F, Functional Requirement I.D. Number 2026, "System shall provide an internal classification audit tracking and documentation process." Can you explain this requirement?

A69. The requirement I.D. number 2026 applies to the classification process associated with a position control number.

Q70. In Attachment F, Functional Requirement I.D. Number 3030, "System shall support a labor distribution process based on:

*Random moment time study results;
*Document counts;
*PRs issued;
*Filled positions;
*Hours of service;
*Case counts;
*Quarterly average of hours spent in specified areas;
*Type of claims paid;
*Penetration rates; and
*Other study data."

Can you explain this requirement?

A70. The State has deleted requirement I.D. number 3030 from Attachment/Exhibit F - Software Functionality and Technical Requirements.

Q71. In Attachment F, Functional Requirement I.D. Number 3234, "System shall calculate lump sum leave pay out based on leave run out." Can you explain the term leave run?

A71. The requirement I.D. number 3234 has been revised to state, "System shall calculate lump sum leave pay out based on bargaining unit specific business rules for employment termination."

Q72. In Attachment F, Functional Requirement I.D. Number 3267, "System shall calculate multiple cash in percentages of eligible pay and eligible positions." Can you explain this requirement?

A72. The requirement I.D. number 3267 has been revised to state, "System shall calculate multiple cash in percentages for eligible pay and eligible positions to fund employer working reserve."

Q73. Is the State expecting a response from a single prime contractor (single Offeror) for software (license and maintenance) and services? Or a combined response which includes sections from a Software Offeror and Systems Implementation Offeror?

A73. The State requires a combined proposal with a Software vendor and Systems Implementation vendor, the agreement between the two entities must comply with 1.14 Subcontractors or 1.15 Joint Ventures and have a single prime Offeror identified.

Q74. If the state is accepting of combined responses which may include a single Software Offeror and a single Systems Implementer (with or without subcontractors), who should sign Exhibit A7: Proposal Signature-the Systems Implementer Offeror or the Software Offeror, or both?

A74. The prime Offeror must sign Exhibit A7: Proposal Signature. RFP Section 2.01, "All proposals must be signed by an individual authorized to bind the Offeror to the provisions of the RFP." It is up to the parties to determine the prime Offeror through their contractual relationship created to respond to the State's RFP.

Q75. Attachment N, page 8 of 12: Under the "Systems Services" category, on the "Server – OS" row, the State indicates "VMware and Microsoft Virtual PC" are allowable standards, with DD/ITM approval. Will the State allow for a solution containing virtual hosts (servers)?

A75. Yes, a proposal may use virtual hosting as a solution.

Clarification: Virtual hosting is a method for hosting multiple domain names on a computer using a single IP address. This allows one machine to share its resources, such as memory and processor cycles, to use its resources more efficiently.

Q76. RFP Section 6.01 states, "templates provided as attachments to the RFP must be used, including 10-point Arial font. Modifications to the format of this template (e.g., altering font size,..) may result in the Offeror's entire proposal being found non-responsive." For example, Exhibit A-1 and A-5 have default text size of 11-point. Should the vendor modify the templates' default 11-point font to comply with this 10-point requirement, or keep the field as-is and submit 11-point text?

A76. Please keep the field text format as they appear in Exhibit A. The fields in question do not have any restrictions on the number of pages that may be submitted with a proposal. Exhibits with a defined page limit must use Arial 10-point format for an Offeror's response.

Q77. Exhibit F – Requirement 5274, "System shall provide redundant "complete" operations from a second geographically remote data center from the primary data center so users do not perceive a loss of service due to operational failures of the system, application, and database." Is the State's Anchorage data center a viable candidate for the required second location?

A77. The State will determine the second geographically remote data center for a traditional solution as defined in Section 1.10, "1. Traditional licensed software models, under which the State will purchase, house, and operate the hardware/software." All other proposed solutions must identify and implement the solution at their own second geographically remote data center to meet this requirement.

Q78. Exhibit F – Requirement 5307, "System shall include either the Cisco Security Agent intrusion prevention tool, or other "Zero Day," non-signature or port-based intrusion prevention solution in compliance with State

Security Policies." On June 11, 2010 Cisco announced 'end of life' and 'end of sales' for the Cisco Security Agent (CSA) product, with the last date to order being December 10, 2010. In addition, Cisco has stated there is no replacement for the CSA at this time. Has the State identified substitute product as the new standard intrusion prevention tool?

A78. The State has a Service Level Agreement (SLA) for Cisco Security Agent (CSA) to cover "existing" licensing through December 31, 2013. In advance of the SLA expiration the State Security Office will identify the replacement product and establish the State standard.

Q79. Clarification question to Amendment 3, Question 38: The scenario that exists is that there will be multiple system implementers teamed on one response. Implementer X will be the primary Offeror and Implementer Y and Z will be subcontractors to Implementer X. Can just implementer X submit system implementer Past Performance Information or do you allow Y and Z to also submit system implementer Past Performance Information. I ask, because in the math equations there is no representation that Z could be only 5 percent of the bid, but 90 percent of the system implementer Past Performance Information?

A79. Any firm, not an individual person, identified as part of the Offeror's proposed team, may submit B4: System Implementer Questionnaire to past clients to obtain Past Performance Information.

Q80. We understand that proposers use a "virtual office" arrangement to acquire the 5% local bidder's preference. Could the State comment on whether it accepts such an approach in order to meet the intent of the bidder's preference?

A80. Alaska Statute (AS) 36.30.170 sets out the five requirements to qualify as an Alaska bidder and receive the 5% bidder preference and specific to this question, requirement (3) states, "has maintained a place of business within the State staffed by the bidder or an employee of the bidder for a period of six months immediately preceding the date of the bid;" To qualify, the Offeror must have an office located in the State with at least one employee staffing the office for at least six months prior to the date of the proposal submission. Should any Offeror submit a proposal in which any item, including the requirements to obtain the Alaska bidder preference, is misrepresented, the State may consider the Offeror to be non-responsible.

Q81. ID numbers 1525 – 1531: In requirement area Financial, requirement subcategory Manufacturing: it is requested for item costing and sales. Can you give me an example on what the State is producing and selling?

A81. The State has deleted requirement I.D. number 1525 through 1531 from Attachment/Exhibit F - Software Functionality and Technical Requirements.

Q82. ID numbers 1550 - 1557: In requirement area Financial, requirement subcategory Marketing/Sales/Retail: it appears like this is selling surplus items and assets. Does the State manufacture and sale additional items on the retail market?

A82. The requirement I.D. numbers 1550 through 1557 refer to tracking of assets that are scheduled for sale through surplus.

Q83. Based on the volume of information included in Amendment 3, will the State please grant an extension of the current proposal due date of Oct. 1, 2010?

A83. The State declines to adjust the published schedule in Section 1.02 Contract Term and Work Schedule.

Q84. The instructions for Exhibit A4 suggest using an 'easy-to-understand naming convention' for the proposal Exhibits to be submitted to the State. Should this naming convention include the Offeror's name even though some parts of the Exhibits must be devoid of company specific identification?

A84. An Offeror's name may appear in the naming convention of the file name of any electronic attachments to Exhibit A4.

Q85. In RFP Section 5.04 - Deliverables, it appears there is a deliverable number missing from the Technical Operations Manual. Can the State confirm that the Technical Operations Manual should be deliverable Number 24 and the subsequent 3 deliverable numbers should be incremented by 1?

A85. Yes, the Technical Operations Manual deliverable was not numbered in Section 5.04 and has been corrected in Amendment Four. The deliverables in Section 5.04 now match Attachment/Exhibit E.

Q86. Can the State please provide more specific timeframes for key role interviews so participants can block their calendars?

A86. No, at this point in time, the State cannot be more specific with the timeframes, as the number and actual identity of those Offerors selected for interviews is not known.

Q87. Can the State please provide more specific timeframes for demos so participants can block their calendars?

A87. No, at this point in time, the State cannot be more specific with the timeframes, as the number and actual identity of those Offerors selected for client demonstrations is not known.

Q88. Exhibit E, Table E - Professional Services includes a line item of 'Flexible use hours'. How will the State rationalize the variance in the amount of hours that different Offerors would include? Will the State consider removing this line from Table E? Industry norms indicate that 10-15% of total hours are appropriate.

A88. The State declines to remove 'Flexible use hours' line from Exhibit E, Table E - Professional Services. It is the Offeror's responsibility to account for all hours in their Cost Proposal to implement their proposed solution. A proposal with "zero" flexible use hours is stating that an Offeror fully understands what is required to perform the scope of work and has accounted for all hours associated with each deliverable.

Q89. What language requirements exist for training materials?

A89. All training material must be in English.

Q90. Are all training materials required to be in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act?

A90. Yes, requirement 5064 states, "System shall comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act access requirements."

Q91. Is there an expectation that all training content deployed to the end-user community be 100% customized for the State of Alaska (i.e., Alaska logo, all screenshots specific to the State's instance, etc.) or will the State accept an agreed-upon volume of content to be generic in nature as long as the functionality and screens are not different?

A91. The State expects the content of the training material to accurately reflect the deployed solution so that end-users are fully capable of using the system.

Q92. In Exhibit A4, is there a format that should be used for any Confidential Proposal Contents and Federal Requirements?

A92. The State has no specific format requirement for either component of an Offeror's proposal.

Q93. In Exhibit A4, should any Confidential Proposal Contents and Federal Requirements be included in the proposal immediately behind Exhibit A4?

A93. Confidential Proposal Content that an Offeror is requesting should be attached in a document to Exhibit A4, while the Federal Requirements should be identified in the block provided in Exhibit A4.

Q94. Can the System Implementer references required in Exhibit B2 include the references of the System Implementer subcontractors?

A94. Yes, please refer to questions Q38 (Amendment Three), Q63 (Amendment Three), and Q79 (Amendment Four).

Q95. Do software resellers complete Exhibit A5 - Software Offeror Profile?
A95. No, the Software vendor (not reseller) must complete Exhibit A5 - Software Offeror Profile.

Q96. Will the State allow limited graphics to be included in response to Attachment C: Work Plan and RAVA Plan?
A96. No, Section 7.05 states, "Offerors **are NOT** allowed to re-create, re-format, or modify the template including altering the font size, font type, font color, adding colors, pictures, diagrams, or any other alterations."

Q97. Could you please clarify the answer to Q22 in Amendment Number Three. QUESTION: Where in the Strategic Fit component do we list size, budget, employees, etc. Is the answer, In Attachment D, page D-3, under "Technical skills and qualification for the project position?"
A97. The information should be provided on Exhibit B3 as part of the Past Performance Information. This information will be provided to the PEC for consideration and evaluation as stated in Section 7.06, "The PEC will evaluate the qualifications of the Software Offeror's and System Implementation Offeror's personnel and experience."

Q98. We understand that specific information in Exhibit D1: on page D-3 identified with an * will be withheld from the PEC during evaluation. However, relevant information that may be included under "Education and Certifications" and "Technical Skills and Qualifications" may identify a specific Offeror's software. Can the SI list certifications of particular software and name the software certification? Also, can the SI list client reference names in the qualifications section on page D-3?
A98. The Offeror should list certificates without identifying a particular software product or firm, for example, "Database Administrator Certificate" or "Project Management Professional (PMP) Certificate." State may clarify credentials during the Pre-award phase.

An Offeror should not list client references in Exhibit D but consider, if applicable, using Exhibit B3: Software Product Questionnaire and Exhibit B4: System Implementer Questionnaire.

Q99. A clarification to Addendum # 3, Question 38- A strong part of our team includes a subcontractor with State ERP qualifications. May we include references (Exhibit B4) from them in our bid submission?
A99. Yes, please refer to questions Q38 (Amendment Three), Q63 (Amendment Three), Q79 (Amendment Four).

Q100. What ETL tool does the State use with ALDER?
A100. The State uses the Business Objects suite of products that includes Data Integrator as the Extract Transform and Load (ETL) tool.

Q101. Exhibit F – Requirement 3194, "System shall provide reporting for Federal, State, and Medicare tax requirements." Can the State identify the specific payroll related State tax requirements that the State of Alaska must report/pay, including any out of State taxes that Alaska must report/pay?
A101. The State currently has employees in the states of Washington, Montana, Oklahoma, and California; however State employees may potentially reside in any state.

Q102. Exhibit F – Requirement 5028, "System shall permit updates to all data for individual and multiple groups." Can the State please provide additional context or elaborate on the needs the State is addressing with this requirement?
A102. The requirement I.D. number 5028 has been revised to state, "System shall provide a method to update all data for individual records or groups of records."

Placing this requirement in context, an example might be load/unload utilities that require proper account authentication with logging for an audit trail.

END OF QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER FOUR

All terms and conditions not modified by this amendment remain in full force and effect.

IMPORTANT:
This is a **mandatory return** Amendment because it constitutes a material change that requires interested parties to understand and acknowledge. Please complete the information below and return this document with your proposal.

_____
Name of Company

_____ _____
Authorized Signature Date

Staci Augustus, CPPB
Procurement Officer

Phone: (907) 465-5656 TDD: (907) 465-2205
FAX: (907) 465-2194

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER FIVE

Department of Administration
Division of Admin Services
PO Box 110208
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0208

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER **DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: September 13, 2010**

RFP TITLE: Statewide Administrative Systems Replacement Project

DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS: 1:30pm, Alaska Time, October 1, 2010.

This Amendment is issued to provide responses to questions submitted by Offerors and received by the procurement officer through Monday, September 13, 2010. Please note that the numbering of the questions has continued from the previous amendment. **IMPORTANT:** This is a **not** a mandatory return Amendment, Offerors are not required to sign and return it.

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

Q103. If there is a valid master agreement in place between the State and a potential Software Offeror or its authorized reseller, is the State amenable to utilizing same in place of the Software Agreement contained in the RFP?

A103. No, the State is not amenable to using an existing valid master agreement in place of the Software Agreement (Attachment H) contained in the RFP. The State and Contractor will use Attachments G and H for contract development.

Q104. Similarly, is the State amenable to using the GSA schedule to acquire the necessary software licenses?

A104. No, per Alaska Administrative Manual (AAM) 81.045, the State is prohibited from acquiring software licenses through GSA schedules.

Q105. With regard to setting out any exceptions to the contract as required in Exhibit D-3; is the State amenable to a proper redline of the terms and conditions to the Software and/or the Services Agreements rather than a piece meal, provision by provision, offering which may consist of partial phrases with notes on where to insert/delete in the Agreement, greatly improving readability of the proposed changes?

A105. Yes, Offerors may submit a "proper redline" of Attachments/Exhibits G and H.

END OF QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

Staci Augustus, CPPB
Procurement Officer
mailto:Staci.augustus@alaska.gov
Phone: (907) 465-5656 TDD: (907) 465-2205
FAX: (907) 465-2194

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER SIX

RETURN THIS AMENDMENT WITH PROPOSAL TO THE ISSUING OFFICE AT:

Department of Administration
Division of Admin Services
PO Box 110208
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0208

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER **DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: September 15, 2010**

RFP TITLE: Statewide Administrative Systems Replacement Project

DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS: 1:30pm, Alaska Time, October 15, 2010.

This Amendment is issued to make the following changes and provide responses to questions submitted by Offerors for clarification.

The RFP has been amended in the following sections, as shown, to clarify content of the solicitation. Please note that changes to the RFP sections are listed below with deletions shown as a ~~strikethrough~~ and additions identified as ***bold italic***. **Please note that the numbering of the changes and questions has continued from the previous amendment.**

CHANGES TO RFP:

7. With this amendment, the deadline for receipt of proposals has been changed in the following two RFP locations:

1.01 Return Mailing Address, Contact Person, Telephone, Fax Numbers, and Deadline for Receipt of Proposals

Proposals must be received no later than 1:30 pm, Alaska Time on Friday, ~~October 1, 2010~~ *October 15, 2010*. Faxed, oral, or emailed proposals are not acceptable. **Please note that overnight delivery to and within Alaska rarely occurs.**

An Offeror's failure to submit a proposal prior to the deadline will cause the proposal to be disqualified. Late proposals or amendments will not be opened or accepted for evaluation.

1.02 Contract Term and Work Schedule

Statewide Administrative Systems Replacement Project Timetable	Date	Time (Alaska Time)
RFP Release	Monday, August 2, 2010	
Best Value Educational Meeting	Tuesday, August 17, 2010	8:00 am
Pre-proposal Conference (refer to Section 2.02 for details)	Tuesday, August 17, 2010	1:00 pm
Deadline for Receipt of Proposals	Friday, ~~October~~ 1 ***October 15,*** 2010	1:30 pm

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER SIX

Statewide Administrative Systems Replacement Project Timetable	Date	Time (Alaska Time)
Client Demonstrations and Team Interviews	Tuesday, ~~October 19~~ ***November 1,*** through Friday, December ~~17~~ ***30***, 2010	As scheduled for short list
Best Value Offeror Notification	Friday, December 31, 2010	
Pre-award Phase with apparent best value Offeror	Monday, January 3 through Tuesday, May 31, 2011	
Notice of Intent to Award	Tuesday, May 31, 2011	
Award Contract (sign contract)	Thursday, June 30, 2011	
Contract Start Date	Friday, July 1, 2011	

END OF RFP CHANGES

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

Q106. Based on the new information provided in addendum 4 & 5 – is the State agreeable to an extension of two weeks?

A106. Yes, with this amendment, the State has extended the deadline for receipt of proposals by two weeks; the new time and date is 1:30 pm, Alaska Time, October 15, 2010. The schedule in RFP Section 1.02 for the remaining procurement milestones will shift accordingly by two weeks. Refer to Change #7 above.

Q107 How much of item 1.G in Section 5.01 does the ASSET system deliver and how much is expected of the new ERP system? **State Clarification:** The State assumes that the question refers to 1.G. Cost allocation/labor distribution in the original RFP release, which is now 1.i. as identified in Amendment Four, Change #4.

A107 The Alaska Statewide System for Employee Time (ASSET) project will serve as a time and attendance collection mechanism only. The cost collectors will be established in the financial system (AKSAS), employee time records will be interfaced from ASSET to the payroll system (AKPAY) for processing, and then an interface to AKSAS for posting of charges to cost collectors created for personal services. The three systems will utilize custom interfaces to accomplish distribution of data, with the financial interface being provided through ALDER.

An integrated HR/payroll and financial solution will eliminate the need for the custom interface between these two modules as they will be integrated by design. The financial module will be a source for ALDER so that the method used to pass cost collector information to ASSET will remain the same. Employee time records will be passed from ASSET to the payroll module for processing.

Q108 If the Prime is using a software reseller to resell the software companies software, does the state enter into a Software and Maintenance agreement with the reseller and a services agreement with the prime hence meeting the States response in Amendment Number Three Q&A 17. Or does the State issue two contracts to the Prime (1) Implementation of software solution and (2) Licensing and Ten Year Maintenance and Support.

A108 The State will not enter into two contractual agreements with the prime Offeror, unless the prime Offeror is both the System Implementer and Software Vendor (software developer).

The State intends to sign contractual agreements as follows:

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER SIX

1) Attachment G - Implementation Services will be signed with the System Implementer.
2) Attachment H - Software License & Maintenance will be signed with the software developer who will provide licensing and maintenance support.

END OF QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

All terms and conditions not modified by this amendment remain in full force and effect.

IMPORTANT:
This is a **mandatory return** Amendment because it constitutes a material change that requires interested parties to understand and acknowledge. Please complete the information below and return this document with your proposal.

_____
Name of Company

_____ _____
Authorized Signature Date

Staci Augustus

Staci Augustus, CPPB
Procurement Officer
mailto:Staci.augustus@alaska.gov
Phone: (907) 465-5656 TDD: (907) 465-2205
FAX: (907) 465-2194

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER SEVEN

Department of Administration
Division of Admin Services
PO Box 110208
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0208

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER **DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: September 24, 2010**

RFP TITLE: Statewide Administrative Systems Replacement Project

DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS: 1:30pm, Alaska Time, October 15, 2010.

This Amendment is issued to provide responses to questions submitted by Offerors for clarification. The State does not require this amendment to be signed and returned with proposals.

QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

Q109. We have reviewed the questions and answers about electronic signatures (Addendum Three Q21). However, we are asking slightly different question. Our clients have signed the performance surveys with an original signature and then they either faxed or scanned and emailed their original "signed" form and to us. Do we need to ask them to mail the original signed document to us or will you accept a scanned form with the original signature?

Reference:
Q21. Is electronic signature acceptable for the survey questionnaires in Exhibit B5 and B6?
A21. No, an electronic signature is not acceptable. RFP Section 7.03 states, "All returned surveys MUST be completed and signed by the past client."

A109. The State will accept a scanned form with the original signature.

Q110 Training and Change Management

Although the RFP states that there is a need for Change Management Expertise, there are no deliverables listed for Change Management or Communications in the RFP. What is the State's expectation regarding Change Management and Communications services/deliverables?

A110 The change management and communications will occur throughout the entire project, there are no separate deliverables listed for them. The State, as described in Attachment L, State Organization Charts and Project Team Job Descriptions, plans to dedicate a full time employee as its communication and change management lead.

RFP Section 4.03 (Paragraph 5) states, "The Contractor is expected to bring organizational change management expertise for the software implementation to the project to assist the State's assigned change management resources."

RFP Section 5.01 also references "Communication and change management support." under item #2- "Comprehensive implementation services," as part of the Offeror's responsibilities.

Ultimately, it is the Offeror's responsibility to determine what level of change management and communication is necessary for a successful implementation of their proposed solution.

Q111 Training and Change Management

Does the State plan and/or desire to use the TrainAlaska system to manage student registration, attendance, and transcripts for the end user training for this project?

A111 At this point in time the State has not determined if TrainAlaska will be used to register students for training.

Q112 Training and Change Management

Does the State any internal training resources that can be leveraged to support the training effort for this project? If the answer is yes, what kind of resources will be available to support the project either full time or part time? Please describe the training development skills and experience of the available resources.

A112 Please see Question Q113.

Q113 Training and Change Management

Is the State currently using eLearning and/or distance learning to deliver training? Does the State desire to incorporate these delivery methods in the training program for this project?

A113 Yes, the State currently uses multiple methods of reaching end users, including eLearning and distance learning. Please note that the State will be responsible for end-user training; RFP Section 5.04, Deliverables 19, 20, and 21 outline training requirements:

Training
Define the approach for training the State's users on the licensed software and following State approval, assist with the overall training process in accordance with the training plan. The State expects to use a "train-the trainer" approach. The Contractor will design and develop the training curriculum, provide associated course content and materials, train State employees as trainers, and train the State's project team. The State expects the Contractor to deliver initial train-the-trainer training sessions on site in both Anchorage and Juneau. Contractor may conduct follow-up training and additional sessions via distance learning. The State will be responsible for end user training.

19. Training Plan
A document that:
- Outlines the necessary classes and curriculum for each class
- Establishes a content outline to guide classroom materials development
- Identifies State attendees and instructors
- Defines a training schedule
- Provides a mechanism for tracking training completion

20. Training Materials
Content and materials for each class, tailored to its specific needs.

21. Training
Train-the-trainer sessions sufficient to train all staff who will lead end user training, including onsite training sessions in Juneau and Anchorage.

Q114 Requirement Question:

Can you elaborate on this requirement? Is this the current process used when someone takes leave in excess of his or her current leave balance?

3120 Payroll Human Resource Accounting Leave System shall allow for automated advance of leave base date (LBD). System shall generate reversals of advanced LBDs when transactions that reduce accumulated leave without pay (LWOP) are processed (including LWOP adjustments in batch and online warrants, reversals, stop/start of employment, etc.).

A114 Leave base dates must be advanced in the payroll system when an employee accumulates sufficient amounts of leave without pay (LWOP). These advanced leave base dates must be reversed if subsequent transactions reduce the LWOP to a level at which no advanced leave base date is required. The current system automatically advances the date but does not reverse it and this is functionality the State desires in the replacement system.

Q115 The Exhibit B4 form requires the client to rate our performance in 10 areas. If one or more of the 10 questions relate to scope that was not part of our contract, and was a responsibility retained by the client, the client cannot provide a rating. In such a case, will the State calculate the raw average score based on the number of survey responses where the scope was applicable, and for which a rating was provided. For example, if 10 B4 forms were provided, but in one case the scope of Question 8 was retained by the client and hence not applicable, the raw average score for question 8 would be based on 9 responses rather than 10, and the vendor would receive credit for submitting 10 responses. Can the State please confirm?

A115 The State confirms this assumption, the raw average score for each question will be based on the scores provided by the Offeror. Further, if no scores are provided for a specific question then an average score of 5 will be assigned to that question.

END OF QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

All terms and conditions not modified by this amendment remain in full force and effect.

Staci Augustus, CPPB
Procurement Officer
mailto:Staci.augustus@alaska.gov
Phone: (907) 465-5656 TDD: (907) 465-2205
FAX: (907) 465-2194

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER EIGHT

RETURN THIS AMENDMENT WITH PROPOSAL TO THE ISSUING OFFICE AT:

Department of Administration
Division of Admin Services
PO Box 110208
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0208

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER **DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: October 1, 2010**

RFP TITLE: Statewide Administrative Systems Replacement Project

DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS: 1:30pm, Alaska Time, October 15, 2010.

Important Note To Offerors: In order for your proposal to be considered responsive, this amendment, in addition to your original proposal and other required documents, must be signed, dated, and received by the issuing office prior to the time set for receiving proposals.

This Amendment is issued to notify potential Offerors that an attachment to the RFP, Attachment/Exhibit F, Software Functionality and Technical Requirements, has been updated. The previous Attachment/Exhibit posted on the State's Online Public Notice website did not contain the updates made in Amendment Four.

All terms and conditions not modified by this amendment remain in full force and effect.

IMPORTANT:
This is a **mandatory return** Amendment because it constitutes a material change that requires interested parties to understand and acknowledge. Please complete the information below and return this document with your proposal.

_____
Name of Company

_____ _____

Staci Augustus, CPPB
Procurement Officer
mailto:Staci.augustus@alaska.gov
Phone: (907) 465-5656 TDD: (907) 465-2205
FAX: (907) 465-2194

STATE OF ALASKA RFP NUMBER 2010-0200-9388
AMENDMENT NUMBER NINE

Department of Administration
Division of Admin Services
PO Box 110208
Juneau, Alaska 99811-0208

THIS IS NOT AN ORDER **DATE AMENDMENT ISSUED: October 4, 2010**

RFP TITLE: Statewide Administrative Systems Replacement Project

DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS: 1:30pm, Alaska Time, October 15, 2010.

Important Note To Offerors: This Amendment is issued to answer an additional question received by the State. No changes to the RFP are being made. The State does not require this amendment to be signed and returned with proposals.

QUESTION/ANSWER

Q116 Can you please confirm a "Risk/value add" question? Some of the value add items have no cost associated with the items and others will have costs. Since we don't know enough about your specific requirements I wanted to know if you will be adding the cost of the value add items to the overall cost of the RFP response? It is difficult to finalize the value add items until we have had the opportunity to have a discovery call/requirements gathering session with the State.

A116 No, the cost of value added items will not be added to the overall cost. Please refer to RFP Section 7.05, which states, "The purpose of the Value Added Plan is to provide Offerors with an opportunity to identify any value added options or ideas that may benefit the State. These options or ideas may also be referred to as additional or optional services. If the Offeror can include more scope or services that fall within the schedule and budgetary constraints of the State, they should provide an outline of the potential value added options. If the contract budget is a risk, the Offeror should provide value added ideas to alter the scope of work to meet the State's constraints. All value added ideas must NOT be included in the base cost proposal.

During the Pre-award Phase the State will determine if the value added items will be accepted or rejected."

NOTE: Offerors must provide pricing based on the State's specific requirements as identified in the RFP and more specifically, as shown in Attachment/Exhibit E, Cost Proposal Forms. While the value add items will not be added to the overall cost evaluation, the best value vendor will not be allowed to change any costs after proposal submission, including during the pre-award phase. The acceptance/rejection of value added items will come during the pre-award phase. If State decides to accept a value added item during the pre-award phase, the vendor will provide the justification on impact to cost and schedule (if any).

END OF QUESTION/ANSWER

All terms and conditions not modified by this amendment remain in full force and effect.

Staci Augustus, CPPB
Procurement Officer
mailto:Staci.augustus@alaska.gov
Phone: (907) 465-5656 TDD: (907) 465-2205
FAX: (907) 465-2194