The following is additional information regarding Request for Proposal (**RFP) SPU No 4746 - Watershed Content Management System (CMS)** released on 03/11/2019. The Updated due date and time for responses is now May 15, 2019, 3:00 PM (Pacific). This addendum includes both questions from prospective proposers and the City’s answers, and revisions to the RFP. This addendum is hereby made part of the RFP and therefore, the information contained herein shall be taken into consideration when preparing and submitting a proposal.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item # | Date Received | Date Answered | Vendor’s Question | City’s Answer | RFP Revisions |
| 1 | 3/29/19 | 4/10/19 | City of Seattle Clarification to the RFP | If the vendor does not intend to supply hardware, that is okay. If the proposal does include hardware, please price as a separate item to assist in comparing proposals |  |
| 2 | 3/29/19 | 4/10/19 | City of Seattle Clarification to the RFP | Offline mode – this is a critical requirement. If a vendor proposal intends to use a subcontractor, that is acceptable. We would consider the vendor the prime contractor and they would be required to ensure the subcontractor work is done as needed. |  |
| 3 | 3/29/19 | 4/10/19 | City of Seattle Clarification to the RFP | The “Citation” requirement for this RFP is a “***Violation***” requirement. There were two options under this topic,   * 1. Violations – used for anything that violates our water quality regs, permitting, or minor issues in the public use area and   2. Citations – which is a **future** use for issuance of punitive citations for infraction or misdemeanor offenses to be outlined via ordinance, local, or state law.   Note: Violation requirement – if you cannot provide this capability, that is okay. If you do intend to include this in your bid, please include as a separate line item in order for us to compare proposals. |  |
| 4 | 3/29/19 | 4/10/19 | Is there a preference for an MS Dynamics 365 solution? | MS Dynamics 365 is mentioned since that is an enterprise platform at the city. We are open to other solutions. |  |
| 5 | 3/29/19 | 4/10/19 | Are you able to share the budget? | The City has not established a budget around this solution. Although vendors will not be eliminated based on pricing, it is important to note that pricing is weighted in our evaluation. The City always reserves the right not to contract if we deem the cost out weighs the value of the solution. At that time we would reduce what we are willing to purchase with the winning proposal or go out for a new RFP. |  |
| 6 | 3/29/19 | 4/10/19 | If our price is deemed too high, will we be able re-submit a price? | No, revised pricing cannot be submitted after due date of proposals. |  |
| 7 | 4/11/19 | 4/11/19 | City Date Change | The due date for proposals has been updated | **New Proposal Due Date is May 15, 2019 3:00 PM Pacific Time** |
| 8 | 4/15/19 | 4/15/19 | With the extension in the due date, would it be possible to get a one week extension on the questions due date as well? | Yes, the question period has been extended 1 week | **New Question Period is COB Monday April 22, 2019** |
| 9 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | Section 12.23 (Page 16) states "Proposer submittal must remain valid until City completes award. Should any Proposer object to this condition, the Proposer must provide objection through a question and/or complaint to the RFP Coordinator prior to the proposal due date."  Q: We are unable to agree to a proposal validity end date that is not firm. Will the City agree to make the proposal validity end date 90 days after the proposal due date of May 15, 2019? | We agree to a 120-day proposal validity period. |  |
| 10 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | **F0021** – **Define and Format Templates** – System will enable defining and formatting templates for data collection and publication forms including ability to add logos to meet city or external agency standards – **High**  Would the use of Microsoft Word/Excel or SSRS meet the “publication” requirements, or is the expectation that they would have a report builder within the application to create and layout reports? | Whatever the application, the solution must enable a user to define and format templates for data collection and publication. We anticipate the business will be required to change publication and collection information product templates per external standards and requirements (agency, city standards change over time). It should be easy for a user to make these changes. |  |
| 11 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | **F0037** – **Non-city Employee Interaction** – Non-city employees will provide agreement to policies using an electronic signature or driver’s license scan – **High**  Would alternatives to electronic signature (via a signature pad) or driver’s license scan be considered? | The City will consider any solution which enables electronic agreement. |  |
| 12 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | **D0012** – **Tagged Content** – When a document (pdf, photo, etc.) is attached to a data collection form, that document is tagged with metadata and follows the content throughout the lifecycle – **High**  Please provide some examples of the Metadata you’d like to associate with the file that has been attached? | Please refer to Content Component Logical Data Model, Figure 01, Section 5.4, SPU Watershed Protection IMS, Seattle IT Business Requirements Document for metadata tags important to the customer. Attachments should be tagged with business process ID, information product ID, information product uniform resource identifier, date attached, name of creator and other information product dependent metadata. For example, if a user is collecting data for TS053, Engine Equipment Inventory and wishes to attach a picture of a piece of equipment, equipment #, equipment description, NIMS type, etc should be included. Or if a user is collecting data for TS045, Violation Notice and wishes to attach a picture of a vehicle, license number, issuing state, location, make, color, etc. should be included. |  |
| 13 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | **D0023** – **Disconnected Data Viewing** – Content for the calendar year for designated information products will be made available disconnected from the network – **Critical**  Please provide an estimate in GB for the amount of content this would grow to (does this include data only or also attachments)? | Our rough estimate is 8 gigabytes of data each calendar year.  We are open to solutions that allow us to store as much data as possible without impacting performance. This includes data and attachments. The content would include about 700 –1200 pictures for inspections and incidents. |  |
| 14 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | **D0023** – **Disconnected Data Viewing** – Should mobile devices include both WiFi and mobile data plan to connect to internet resources and only use the disconnected mode when no other access is available? Provide an example scenario of data entry / reference in a disconnected mode on mobile device. | Only use disconnected mode when no other access is available.  Customer is frequently disconnected from both Wi-Fi and mobile plans and will need to collect and publish information products in disconnected mode. See Watershed Protection Forms, Current State Information Product Inventory, column H, for remote, disconnected use requirements. Data to be synched when re-connected. |  |
| 15 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | **TXN0004** – **Seattle.gov** – Will be updated when CAPS (previous system) is no longer in use – **Critical**  Please clarify whether this would be a collaboration with City staff on writing content only, and that the contractor would not be responsible for updating the Seattle.gov website directly? | Contractor is not responsible for this requirement. |  |
| 16 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | **BP0002** – **AR** – **Alarm Response** – Audible or silent alarm triggered within the Integrated Security System or by a private security monitoring service that requires an investigation – **Non-routine**  Do the Integrated Security System or private security monitoring service system provide API access for tracking alarm events, or would these be entered by staff? Is the new solution expected to record alarm events only? New solution will not trigger alarm events, correct? | No API required. Staff enter activity manually in Daily Log. See DailyLog tab, Watershed Protection Forms, Current State Information Product Inventory. |  |
| 17 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | **BP0023** – **WX** – **Weather Data Collected** – Collect and download weather data – **Routine**  What frequency, for how many stations, and from what source(s) do you intend to collect and download weather data? | Staff manually collect weather data every day at three sites. No API required. See Weather tab, Watershed Protection Forms, Current State Information Product Inventory. |  |
| 18 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | **BP0035** – **SI** – **Access Card Issued** – Issue a Security Access ID card – **Routine**  What security features are used by your security cards (mag stripe, RFID, chip, barcode, 2D barcode, QR code, etc.)? Is the solution required to print and encode Access cards? Use an existing printer or include cost of a new Card printer? Provide details of required card features. | Solution is not required to create SAID cards. We leave open the possibility of interfacing with data stored in AMAG technology platform. See SAID Card tab, Watershed Protection Forms, Current State Information Product Inventory. This would be a two-way interface. |  |
| 19 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | **BP0039** – **MM** – **Map Made** – Make a map – **Non-routine**  Please provide additional detail around the type of maps you intend to generate from the application. | Solution will not generate maps. Customer will manually report this activity in the daily log. See Daily Log tab, Watershed Protection Forms, Current State Information Product Inventory. |  |
| 20 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | **BP0045** – **PT** – **Photo taken** – Take a photo – **Routine**  Is the expectation that photos will be directly captured by the application, or is the ability to take photos from mobile devices and upload/attach to a record sufficient? | Attaching photos from mobile device is sufficient. |  |
| 21 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | **D0015** – **Access Device Issuance** – Are mobile devices used by City and watershed employees or contractors shared devices (managed by SPU) or do employees use their own devices? If owned by SPU, how many devices are in use? | An Access Device is any physical device (e.g., mechanical key, electronic key, key card, etc.) used to gain physical access to a secure facility. Access devices are issued to Watershed employees, City employees, and contractors.  See MechKey and SAIDCard tabs, Watershed Protection Forms, Current State Information Product Inventory. Refer to Glossary (section 5.1) SPU Watershed Protection IMS, Seattle IT Business Requirements Document. . |  |
| 22 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | **D0003 – Historical Data -** Expand on the data migration details of Inspections in Maximo, Permits in CAPS to the new solution. How many years of historical data is to be migrated? Approximate the data size in volume to be migrated. Is the data in a SQL database in use today for the master content database? | 5 years of historical data currently stored in systems to be deprecated. Deprecated systems include CAPS, Maximo Aquatic Invasive Species inspections, and Report Exec. We estimate data volumes to be around 25 GB.  CAPS data is in SQL database. Maximo data is in Oracle. Report Exec proprietary but extracts available. |  |
| 23 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | What mobile devices are currently in use by field staff? | Dell Latitude E6430, iPhones, iPads, Android smartphones. |  |
| 24 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | What mobile printing devices are currently in use by field staff? | None. |  |
| 25 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | From the City’s perspective, why is Dynamics the preferred platform for the PACS? | The City has determined that the Microsoft Dynamics CMS, already utilized by other City Departments, could meet the key requirements identified in this RFP. The City is also open to a proposed solution utilizing a different CMS structure that can meet or exceed expectations identified in this RFP. |  |
| 26 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | How and when will the City know if they can provide IT support for the proposed vendor solution? | For an MS Dynamics 365 solution, the City has a team to support applications. The vendor should assume being the primary support for the new system for 3-6 months at which time they could do a knowledge transfer to the City’s team for support.  For other platform solutions, support would have to be worked out on a case by case basis. |  |
| 27 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | Should vendors base their solution around the business processes as defined in the Watershed Protection PDF documents in the PDF? Or is the preference to base scope around the business processes in the PDF and the Forms outlined in the Watershed Protection Forms Excel sheet? | Vendors should base their solution around Target State Business Process Inventory (section 5.2) and Target State Information Product Inventory (section 5.3) in SPU Watershed Protection IMS, Seattle IT Business Requirements Document. Watershed Protection Forms, Current State Information Product Inventory is provided for context. |  |
| 28 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | Are the numbers presented in the Annual Activity Levels for all field staff? | The numbers are for the entire Watershed Protection staff.  Watershed Protection Staff is up to 12 people. |  |
| 29 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | Can the City provide general guidance on the requested integrations to the other City systems? (e.g. data sharing, lookups to eliminate manual keying of common metadata, image enabling, etc.) | The value proposition is to minimize data entry (and maximize data reuse) if data is already stored in an enterprise system. To realize the value, the proposed solution will provide interface analysis and development with data mapping and conversion from one or more data sources to the proposed software solution (see section 7.4 #9 in RFSPU4647Rev document). See also SPU Watershed Protection IMS, Seattle IT Business Requirements Document: D0007 System shall reuse enterprise information whenever possible to enable efficient data entry and error reduction. And SI0001 System interfaces with Active Directory. Can also interface with other City systems such as AMAG, Videx, Keystone, Maximo, Fleets, PeopleSoft/Summit, WiseTrack and other systems as needed. |  |
| 30 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | Are the user counts in the Instructions tab of the Pricing Sheet unique individuals? Or are the requested based on concurrent interactions? | These are unique individuals. |  |
| 31 | 4/22/19 | 5/3/19 | Does the City have any existing agreements with AWS or Azure for hosting purposes? | The City of Seattle has contracts with Azure. The City has an agreement with AWS, however, it is specialized and would probably not cover most other types of service. |  |
| 32 | 5/3/19 | 5/3/19 | City of Seattle change to the RFP | Schedule change | **\* Interview Start Date, July 10-12, 2019 (Hold the dates. If your proposal makes it to Round 5 you will be expected to be available all day for one of the days listed). These sessions will be held at the Watershed Offices.** |