



REQUEST FOR COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS
Solicitation Number: R-13-004-MR

CAPITAL PROGRAM

PROJECT MANAGEMENT SOLUTION

ADDENDUM #2 – 11:00 AM Central | March 28, 2013

This addendum provides answers to written question submissions.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

1. Page 14 of the RFP refers to a “signature sheet.” Can you please clarify what this is, where it should go in our proposal, and what format is required for it, if such a sheet must be included?
 - a. There are multiple sheets which require a signature for your submittal to be considered responsive. Any sheets submitted requiring a signature should have ORIGINAL stamped on the one (1) original submittal. This is not required on the additional evaluation copies.
2. Can we double-side print our proposal?
 - a. Yes. Each sheet printed on two sides will be counted as two pages towards the limit.
3. Can we include a cover letter, and if so, does it count against the overall page limit?
 - a. A single page cover letter will not be counted against the aggregate limit.

4. Are any of the required forms required to be completed by subconsultants as well as the prime firm?
 - a. SMWB forms are required to be completed by the PRIME or main Consultant submitting the response. Sub-Contractors/Consultants are not required to complete or submit forms.
5. We would like to request clarifications regarding Exhibit “F” section 2(a): We have never seen Liquidated Damages language included in a software/Implementation contract before. Was this section accidentally left in this RFP?
 - a. This is a standard form agreement which SAWS is providing as an example of our terms and conditions. A negotiated agreement may differ to some extent however any objections to the agreement must be indicated by the use of the RESPONDENT QUESTIONNAIRE FORM #13 Contract Terms and Conditions.
6. If Liquidated Damages are to be part of this contract, we noted that the dollar amount is blank. Should there be a number inserted where the text reads “the amount of \$ per day as ‘Liquidated Damages’”?
 - a. Please refer to the answer provided for question 5 above.
7. The term of the agreement language refers to an Exhibit D, but Exhibit D in the RFP is an acknowledgement of Texas Release Form. Where is the Exhibit D to which section 2(a) refers?
 - a. This would be Exhibit D Term and Timeframe for Deliverables of the SAMPLE CONTRACT AGREEMENT and not the RFCSP document. This Exhibit is not included with the RFCSP for reason that it is developed for a specific agreement.
8. The work completed in conjunction with the term language refers to an Exhibit B, but Exhibit B in the RFP is a Good Faith Effort for Sub-Contracts form. Where is the Exhibit B to which section 2(a) refers?
 - a. This would be Exhibit B Scope of Services of the SAMPLE CONTRACT AGREEMENT and not the RFCSP document. This Exhibit is not included with the RFCSP for reason that it is developed for a specific agreement.
9. Integration – Section E, ii: Can you specify which data elements will be integrated in which direction for Kronos Workforce Central – Time Management Software?
 - a. SAWS intends to capture time elements from Kronos, in order to capitalize staff time on CIP projects.

SAWS will take a best value approach to data conversion and customized services (i.e. integration services) based on the CPMS solution selected. Data conversion and customized services will not be included in the cost scoring; instead the approach and mechanism proposed in the response will be scored.

10. Data Conversion - Section F, ii: Would it be possible to obtain sample files from source systems for the Data Conversion?

- a. CIP data is stored in spreadsheets, CIP Planner CIP Ace, Meridian Prolog Converge, MS Access, Infor Lawson, Infor Hansen and ESRI Geodatabase. SAWS will take a best value approach for data conversion services.

SAWS will take a best value approach to data conversion and customized services (i.e. integration services) based on the CPMS solution selected. Data conversion and customized services will not be included in the cost scoring; instead the approach and mechanism proposed in the response will be scored.

11. What software/program are you currently using to manage projects?

- a. CIP data is stored in spreadsheets, CIP Planner CIP Ace, Meridian Prolog Converge, MS Access, Infor Lawson, Infor Hansen and ESRI Geodatabase.

12. Scaling from 400 to 1,000 users within what timeframe?

- a. SAWS has no current plan to scale the CPMS up to 1,000 users; however, the system will have a life of 7 or more years, over which time that requirement may change.

13. What are the roles of the various users of the CPMS and how many within each role? Further breakdown of the 300 active users and 100 simultaneous users.

- a. Role definition and breakdown will be based on the CPMS selected. The CPMS shall provide inter- and intra-departmental coordination of capital project work amongst SAWS stakeholders and/or departments:

- Sewer System Improvements
- Engineering
- Legal (Contracting and Document Management)
- Information Systems
- Finance

The CPMS may provide information access, interaction, and coordination with internal and external stakeholders beyond SAWS departments including:

- Consultants
- Construction Contractors and Developers
- Prospective Proposers

14. Can you provide a weight or a ranking for each CPMS functional and technical requirement? We want to know how important each feature is to you. Which are critical, nice to have, wish lists, etc.

- a. All requirements are important and will be considered in scoring.

15. What document management system do you use now? (TR-3)

- a. SAWS does not currently have an Enterprise Document Management System.

16. What technology is the GIS system based on? (FR-110)

- a. ESRI ArcServer 10

17. Clarify "Spatial referencing of all CPMS projects, documents, drawings and pictures" (FR-111)

- a. Associate spatial information and visualize spatially (on a map) projects, documents, drawings and pictures.

18. Can you provide more details on the integration requirements to Lawson, Hansen and Enterprise GIS? (requirements TR-10,11, 12)

- a. The CPMS should allow for:

TR-10 Bidirectional flow of data from Lawson to include but not limited to:

- Budgeting/Accounting
- Employee
- Materials Costing
- Payments
- Contracting
- Retainage/Encumbrance/Commitments

TR-11 Bidirectional flow of data from Hansen to include but not limited to:

- Project Number
- Service Requests
- Work Orders
- Inspections

TR-12 Bidirectional flow of spatial data between the CPMS and the SAWS Enterprise GIS

SAWS will take a best value approach to data conversion and customized services (i.e. integration services) based on the CPMS solution selected. Data conversion and customized services will not be included in the cost scoring; instead the approach and mechanism proposed in the response will be scored.

19. SAWS already owns a CPMS platform (CIPPlanner through the BEXARMet and Prolog Converge). In detail, please describe why the SAWS is not simply expanding the use of that solution?

- a. SAWS is considering all options. Although SAWS believes aspects of the desired CPMS exist in CIPPlanner and Prolog Converge, as depicted in this solicitation, with the scope, scale and importance of the desired solution, we decided to reach to the market to ascertain and understand the best long term solution(s) and partner(s). Also see response to question 21.

20.If SAWS has chosen not to expand the use of CIPPlanner/Prolog Converge, what are the identified gaps in that solution vs. the requirements in the RFP?

- a. SAWS is considering all options.

21.The requirements in the SAWS RFP appear to be written in CPMS marketing language; not specific language that might be developed by a Water Authority. Where did the requirements for the CPMS come from? If, so which CPMS solution provided SAWS with the RFP template?

- a. Requirements for this RFCSP were derived from SAWS Staff and their related experience. SAWS intends for the CPMS to become a transformational tool, refining how SAWS delivers CIP projects. The RFCSP was written to reflect that approach and allow respondents to showcase the CPMS industries' leading edge products and services.

22.Which vendors has SAWS already evaluated or seen demos of their solution within the past 12 months?

- a. SAWS currently owns CIPPlanner CIPAce and Meridian Prolog Converge; in addition SAWS has researched the CPMS market through the course of developing the CPMS project. No evaluations or demonstrations have been conducted in the last 12 months for any of the current team members participating in this RFCSP. SAWS thru normal course of business has received training on Prolog Converge for the purpose of updating Prolog.

23.If SAWS "prefers an on-premise solution", is the evaluation criteria different for selecting a vendor that does not provide on-premise solutions?

- a. Since SAWS is a critical infrastructure company, there is a preference for on-premise solutions. In the event of a tie in scoring, an on-premise solution would prevail.

24.The City of San Antonio already owns a CPMS system (Skire). Why would SAWS not use an existing system within the City?

- a. SAWS is considering all options. SAWS leverages systems available thru other Agencies where synergies or efficiencies make sense. See also the answers to questions 19 and 21.

25. Please define: "TR-3 Support third-party document management system integration"
- a. The CPMS should support an Enterprise-wide third party document management system.
26. Please define in detail all the specific requirements for integration (with all the various systems:)
1. System of data origin
 2. Data mapping
 3. Integration methodology
 4. Data processing
 5. Integration rules & validation
 6. Error handling
 7. Integration reporting
 8. Integration time intervals
- a. SAWS will take a best value approach to data conversion and customized services (i.e. integration services) based on the CPMS solution selected. Data conversion and customized services will not be included in the cost scoring; instead the approach and mechanism proposed in the response will be scored.
27. Please define: "FR-60 Integration with software that captures, stores, and recreates images for document imaging (using scanners or multifunction printers)"
- a. The CPMS should integrate with document capture tools; in order to digitize a physical document and associate it in the CPMS.
28. In order to develop a data conversion plan, please provide a detailed accounting of the amount of data, type of data, data format, etc.
- a. SAWS will take a best value approach to data conversion and customized services (i.e. integration services) based on the CPMS solution selected. Data conversion and customized services will not be included in the cost scoring; instead the approach and mechanism proposed in the response will be scored.
29. What is SAWS's budget for the software licenses and for implementation, setup and integration?
- a. Depends on the responses to the RFP and ultimate implementation approach.
30. Detail of references on page 20 indicates, "Contacts of firms utilizing your current system." Would SAW prefer to receive no less than 10 references?
- a. A minimum of three references is required however you may include additional firms keeping within the page limits of your response.

31. Re S-23 thru S-25: Is vendor to be responsible for actually doing the work mentioned (e.g., setting up and updating schedules for each project; assisting SAWS or consultants with review of change order requests; and establishing and managing risks) or is vendor to be responsible for establishing the tools and providing training for others to do that work?
- a. The vendor is responsible for the tools. Any project management services only relate to the implementation of the CPMS.
32. Re II.C. Evaluation Criteria: It is noted that “system’s demonstrated functionality and features” will be worth 35 points. How does SAWS intend for the vendor to “demonstrate” its proposed system?
- a. The features will be evaluated based on the submitted response; and if necessary a demonstration.
33. Re Exhibit F, Consulting Agreement, Section 2 (a), Term, Termination and Suspension: Liquidated Damages is mentioned, but it doesn’t say what the daily charge is. Are LDs truly to be imposed on this project, and if so, what is the monetary amount per day?
- a. See response to question 5 above.
34. Re Exhibit F, Consulting Agreement: No payment terms are mentioned. What are the payment terms (e.g., Net 30 days after receipt of invoice, etc.)?
- a. This would be negotiated.
35. Page 17 of 40 of the RFP lists subsections “Training” and “Prices, subsections i-v”. We interpret these subsections to be returned in our proposal behind TAB 8-B, Maintenance and Support Costs, even though these sections do not seem to be associated with the Cost Section. Is this the correct Tab for these items, or should they be placed behind one of the “Technical” tabs instead?
- a. TAB 8-B covers post implementation support cost and services; which should include subsections i-v.
36. Page 17 of 40, Training. We interpret that the Training Plan is to be returned in our proposal behind TAB 8-B, Maintenance and Support Costs. Is this the correct Tab for this item, or should it be placed behind one of the “Technical” tabs instead? Also, is the Training Plan part of the 80-page limit?
- a. The CPMS Training Plan for implementation should be included in the Project Plan (TAB 4). Post implementation training options should be included in TAB 8-B. These pages count towards the limit.
37. On page 14 of 40, the RFP states that “Required forms do not count toward the page limit”. Please verify the forms are as follows: Submittal Response Checklist, Respondent Questionnaire, W-9, and Exhibits A-D.

- a. These are required forms and therefore do not count against the page limit per the RFCSP instructions Section IV. Submitting a Response, Sub-Section B. Submission, Item 6.

END ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

No other items, dates or deadlines for this RFQ are changed.

END ADDENDUM #2