

---

## SOFTWARE RFP 3594

### AMENDMENTS OR CLARIFICATIONS

---

If you have questions or requests for clarifications, please contact the ITS consultant listed below.

*Jane Woosley*  
*Technology Consultant*  
*Phone: 601-359-2081*  
*FAX: 601-354-6016*  
*E-Mail: [jane.woosley@its.ms.gov](mailto:jane.woosley@its.ms.gov)*

---

1. **Question on Adobe Reseller Certifications for CLP:**

For Adobe, is it necessary for us to be authorized for CLP or can we just be an Authorized Reseller and use the Program Member numbers provided in the RFP? Second, if we must have CLP authorization, can we partner with a company that does hold that authorization who will pass on that pricing to us in a distribution-style relationship?

**Answer:**

ITS' original RFP 3594 specifications for the Adobe reseller certifications were not correct. Responding vendors need to be Adobe CLP authorized. It is not acceptable for the proposing vendor that is not CLP authorized to partner with a company that does hold the CLP authorization.

Section VIII, Technical Specifications, sub-section 7.1.5, page 45, is hereby amended to read:

Vendor must be an authorized Adobe reseller. Vendor must further be authorized to sell under the CLP programs.

- **Government CLP**  
Vendor must be an Adobe License Center (ALC)

For a list of currently authorized Government ALCs, go to  
<http://partners.adobe.com/resellerfinder/na/government.jsp?nav=alcg>  
Select "Adobe License Center (ALC) – Government Authorized"

- **Academic CLP**

Vendor must be an Authorized Educational Reseller and be CLP authorized or be an Adobe License Center (ALC)

For a list of currently authorized Educational Resellers, go to

<http://partners.adobe.com/resellerfinder/na/education.jsp>

Select “National and Regional Education Resellers – CLP Authorized”. Then select “ALL” under “Where are you” and leave the zip code blank.

*(Posted 04-29-2009)*

*Questions 2 – 18 posted 5/11/2009*

2. **Question on Adobe FLP:**

I wanted to request that an amendment be made to the RFP document that will allow for resellers who are FLP authorized to be able to submit pricing for the FLP product line. Products in the FLP product line include Adobe Acrobat Connect Professional, Adobe Presenter, Adobe Form Designer, Adobe LiveCycle, Adobe Flexbuilder, Flex Data Services, and Flash Media Server.

**Answer:**

FLP products will not be added to RFP 3594. The FLP program is Adobe’s Enterprise Licensing Program and is not part of the CLP program requested in RFP 3594. Many of these FLP products require custom configuration and tailoring and have a build to order option for more intricate applications. The focus of RFP 3594 is for commercial off-the-shelf desktop application software and the FLP products do not fit within the scope of RFP 3594. If and when a need arises to purchase Adobe FLP products, these FLP products would be bid separately and purchased through other public purchasing mechanisms.

3. **Clarification on Hummingbird:**

Hummingbird is now Open Text Connectivity Solutions Group

<http://connectivity.hummingbird.com/home/connectivity.html>

Responders to RFP 3594 should change “Hummingbird” to “Open Text” in their spreadsheet submission on the “Non-Core” products, “**Cost Plus/Minus Percentage Spreadsheet**” in Section IX.

If you have questions about Open Text products, our contact is Chris Chin-Sue, [cchinsue@opoentext.com](mailto:cchinsue@opoentext.com) , 905-762-6448.

4. **Clarification on Computer Associates:**

There seems to be confusion regarding the products solicited as “Non-Core” software for “Computer Associates” with companies of similar name. The intended software manufacturer is the Computer Associates at this URL:

<http://www.ca.com/us/>

The desktop utility software within the scope of RFP 3594 is for such products as virus protection and backup software. Mainframe products are not within the scope of RFP 3594. Responders to RFP 3594 should propose CA discounts in their spreadsheet submission on the “Non-Core” products, “*Cost Plus/Minus Percentage Spreadsheet*” in Section IX.

5. **Clarification on the “Sample Pricing Spreadsheets” provided on the ITS website:**  
As of 5/12/2009, five of the seven “Core Product” Manufacturers provided ITS with a sample spreadsheet to assist the responding vendors and to assist with evaluation. Please be reminded that these are sample spreadsheets only and do not represent all of the products that could be sold under the contract. ITS has requested similar spreadsheets from IBM and from Novell but has not received them. Therefore, the resellers will have to create their own spreadsheets using the format in RFP 3594, Section IX, “*Product Pricing Spreadsheet*” if proposing IBM Passport and/or Novell. For IBM, you need to submit a spreadsheet for both Government and Academic under Passport with the full product list. For Novell, submit a Product Pricing Spreadsheet for Novell MLA only.

For the “Non-Core” Products, the RFP does not require a “*Product Pricing Spreadsheet.*”

All solicited software manufacturers that your company proposes to sell need to be fully shown in the “*Cost-Plus/Minus Percentage Spreadsheet*” – both Core and Non-Core. Be sure to include percentages for the various pricing programs for each manufacturer as well as media and documentation, even if the Sample Pricing Spreadsheets did not show all programs. Examples: (1) The Adobe sample spreadsheet only shows CLP product numbers. You still need to show the TLP and media percentages in the “*Cost-Plus/Minus Percentage Spreadsheet*”. (2) For Novell, we are only asking for the “*Product Pricing Spreadsheet*” for Novell MLA. But in the “*Cost-Plus/Minus Percentage Spreadsheet*” you still need to show MLA, ALA, SLA, VLA, and media.

6. **Clarification on the McAfee Sample Pricing Spreadsheet:**  
The McAfee Sample Pricing Spreadsheet has multiple tabs. The only tab you need for your “*Product Pricing Spreadsheet*” in Section IX is the tab labeled “RawData”. The other tabs are informational only and may be ignored.
7. **Question on RFP 3594, Section III, item 18, page 13:**  
This item states: “*Additional Information to be Included*  
*In addition to answering each specification within this RFP, the Vendor must include complete product/service information, including product pictorials and technical/descriptive literature relative to any product/service offered with the proposal. Information submitted must be sufficiently detailed to substantiate that the products/services offered meet or exceed specifications.*”

**Question:**

As this bid is for a variety of software publishers with thousands of products, does the

State really want product literature on every product or is this requirement inapplicable to this RFP?

**Answer:**

No. Please disregard item 18.

**8. Question on RFP 3594, Section VI, item 2.2, page 31:**

This item states: “*Vendors must provide a current letter (dated no earlier than January 1, 2009) from the **manufacturer of software** being proposed that the Vendor has been authorized to sell the manufacturer's product to **ITS** customers.*”

- a. Is this applicable for both Core and Non-Core publishers?
- b. What if the publisher sells only through distribution? Will a letter from the distributor for non-core publishers be acceptable?

**Answer:**

- a. **ITS** will remove the requirement for letters of authorization for the Non-Core publishers. However, ITS reserves the right to request this information during evaluation.
- b. For all Core publishers, ITS requires the letter of authorization from the publisher or manufacturer, not the distributor. ITS has provided names and contact information for our manufacturer representatives as a resource.

**9. Question on RFP 3594, Section VII, item 1.6, page 33:**

This item states: “*Pricing is a major concern of **ITS**. Therefore Vendors must submit their pricing structure comparable to national pricing trends, the GSA, other statewide contracts, or other prominent pricing benchmark in terms of volume discounts.*”

Can the State please clarify what you are looking for here?

**Answer:**

The State is looking for best discounts that are comparable to those offered in other States or GSA. Vendors should propose their best discounts in Section XI. Please note that Section VII does **not** require a point-by-point response.

**10. Question of RFP 3594, Section VII, item 4, page 34:**

This item states: “*A price increase will not be accepted during the lifecycle of the EPL, unless stipulated in the contract.* Does this mean that the sample prices submitted with the proposal cannot be increased for the 3-year term or only that the cost plus/minus percentage bid cannot increase for the term of the contract?

**Answer:**

This means the cost plus/minus percentage bid cannot be increased for the term of the contract. Also please reference Section VIII, item 4.13.2. During the term of the RFP, awarded vendor(s) will issue pricing quotations through their websites or by quotations to

individual customers. These quotations must be guaranteed by the proposing vendor for a period of sixty days should the manufacturer increase prices. Vendor must also agree to lower the price should there be a price decrease.

**11. Question on RFP 3594, Section VIII, item 2.1, page 39:**

This item states: *“Beginning with Item 4.1 of this section and all sections hereafter, label and respond to each outline point as it is labeled in the RFP”*. Does this requirement mean the State wants a point by point response to each and every requirement including Item 4, General Requirements for Vendors; Item 5, General Information about Pricing, Item 6, Evaluation; Item 7, CORE PRODUCTS...; Item 8, NON-CORE PRODUCTS; Item 9 E-Rate; as well as Sections IX through XIII?

**Answer:**

Yes.

**12. Question on RFP 3594, Section VIII, item 4.13.2, page 41:**

This item states: *“...Only price increases resulting from an increase in price by the manufacturer will be accepted.”* Does this mean that the sample prices submitted with the proposal cannot be increased for the 3-year term or only that the cost plus/minus percentage bid cannot increase for the term of the contract?

**Answer:**

See answer to Question 10 above.

**13. Questions on Fixed Cost Plus/Minus Percentages:**

- a. Are we correct in our assumption that for all publishers, vendors may bid a cost plus percentage from their cost?
- b. As the Corel price sheets are the only ones that show vendor cost, if vendors are bidding a cost plus from their cost for all publishers, does the State want us to add a column to all the other sheets showing vendor cost?

**Answer:**

- a. Yes.
- b. For the five sample *“Product Pricing Spreadsheets”* provided by ITS, it is not necessary to add additional columns. For the IBM and Novell spreadsheets that you will need to create per Clarification # 5 above, please include this column per the sample in Section IX.

**14. Question RFP 3594, Section VIII, item 5.1.3, page 43:**

This item states: *“The Vendor must provide their initial proposed price as well as the manufacturer’s base price for the software and the percentage by which the final price to*

*the State exceeds the Vendor's cost for the software. ('cost plus')*

As all of the price spreadsheets already have the publishers list price, can the state please explain what you mean by 'manufacturer's base price' and where this price should be included?

**Answer:**

See clarification # 13(b) above. For the five spreadsheet provided by the State as samples, you do not need to add any additional columns to your response. For the two other "Core Spreadsheets" for Novell and IBM, please include this column per the sample in Section IX.

**15. Question on Non-Core Software:**

Are we correct in our assumption that vendors should create their own spreadsheets for the Non-Core Software Manufacturers?

**Answer:**

Please refer to Section VIII, item 8.4, page 52. The Vendor does NOT have to provide a separate set of "***Product Pricing Spreadsheets***" in Section IX for the "Non-Core" Software Manufacturers. The Vendor DOES have to propose the discounts offered for each manufacturer, both "Core" and Non-Core," in the "***Cost Plus/Minus Percentage Spreadsheet***" in Section IX. These instructions are repeated in Section IX, items 1.2 and 2.1, pages 54 -55, and in the sample spreadsheets pages 56-59.

**16. Question on RFP 3594, Section IX, item 1.5, page 54:**

This item states: "*Vendor's list must include suggested retail pricing, the Vendor's cost, proposed price for government and education, and the percentage markup used to determine the Vendor's government and education prices for the State.*"

- a. Which list is this referring to?
- b. Is this separate from the spreadsheets provided by the State?
- c. As the State's spreadsheets show retail pricing already, where would this be put?

**Answer:**

- a. The first instance of the word "list" in item 1.5, "*Vendor's list must . . .*" refers to the responding vendor's spreadsheet response. Please revise item 1.5 to read "*Vendor's spreadsheet must include . . .*"
- b. Please refer to Clarifications # 13 and 14 above.
- c. Please refer to Clarifications # 13 and 14 above.

**17. Question on paper and electronic formats of spreadsheets:**

Section X, page 61, Vendor Information Sheet, *Directions for submitting an RFP Diskette*.

- a. Is the Vendor Information Sheet to be submitted in electronic format only or also in hard copy?

**Answer:**

Please submit both a paper copy for your binder, as well as an electronic copy on diskette or CD.

**18. Question on Multiple Resellers for award:**

Is the purpose of this RFP to have multiple resellers fulfilling one MFG's product line (for example McAfee) or is there only going to be one reseller represented for each MFG (possibly multiple MFG's)? Also, If there a minimum amount of bids you have to receive to award this bid (for example, if you only have 2 quoting McAfee, will it go out for rebid if you required 3 or more responses)?

**Answer:**

The State will choose, per Section VIII, item 1.2, page 38, one, two or possibly more resellers to handle sales from the various manufacturers requested.

Per Section VIII, item 1.3, there is a preference for vendors who can provide all or most of the software. That being said, we do not have a set number of resellers for this award but it is not our intent to accept a large group of resellers if a smaller group can provide the products with the combination of good discounts and services.

**19. Question on Prior Software EPL Sales:**

In order to provide the State with the most competitive price points, we would like to know what the customer spend has been over the past three years by segment, education and government for each manufacturer. Can the State provide this information?

**Answer:**

ITS has requested sales information from the incumbent vendors under current Software EPL 3465 as part of their submission response to RFP 3594. ITS does not have the sales information requested at present. Copies of the "Marketing Report" summaries showing sales under ITS Express Products Lists may be obtained through ITS Public Records Procedures once the data has been collected. See the ITS Procurement Handbook, article 019-010 at this link:

<http://dsitspe01.its.ms.gov/its/procman.nsf/TOC4?OpenView>

Alternatively or in addition to above, we suggest that you contact each manufacturer solicited under RFP 3594 and request this information.

*(Posted 5/12/2009)*

**20. Question on "Cost-Plus/Minus Percentage Spreadsheet", Section IX:**

As the State may be aware, for many software lines, especially the "Non Core"

Software Manufacturers, MSRP is often unavailable; pricing is rarely updated and may not reflect current market prices. For these “Non Core” lines, we would like to propose a discount off our web price, which is publicly verifiable, benchmarked weekly against the IT industry and therefore gives MS customers a competitive offer long term. Would that be acceptable to the State?

**Answer:**

For the “Non-Core” Software Product Lines, if the vendor uses their own commercial web price as the national benchmark requested in Section IX, item 2.1, page 55, please provide justification for how your company’s website qualifies as a national benchmark to be used for special discounts for RFP 3594.

*(Posted 5/12/2009)*

**FINAL CLARIFICATION, for original opening POSTED May 12, 2009, noon, CDT: There have been 20 clarifications posted. Any issue not covered by these clarifications will be addressed after the proposal opening. Should the vendor find errors, omissions, or items that need clarification after this time, please address these in a separate letter or text document and place at the beginning of your binder submission. All proposals are due by May 19, 2009, 3:00 p.m. local time.**

*Last updated 5/12/2009*