

## RFP Questions and Clarifications Memorandum

---

**To:** Vendors Responding to RFP Number 3568 for the Mississippi Department of Finance and Administration (DFA)

**From:** David L. Litchlitter

**Date:** August 5, 2008

**Subject:** Responses to Questions Submitted and Clarifications to Specifications

**Contact Name:** Sheila Kearney

**Contact Phone Number:** 601-359-2686

**Contact E-mail Address:** Sheila.Kearney@its.ms.gov

---

**RFP Number 3568 is hereby amended as follows:**

- Section VII Technical Specifications, Exhibit L, rows 303 through 305 in the spreadsheet are being modified to correct the specification numbering as follows under 5.1.4 Templates:**

301	<b>5.1.4</b>	<b>Templates</b>
302	5.1.4.1	The system must support user creation and modification of templates for use in Projects and Sub-projects for all approval levels.
303	5.2.4.2	Templates must offer complete configuration of data fields, drop-down lists, search screens/views, workflows, etc.
304	5.2.4.3	Templates must permit quick generation of budgets, schedules, contracts, etc. to eliminate redundant data entry and to leverage best practices.
305	5.2.4.4	The system must provide the ability to maintain the workflow templates in a library of automated processes.

**5.2.4.2 is being changed to 5.1.4.2,  
5.2.4.3 is being changed to 5.1.4.3, and  
5.2.4.4 is being changed to 5.1.4.4.**

301	5.1.4	Templates
302	5.1.4.1	The system must support user creation and modification of templates for use in Projects and Sub-projects for all approval levels.
303	5.1.4.2	Templates must offer complete configuration of data fields, drop-down lists, search screens/views, workflows, etc.
304	5.1.4.3	Templates must permit quick generation of budgets, schedules, contracts, etc. to eliminate redundant data entry and to leverage best practices.
305	5.1.4.4	The system must provide the ability to maintain the workflow templates in a library of automated processes.

**Vendor is instructed to edit Exhibit L as indicated above. Vendor is also instructed to add specification 4.5.17 to the spreadsheet, as provided in item 9 of Amendment 1 to RFP 3568 on July 29, 2008.**

2. **Exhibit B is being replaced in its entirety to provide all of the workflows. A revised Exhibit B has been posted to the website.**
3. **Exhibit M, Lease Agreement, Capitol Complex is being provided as a result of question number 26 below and has been posted to the website.**

The following questions were submitted to ITS and are being presented as they were submitted, except to remove any reference to a specific vendor. This information should assist you in formulating your response.

**Question 1:** The RFP identifies an expected start of 11/3/08, at least 1 (one) and possibly 2 (two) implementation phases, and an anticipated 5 (five) year hosting term – what are MS ITS expectations on implementation timelines / schedules for phases 1 and 2?

Project Timeline – in the RFP schedule it is noted that implementation will begin on 11/03/08.

- a. What is the timeframe for Phase I completion?
- b. Are there any constraints on this deadline?
- c. For Phase II, are you requiring in the response to the RFP a detailed schedule? If so, what is the timeline for completion for this phase

**Response:** The State anticipates Phase I of the proposed solution (BRICKS) to be completed in 9-12 months. The State is currently not aware of any constraints on the Phase I deadline. Phase II of BRICKS is anticipated to be completed in 6-9 months. The State desires sufficient detail to understand the major activities and durations of the tasks in the Vendor's estimated schedule for each Phase. Vendor should propose an implementation approach based on their best practices expertise that causes the least amount of disruption with BoB and CF work while providing a cost effective solution for the State.

**Question 2:** What level of effort / project staffing do MS ITS and BoB anticipate providing – other than Project Management, Contracting Officer, and expected Executive Steering Committee? Are technical and functional resources available to participate in the implementation activities?

How much staff resources (time and role) will be involved in project:

- a. Roll-Out:
- b. Administration:
- c. Management:

Will there be personnel with project roles for the CF and BoB?

**Response:** During implementation, the State will provide full-time:

- The technical Project Consultant that developed the DFA / Bureau of Buildings (BoB) workflows and RFP,
- A non-technical Business Analyst.

During implementation, the State will provide part-time participation from the remaining BRICKS Core Team members:

- The DFA / Mississippi Management and Reporting System (MMRS) Project Manager and Deputy Project Manager,
- For Phase I, the BoB Director, Contract Analyst, and Special Projects Facilitator,
- For Phase II, the DFA / Capitol Facilities (CF) maintenance and office management.

During implementation, the State will provide, as needed:

- Subject Matter Experts to clarify current business processes, formulate enhanced business processes, and document internal Standard Operating Procedures,
- Technical staff to be trained on the support of administrator activities,
- Technical staff to provide conversion support for data export and data scrubbing,
- The BRICKS Executive Steering Committee representing MMRS, BoB, and CF.

MMRS Office of DFA will provide staff to perform the following roles to support BRICKS post implementation: personnel management, business analysis, and technical administration. The State expects BoB and CF management to be able to monitor BoB and CF business through executive dashboard and report information provided by BRICKS.

**Question 3:** Section VIII of the RFP requests the identification of general software license for additional users if enterprise licenses are not quoted – tiers for 25, 50, and 100 users. Exhibit K of the RFP indicates that the total BoB staff is 25. Exhibit L of the RFP indicates that software sizing for licenses must be submitted to support a minimum of 50 users. What is the total number of primary users – those who will use the Integrated Workplace Management System (IWMS) solution on a daily / recurring basis? Of that number, how many “concurrent” (defined as use at the same time) users are expected? How many “casual” (defined as either state employees who access the solution on a non-recurring or infrequent basis, or state vendors that provide / receive input from the solution for purposes of facilities services, construction management, work order management, etc.) users are expected?

Please identify the number (at any one time) of users required to access the system based on roles to the associated activity.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>System/IT Administration</b>	<b>Planner/Manager</b>	<b>Field or Operations</b>	<b>Executive or Director</b>	<b>Requestor or Contractor</b>
<b>Capital Project Management</b>					
<b>Construction Management</b>					
<b>Financial Management</b>					
<b>Lease Management</b>					
<b>Furniture and Equipment</b>					
<b>Maintenance Management</b>					
<b>Inventory</b>					
<b>Space Management</b>					
<b>Reservations</b>					

What is the projected number of concurrent users and total users?

Referencing Exhibit L, Item 4.2.1.0, How many potential users submitting work requests or other types of requests? Can you provide more info about total number of users by profile /use of system projects, lease, facilities management etc?

Are there any contractors, vendors, suppliers or non state users of system? How would they interface with BRICKS?

**Response:** RFP 3568 does not contain a specification numbered 4.2.1.0. Section VII, items 4.2.1 and 4.2.10 of the RFP specify software sizing for licenses to support a minimum of 50 users to accommodate BoB, Capitol Facilities and selected MMRS staff anticipated to use BRICKS on a daily / recurring basis. All BoB staff members perform some level of Project activity with only three involved part-time with leases. CF has maintenance staff assigned to seven and custodial staff assigned to five groups of Capitol Complex buildings. The State must rely on the experience of the Vendor to estimate the number of “concurrent” and “casual” users. Since the State is not familiar with the scope of each system activity or the roles, the Vendor must use their experience with installations of similar size and structure as presented in the RFP System Sizing Metrics to estimate user access to the system.

If Vendor’s pricing model requires licenses for Project query and work order entry, the Vendor must provide pricing for these licenses in tiered increments separate from the 50 users identified in the RFP. This pricing must be included in Section VIII, Cost Information Submission.

Licenses for contractors, vendors, suppliers, and non state users of the system are not included in the scope of this project. However, if the Vendor’s pricing model for this group is not covered by the above Project query and work order entry or by tiered pricing provided for licenses beyond the 50 users identified in the RFP, then Vendor must provide tiered pricing for these users in Section VIII, Cost Information Submission. The State, at its sole discretion, may opt to purchase these additional licenses.

**Question 4:** Section VII, 3.3 of the RFP identifies 2 (two) legacy mainframe applications used by BoB that the state intends to replace with the selected IWMS solution. The RFP also indicates that MS Word and Excel are used to accomplish scheduling and other supporting activities. The current Exhibit L, 5.1.3, identifies interface requirements. Other than those applications identified such as AutoCAD, are there any state applications to which MS ITS is expecting the IWMS solution to be integrated / have interface? Example – State Financial Management System, ERP solutions, cross agency project management, cross agency reporting, etc.? If so, please provide any available technical or functional information for implementation planning purposes – number of interfaces, what applications, bi-directional, hosting methods, etc.

Please describe in detail in what capacity PATS will be used for financials. Also, will PATS be used for invoice receipts, payments and general ledger posting; if not, what application will be responsible for these activities?

Interfaces to other state owned systems:

- a. Financial System
  - i. What system is currently being used?

- ii. What type of database is it?
- iii. Where is it located? (Internal or Hosted)
- iv. Please provide details on the interface requirement with your current financial system.
- b. Human Resource System
  - v. What system is currently being used?
  - vi. What type of database is it?
  - vii. Where is it located? (Internal or Hosted)

Please provide details on the interface requirement with your current human resource system.

Can you provide a list of contemplated database interfaces? For example, one possible interface might be moving financial data between the state financial system and the contract module (i.e. invoices, budgets, change orders, etc.).

**Response:** **The BoB current financial system (PATS) will continue to support invoice receipts, payments, and general ledger posting for the BoB after the BRICKS implementation. Some PATS financial information must be duplicated in BRICKS to reflect accurate financial information on Projects and to permit adequate information for reporting. To avoid duplication of entry, the State desires the ability to load financial data from PATS and/or the Statewide Automated Accounting System (SAAS) via data extracted from the State data warehouse (MERLIN). Daily batch loading of the extracted financial information into BRICKS is an acceptable option. If this option is available in the proposed solution, the State will be responsible for the data extraction from the State systems; the Vendor will be responsible for an interface into BRICKS to post the extracted financial data. At a later date, PATS will be replaced either through enhanced BRICKS functionality or an ERP solution that would be interfaced with BRICKS, separate from the scope of the current RFP.**

**The State expects the BRICKS system to replace the current use of MS Word and Excel for scheduling and other supporting activities.**

**The State expects to fully replace the leasing system (APLS) with the BRICKS system.**

**The State anticipates transmitting a CSV formatted file in batch mode via FTP for both sending and receiving State database data with the Vendor. As specified in Section VII.5.1.3, the BRICKS solution is expected to have interface / integration abilities with Microsoft products, AutoCAD and project management systems. The State expects the Vendor to advise of any unique formatting needs or procedures to interface information between BRICKS and these products.**

**Data from PATS, APLS, SAAS and the Statewide Payroll and Human Resource System (SPAHRs) is extracted and downloaded nightly to the State’s data warehouse (MERLIN). All of these systems are proprietary to the State and operate from the state data center provided by the Department of Information Technology Services (ITS). At this time, the State does not anticipate interfacing SPAHRs and BRICKS data. As described above, interfaces (extracting or importing data) with the State systems will be the responsibility of the State. The interfaces with BRICKS are expected to be provided by the Vendor. The State has found this procedure simplifies the exchange of information between systems.**

**Question 5:** Archival requirements following IWMS solution implementation, as identified in Exhibit L, are understood. Exhibit L, 4.13.1.1, indicates conversion of “all electronic and manual data.” Exhibit K identifies very high level document type and number variables, but does not explicitly identify whether each is electronic or manual/hardcopy or the number of data elements per document. Please provide an estimate of the number of discrete data elements per document type expected for conversion and upload to the IWMS solution. Does MS ITS expect current historical documents to be captured via document imaging or via data conversion?

**Response:** Exhibit K provides a variety of estimated counts and amounts to give the Vendor a general understanding of magnitude for construction and real property projects, leases, and facilities management.

**Most documents identified in Exhibit K are currently hardcopy only. The BoB anticipates capturing the document information via imaging. The BoB will be responsible for screening and scanning existing documents. The BRICKS system is expected to allow a user to select and view document images associated with a specific Project, Lease, etc. The BoB anticipates working with the Vendor to:**

- define the metadata necessary for the solution to provide automated access of a document, and**
- establish a method to load the metadata and scanned documents into the solution.**

**As described in Exhibit L, Item 4.13, the State anticipates using selected PATS data for an initial load of the BRICKS Project database. The State will be responsible for the data extraction from PATS; the Vendor will be responsible for posting the extracted data into BRICKS. Projects that are closed at BRICKS implementation will permanently contain only the converted PATS data and selected scanned images. The BoB anticipates that Projects active during or subsequent to implementation will have most, if not all, discrete data elements according to the Project information identified in**

**VII.6.2.1.4 and reflected in the Standard Approval Forms included in Exhibit D.**

**As described in Exhibit L, Item 4.13, the State desires to extract APLS data for an initial load into the BRICKS lease database. The State will be responsible for the data extraction from APLS; the Vendor will be responsible for an interface into BRICKS to post the extracted data. Each current and, if appropriate, one prior generation lease will be scanned. The BoB anticipates that the current leases will have most, if not all, of the discrete data elements according to the lease information identified in Exhibit L, Item 6.12.**

**Question 6:** Does the scope of the RFP require a Condition Assessment of Facility Equipment?

Condition Assessment in scope? If so, how many users of condition assessment? Phase II?

**Response: No, a Condition Assessment of Facility Equipment is not within the scope of this RFP.**

**Question 7:** Does the scope of the RFP require an audit of equipment data?

**Response: No, an audit of equipment data is not within the scope of this RFP.**

**Question 8:** Does the scope of the RFP require an audit of space and occupancy data?

**Response: No, an audit of space and occupancy data is not within the scope of this RFP.**

**Question 9:** In the RFP, CAD Drawings are mentioned several times. It is important that we understand the needs and involvement with the drawings. Please verify the number of existing CAD Drawings. What is the quantity of electronic drawings and format? (i.e., DWG, PDF, etc.) If the drawings are not in DWG format, then will it be required to convert to CAD DWG? What is the quantity of paper drawings and is it required to convert these to CAD DWG? Are the current drawings up to date? Are we required to audit and bring the drawings to current specification?

**Response: The numbers of CAD drawings for the Capitol Complex are provided in the Real Property Management section of the System Sizing Matrix, Exhibit K. The BoB plans to develop up-to-date CAD drawings for each of the Capitol Complex buildings. CAD Land Drawings for three counties have been completed and a fourth is in progress. Most of the Capitol Complex properties are within these four counties. The CAD drawings are maintained in the DWG format.**

The numbers of paper drawings (Project Management and Real Property Management) are estimates. Many of the Project drawings on file will be scanned. The BoB will determine which drawings to scan and procure those services outside the scope of, but in conjunction with, the BRICKS project. Since September 2004, the BoB has requested an electronic copy (PDF format) of contract documents (plans and specifications) from the Professional. The BoB expects the Vendor to advise which electronic drawing format(s) should be requested from the Professional in the future.

The BoB desires the ability to access drawing images for a construction or real property Project through the BRICKS solution. The BoB anticipates working with the Vendor to determine the best approach for storage and access of historical, current and future Project drawings. The Vendor is expected to define and implement the solution's ability to manage drawings. The State is responsible for procuring electronic Project drawing documents and developing and maintaining CAD drawings.

**Question 10:** Will the vendor be required to link the space data (Site, Building, Room Floor, Department, Equipment etc.) to the drawings?

**Response:** The State desires a solution to track Capitol Complex utilization and vacancy, and assign and manage space as detailed in Exhibit L, Item 7.6. The State currently has limited Capitol Complex space data and CAD drawings of the Capitol Complex space are under development. Manual methods are utilized for managing space. The State anticipates working with the Vendor to:

- define automated space management procedures,
- define the space data to capture,
- determine the most efficient way to enter the data into the system,
- document the procedure to link the data to the drawings,
- train State staff on the BRICKS space management functionality, and
- establish space management prototype buildings in BRICKS.

The State will be responsible for capturing the appropriate Capitol Complex space data, entering the data into BRICKS, developing the Capitol Complex CAD drawings, and linking the space data to the CAD drawings for the Capitol Complex buildings. The Vendor is expected to define, implement and train for the space management methodology as specified in the RFP. The State will populate and maintain Capitol Complex space data and drawings as a long term automation plan.

**Question 11:** Please provide all "work flow" detail analysis that has been developed.

- a. Are these workflows considered to be the standard model that we follow in the implementation of the BRICKS system? If not, how are changes to be managed, communicated, and documented?
- b. The workflows will serve as the foundation to establish the scope of services and pricing. If we are required to deviate from the documented workflows, is it acceptable to provide mutually agreed cost change orders?
- c. Do these workflows represent the current process or the desired and best practice process?
- d. What is the current Gap between the current workflow and the future desired workflow?
- e. Who responsibility will it be to change manage, train, and document the new desired work flow process vs. system and application roll-out?

**Response:** **A revised Exhibit B has been posted to the website that represents the current business processes of the BoB. The State does not guarantee these workflows to be accurate. The workflows and BoB Functional Requirements in Section VII.6 are intended to help the Vendor envision the project scope.**

**As part of the BRICKS project, the State expects to work with the Vendor to develop enhanced business processes that take advantage of:**

- 1) recommended best practices, and**
- 2) the capabilities of an automated work management system.**

**The State must rely on the Vendor's experience with implementations of similar scope to estimate the gap between the current and enhanced processes.**

**In Exhibit L, Item 4.8, the Vendor is requested to provide information that reflects their Project Management methodology, including typical deliverables, change control, scope management, implementation methodology, etc. The Vendor is expected to follow their established methods and procedures for the BRICKS project. The State expects the Vendor to provide appropriate documentation of the revised business processes for the State to approve. Subsequent deviation from the mutually agreed upon revised processes may lead to a change order.**

**The State will be responsible for revising the current workflow documents to reflect the process enhancements agreed to by the State. The State will be responsible for informing and/or training staff for business process changes. As specified in Section VII.4, the Vendor is expected to provide appropriate Acceptance Testing (4.6), Training (4.7), and Documentation (4.10) to facilitate a successful implementation.**

**Question 12:** Are Standard Operating procedures documented? If so, can we have access to them? Will it be the responsibility of the vendor to document Standard Operating Procedures?

**Response:** The BoB workflows were developed to capture the current standard operating procedures of the BoB. No other documentation of internal procedures exists at this time. The BoB Procedure Manual (construction) and Real Property Management Manual reflect the procedures expected of external parties (i.e., Professionals, Contractors, Using Agencies, etc.). These manuals and several construction and real property forms can be found on the DFA website at <http://www.dfa.state.ms.us/Offices/BOB/BOB.htm>, as indicated in Section VII, Item 3.8. The BoB intends to develop a Policy and Procedures Manual from the workflows and information gathered during the BRICKS project.

The CF Policy and Procedures Manual is currently under development and is not available for publishing. The State will be responsible for updating and finalizing this manual after BRICKS is implemented.

**Question 13:** Will existing detail work order (demand and preventative maintenance) history in PATS need to be transferred?

**Response:** PATS does not contain work order data. Currently, the State work order information only resides in an Excel spreadsheet. The State does not expect to load any past work order history into BRICKS. The work order history will begin to accumulate upon implementation of the BRICKS facilities management processes in Phase II.

**Question 14:** Will the existing equipment, location and other data be 100% transferred or will there be modification and updates before, during and after data transfer?

- a. If so, who is responsible for the making the changes to the existing database?
- b. Who is responsible for collecting the data?
- c. If so, who is responsible for development of coding and naming convention of new data?

**Response:** Equipment information currently exists only in manual files. The State anticipates working with the Vendor to:

- define automated equipment information management procedures,
- define the equipment data to capture,
- devise coding and naming conventions for the data,

- determine the most efficient way to enter the data into the system,
- train State staff on the BRICKS equipment management functionality, and
- establish equipment prototypes in BRICKS.

The State will be responsible for capturing the appropriate Capitol Complex equipment data and entering the data into BRICKS. The Vendor is expected to define and implement the equipment management methodology as defined in BRICKS Phase II of the RFP. The State will populate and maintain Capitol Complex equipment data as a long term automation plan.

**Question 15:** Report Data Output

- a. What type of Executive Reporting is required? It is imperative that you provide examples.
  - i. Weekly
  - ii. Monthly
  - iii. Quarterly
  - iv. Yearly
- b. What Operational reports will be required?
  - v. Weekly
  - vi. Monthly
  - vii. Quarterly
  - viii. Yearly

**Response:** The requirements in Exhibit L, Item 6.2.8 identify specific BoB executive reporting needs. These requirements include the minimal information expected on each report, including counts and summarizations. Various expected and desirable operation reports are listed throughout Section VII.6 BoB Functional Requirements. The State does not have a specific required format for these reports.

If standard reports provided with the proposed solution do not address facilities management executive and operational reporting needs, the gaps will be addressed using the change order rate provided in the Cost Information Submission, Section VIII.

**Question 16:** Is there a budget established for the project?

- a. Phase 1 Budget:
- b. Phase 2 Budget

Is there separate funding for the hosted software license vs. services for deployment of the solution or is the funding combined? If it is combined what is the annual funding budget?

Is the funding for this project already appropriated?

How much funding is appropriated for this project?

**Response:** **The State will not release the budget information for this project. The funding has been partially approved.**

**Question 17:** Section VII, General Overview, Number 3.11 lists the project schedule. Currently answers to the posed questions are due 8/5/08. Will the questions be answered as they are received or only on August 5th?

**Response:** **All questions received by the deadline published in the RFP have been answered in this document and were posted to the web site by the August 5, 2008 deadline.**

**Question 18:** If we meet the mandatory requirements with the exception of a referenced installation having our proposed solution operational for twelve months will we be disqualified? If no respondents meet this requirement, will everyone be disqualified?

**Response:** **The Mandatory Provisions are stated in Section VII.2. Section VII, Item 2.3 of the mandatory requirements states: “The additional requirements for the three references as detailed in Section IX, Items 1.2.4.1 and 1.2.4.2 must be provided.” Section IX References, Item 1.2.3 states: “The reference installation must have been operational for at least twelve (12) months.” Item 1.2.3 of Section IX was not included in the mandatory requirements; therefore, Section IX, Item 1.2.3 is not mandatory. Taking exception to a requirement not labeled as a mandatory requirement does not disqualify the Vendor’s proposal. Upon evaluation, the State will determine the impact of each exception taken.**

**Question 19:** Are there any other state contract vehicles to procure the software?

**Response:** **Available State software procurement instruments are detailed on the ITS website at the following link: <http://www.its.ms.gov/EPL.shtml>. The State is not aware of any procurement instruments providing software that meets the specifications detailed in RFP 3568.**

**Question 20:** What is the anticipated interface to access the hosted solution (i.e. VPN, Internet, Citrix).

**Response:** The preferred mode of transfer is the internet. Department of Information Technology Services policy requires the Vendor to provide a secured FTP server and the transfer must be State initiated and the transferred data encrypted, as detailed in Enterprise Security Policy at [http://www.ms.gov/pdf/security\\_policy.pdf](http://www.ms.gov/pdf/security_policy.pdf).

**Question 21:** Some of the requirements relate to the management of real property, locations, and fixed assets with a geographic location. Is it desirable to the State to integrate the proposed solution with GIS or other spatial data repository?

**Response:** The BoB and CF currently use street address and building names to identify property. Other State agencies are involved in GIS initiatives. While not a current requirement, the ability to integrate with a GIS or spatial data repository may be desirable in the future. The State expects the Vendor to advise what and how information should be captured in BRICKS to facilitate future GIS integration.

**Question 22:** Does the State currently manage their properties, leases, and other location related assets within a GIS system? If so, which system and what is the primary data format (i.e., geodatabase, shape file, .DWG file, etc.)?

**Response:** The State does not currently manage their BoB or CF assets within a GIS system. The BoB has started a GIS initiative that is expected to run separate from, but concurrent with, the BRICKS project.

Since the four CAD county Land Drawings correspond with the primary locations of state properties, development of additional county drawings is of low priority to the BoB. External files of satellite imagery are referenced within these CAD drawings. The CAD drawings, maintained on the BoB network in DWG format, are the only current BoB use of geodata.

**Question 23:** Section VII, Item 2 Mandatory provisions. If some of the Exhibit L features for "Construction" will be new integrations with other solutions, or added features to the proposed solution, and not Out of the Box (OTB) proposed solution, does this exclude us from responding?

**Response:** A vendor that cannot satisfy the Mandatory Provisions as stated in Section VII, Item 2 is subject to immediate disqualification, at the sole discretion of the State. This does not exclude a Vendor from responding.

**Question 24:** Section VII, Items 8.2 - 8.4. Proposals scoring below 80% COTS based solution may be eliminated from further consideration. If the proposed solution will require some new technology integrations that will not be COTS, should the Vendor respond knowing that they will not meet these requirements?

Section IX References, Item 1.2, some of the solutions are new, and not available for reference. Are there shades of gray here?

**Response:** **A Vendor may take an exception to a requirement they cannot meet. Upon evaluation, the State will determine the impact of the exception. Whether to submit a proposal is a business decision that the Vendor must make.**

**Question 25:** Regarding use of software or ‘sandbox’, can you describe roles of users, whether training will be requested, timing of the review of software and over all goals?

**Response:** **If this question is referring to Section VII, Item 8.6 requiring a demonstration copy of the proposed solution, this requirement also states that Vendor must provide appropriate system, administration, and user documentation for evaluation purposes. The intent of this requirement is to allow the State to get a general look-and-feel of the proposed solution. Training will not be required and it is acceptable for the Vendor to specify a time limit on access to the demonstration copy.**

**If this question is referring to the development environment required during and after BRICKS implementation, the State anticipates working with the Vendor to define the objectives, participant roles, activities, and timeframes for each requested environment. The State will document and train staff on the agreed upon procedures.**

**Question 26:** Will the State of Mississippi provide a copy of the Capital Complex Lease Agreement Template?

**Response:** **Yes, please refer to Amendment # 3 above for Exhibit M.**

**Question 27:** Exhibit L, Item 5.1.6.10. Are PDAs in scope for software licensing and if so, how many users and in Phase II?

**Response:** **Currently there are three BoB employees with PDAs. While PDAs are listed as a desirable specification in the RFP, the Vendor is encouraged to provide any and all licensing options for integration capabilities the may exist between their proposed solution and PDA devices. BoB envisions the ability to enhance efficiency of operations utilizing PDA technology with the proposed solution.**

**CF does not currently utilize any PDAs; however, ten cell phones are currently assigned to CF employees. If the proposed CF solution integrates with PDA devices, CF may consider replacing the cell phones with PDAs.**

**Question 28:** Will the State of Mississippi consider an extension of the RFP proposal deadline of Aug 22<sup>nd</sup>?

**Response:** The proposal due date and subsequent related activities were extended in Amendment #1.

**Question 29:** The professional services pricing should be firm fix or time and materials?

**Response:** The State requires a fixed cost for a turnkey system solution.

RFP responses are due **August 19, 2008, at 3:00 p.m.** (Central Time).

If you have any questions concerning the information above or if we can be of further assistance, please contact Sheila Kearney at 601-359-2686 or via email at [Sheila.Kearney@its.ms.gov](mailto:Sheila.Kearney@its.ms.gov).

cc: File 36880