mississippi department of
Information Technology Services

3771 Eastwood Drive
Jackson, MS 39211-6381
Phone: 601-432-8000
Fax: 601-713-6380
www.its.ms.gov

Craig P. Orgeron, Ph.D., Executive Director

RFP Questions and Clarifications Memorandum

To: Vendors Responding to RFP Number 3732 for the Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services (ITS)

From: Craig P. Orgeron, Ph.D.

Date: August 20, 2013

Subject: Responses to Questions Submitted and Clarifications to Specifications

Contact Name: Paula Conn

Contact Phone Number: 601-432-8046

Contact E-mail Address: Paula.Conn@its.ms.gov

RFP Number 3732 is hereby amended as follows:

1. Section VII Technical Specifications, Item 6.1.3 is being modified to read:

   6.1.3 Vendor must include a listing of all technology courses offered in the proposed course library. For evaluation purposes, Vendor may provide a link to its proposed course library. Prior to contract execution, the awarded Vendor must provide to ITS a CD with its proposed course library. For each technology course included in the proposed course library, Vendor must provide, at a minimum, the following:

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: 4.3 How does a vendor find out their performance rating if it is based on the state of MS?

Response: **Item 4.3 reads that the "State deems performance of the Vendor on existing contracts and support after the sale to be of critical importance." First, if a Vendor does not have a current contract or a contract in the past with the State, we cannot evaluate performance based on existing contracts. If a Vendor has or had a contract with the State, we can use past performance as an evaluation tool. A Vendor who had performed poorly on a previous contract would have been notified during the contract that performance was unacceptable.**

Board Members - Rodney Pearson, Chairman • Lynn C Patrick, Vice-Chairman • D. Shane Loper • J. Keith Van Camp • Thomas A. Wicker
Legislative Advisors - Senator Sampson Jackson, II • Representative Gary V. Staples

Question 2: 4.8 The RFP states that the award will be made to one vendor. However, in 4.5 within the RFP it mentions listing out additional vendors. **Is this RFP intended for one vendor to provide online training?**

Response: **It is our intent to make a single award. Item 4.5 indicates that the State may have listed other Vendors in the RFP with whom the State currently has contracts and that we intend to honor the contract until the expiration period.**

Question 3: 6.1.3 In the pursuit of going green we would like to minimize our printing footprint if allowed, as an entire list of our courses would be 1,000+ pages. Would it be acceptable to provide a link out to all of our courses and descriptions?

Response: **The State revised 6.1.3. Please see revision on page one of this memorandum.**

Question 4: 6.11.5 Vendor must provide one price per curricula for one user to have access to each curriculum offered for one year (e.g., technical, end-user, professional/business development). This price must not require a specific and/or minimum number of users and must provide for access of the courses via the Internet. **Would you like pricing for each individual collection area that vendor has to offer, for one person?**

Response: **We are asking for three prices: one price allowing the user to have access to all curricula; one price allowing the user to have access to technical courseware; and one price allowing the user to have access to professional/business development courses.**

Question 5: 6.11.9 Vendor must include any discount options available (e.g., 1 to 100 user licenses cost per license, 101 to 200 user licenses cost per license, etc.). **Can vendor provide monthly discounts based on the number of end users licensed each month?**

Response: **The State requests that discounts be applied yearly, from the anniversary of contract execution. At the end of the year, the discount can be trued-up either in favor of the State or the Vendor.**

Question 6: 6.11.11 Additionally, Vendor must include a fully-loaded hourly change order rate for possible use in the future. This hourly rate would be utilized if a need arises for the proposed solution to interface with another software application(s) utilized by the State. **Can you please clarify exactly what this entails?**

Response: **Vendor should provide a fully-loaded hourly rate for any change orders that may occur. A fully-loaded hourly rate includes any per diem and/or travel expenses (such as hotels and/or meals) should vendor be required to be on-site. This rate would be used if the State found it necessary to interface the online courseware with another software application used by the State.**

Question 7: SECTION VIII- **Can you please clarify what you mean by extension and deliverables?**

Response: **The verbiage in that paragraph is part of the boilerplate language, applied to multiple and varied RFPs issued by the State. Extension applies to carrying out a quantity of items at a unit price. For example, five telephones at $100.00 each would have an extension of $500.00. Deliverables include items or services expected by the State, which could include documents, software implementation, etc.**

Question 8: What is the intended audience size for the RFP?

Response: **The State does not guarantee a number of users. During FY13, the State purchased 560 seats for users of our present online courseware. This number may increase or decrease for various reasons. The online courseware is made available to State agencies, universities, community colleges, and local government entities.**

RFP responses are due August 29, 2013, 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 Paula Conn at 601-432-8046 or via email at Paula.Conn@its.ms.gov.

cc: ITS Project File Number 40357