



## ADDENDUM NO. 2

Date: November 22, 2017

Bid Date: November 30, 2017  
at 3:00 P.M. (Local Time)

Bid Name: IT Consulting Services

Bid No.: CMGR-180039-MS

NOTE: This Addendum has been issued only to the holders of record of the specifications and to the attendees of the pre-bid conference held on November 14, 2017.

The original Specifications remain in full force and effect except as revised by the following changes which shall take precedence over anything to the contrary:

Please find attached:

- a) Copy of the black-out period information (Financial Procedures Manual Section 41-423 Prohibition of lobbying in procurement matters) distributed during pre-bid meeting.

The following are answers/clarifications to questions received since the pre-bid meeting:

1. Question: Would the City please elaborate on any additional business drivers for this project beyond those specified in the RFP?  
Answer: The City is moving towards the vision of being the “New American City” through a strong technological baseline (please refer to Addendum 1).
2. Question: Would the City please confirm that all functional areas currently serviced by the CGI Advantage applications are to be the focus of this project? Or, are there new or different functional areas the selected consultant should plan to review?  
Answer: CGI Advantage serves all the City’s functional areas by interacting with the City’s additional systems and tools. Depending on proposers’ approach to this RFP response, the outcome may require different functional area review. The City is looking for selected consultant’s expertise to achieve the overall outcome of this RFP.
3. Question: Would the City please elaborate on the intent of the selected firm to “build a modern, strategic, and comprehensive technology design” and how this aligns with the Scope of Work? Does the City desire a City-wide technology strategy be developed, or is this in the context of just the ERP replacement initiative?  
Answer: The City is looking for strategic recommendations for establishing a strong technology framework to support the City’s vision for the next 20-30 years by assessing the “as-is” technological environment (please refer to Addendum 1).

4. Question: Would the City please elaborate on the intent of the selected firm to “secure data across the City and reduce the risk of cyber-attacks: and how this aligns with the Scope of Work? Does the City desire a City-wide effort in this area, or is this in the context of just the ERP replacement initiative?

Answer: The City is looking for data-security strategic recommendations for establishing a strong technology baseline to support the City’s vision for the next 20-30 years by assessing the “as-is” technological environment (please refer to Addendum 1). The City’s expectation of the awarded vendor is to evaluate the City’s “as-is” environment.
5. Question: Would the City please elaborate on the desired services in Section C.b? Does the City desire the selected consultant develop system requirements for an RFP, develop an RFP, assist with vendor selection, etc.?

Answer: The City expects the selected IT Consultant firm to be a part of the bid evaluation review team for the ERP Product and Service Implementer RFP. This does not include developing the functional system requirements and developing the RFP, however, the “as-is” environment assessment findings will be included in the RFP(s).
6. Question: Does the city desire contract negotiation assistance with the preferred vendor as part of this project?

Answer: The City expects the selected IT Consultant firm to be a part of the bid evaluation review team for the ERP Product and Service Implementer RFP.
7. Question: It is noted that the selected consultant should develop technical process design documents; does the City desire business process diagrams for all City department processes?

Answer: The City expects the IT Consultant to collaborate with the functional leads to provide way/means of integrating the business processes with the technical processes.
8. Question: For the purpose of providing cost estimates to provide implementation project management services, does the City have a preferred level of effort or implementation timeline estimate that all proposers should use to consistently base their estimates? Or, would an hourly rate be acceptable?

Answer: We are looking for the best pricing on the proposals. We are leaning towards time and materials but we would definitely like to know the supplement tables if you have them showing staff and hourly rates (please refer to Addendum 1).
9. Question: Does the City desire status reports as part of the system selection phase? If so, at what frequency (e.g., bi-weekly)?

Answer: Depending on the proposers’ approach provided in the written response to this RFP (please refer to Addendum 1, Evaluation Criteria) for consideration.
10. Question: Does the City desire any presentations be made by the selected consultant as part of the system selection phase? If so, how many and to what audiences?

Answer: Depending on the proposers’ approach provided in the written response to this RFP (please refer to Addendum 1, Evaluation Criteria) for consideration.

11. Question: Does the City have any target milestone dates for the consultant engagement? For example, date the ERP RFP is issued, date of implementation kickoff, etc.?  
Answer: Yes. The City's estimated timeline is to begin implementation before January 2019 (please refer to Addendum 1).
12. Question: Does the City have a budget for this project? If so, what is it?  
Answer: The budget for the entire ERP project is \$7 million (please refer to Addendum 1).
13. Question: We are aware that the City released an RFP for ERP Consulting Services in September of 2016 and that it was awarded. Was the scope of that RFP completed and how does it differ from the City's current RFP? In addition, is the firm that was awarded the previous RFP eligible to participate in this RFP process?  
Answer: The September 2016 was a functional RFP whereas this is an IT Consultant RFP. Yes, the firm that was awarded the previous RFP is eligible to participate in this RFP process.
14. Question: On Page 2 of the RFP document, under "C. Proposal Submission", it states that "proposal must be received by November 30, 2017 at 3:00 p.m. local time at which all proposals will be publicly opened." Can you please describe the specific information of each proposal that will be disclosed at this public opening?  
Answer: Because there will be evaluations that include more than just price, we will only make available which vendors have submitted bids and verify that all required documents are attached and signed. We will not be disclosing price or other bid details at this time.
15. Question: Is a separate, sealed price proposal required, or should all proposal contents be included in one document? If separate documents, does it need to be sent in a separate envelope?  
Answer: It can all be included in one document; a separate envelope is not needed.
16. Question: If there is to be a separate, sealed price proposal, does the City also require one (1) original and six (6) hard copies, and one (1) electronic copy of the price proposal as well?  
Answer: All information can all be included in one document, but we do still need 1 original, 6 hard copies, and 1 electronic version.
17. Question: As specified on page 6, "Living Wage" is not a covered service under this contract – therefore, do vendors need to fill out Exhibit B?  
Answer: Submit the form, but write N/A, if it is not needed.
18. Question: On page 7, "T. Local Preference" specified "If Local Preference is requested by the proposer, the attached Exhibit A must be submitted with the proposal." If a vendor is not requesting Local Preference, do we need to submit Exhibit A?  
Answer: Submit the form, but write N/A, if it is not needed.
19. Question: On page 9 under "B. Minimum Requirements", point "f." states that "Consulting firm shall provide for their own use laptops, cell phones and all applicable licenses." Can you please specify what "applicable licenses" are required for the delivery of services under this contract?  
Answer: The applicable licenses depend on the proposers' approach provided in the written response to this RFP (please refer to Addendum 1, Evaluation Criteria).

20. Question: On page 9 under “B. Minimum requirements”, point “i.” states that “Consultant Firm onsite presence is required”. Does this mean that 100% of all work performed under this contract must be performed on site at City offices?  
Answer: Yes, the City prefers the consultant to be on-site, however, the City is open to any recommendations.
21. Question: On page 11 it states that “A copy of your Business tax receipt and Zoning Compliance Permit should be submitted with the proposal if a local preference is requested. If we are not requesting Local Preference, do we still need to provide these documents/information?  
Answer: No.
22. Question: On page 11 under “B. Qualification/Statement of Qualifications”, it requests a description of “financial stability.” Aside from a description confirming such via a statement, are proposers to include specific financial documentation in our proposals, or only if requested upon award?  
Answer: Please provide your most recent financial statement to meet this requirement.
23. Question: Should all of the proposal content mentioned on page 11 under “A. Format and Contents of proposal” be included in one document, or would the City like proposers to break each section into separate documents?  
Answer: Please refer to format provided in Addendum 1.
24. Question: Does the “Attest” signature on page 28 of the RFP document need to be notarized?  
Answer: No.
25. Question: According to Addendum 1, proposers are to remove page 30 of the original RFP document and replace it with Evaluation Criteria Format included in Addendum 1. Is this the specific format and template we are to use for our entire response or may we include additional content as described in the original RFP in section III-Proposal Format? If we are allowed to respond with additional content, please advise if we must also respond by filling out the boxes within the new Exhibit E as well.  
Answer: If you think the content is valuable for evaluation and does not fit within the box, please provide an attached document with correct reference. Otherwise, the City prefers to consolidate the information in the proposal format.
26. Question: Exhibit E-Pricing seems to ask for fixed pricing by project deliverable. During the Pre-Proposal Conference, it seemed as though the City would accept Time and Material pricing. Please provide guidance? In either scenario, is the City looking for firm estimates for each deliverable in this response?  
Answer: We are looking for firm prices that include total cost including details for each component.
27. Question: Several selections of the response documents do not indicate the need to be notarized. Can the City please confirm which response documents need notarization?  
Answer: No documents require notarization.

28. Question: It is clear that no subcontracting is allowed. Are proposers able to use Independent Contractors working for our company if they are the best resource for the project?  
Answer: No.
29. Question: The City of Gainesville has identified the ERP team including functional leads. Is the ERP team who the winning proposer will be interacting with to develop the Technical Feasibility Study or will it be necessary to also interact with functional leads at each of the Cities municipal services?  
Answer: The awarded IT Consultant Firm is expected to interact with City's internal stakeholders to achieve the expected outcomes.
30. Question: It is understood the GRU is in scope and will be part of the feasibility Study. Is GRU included on the ERP team and are they also part of the evaluation team?  
Answer: GRU is the City's IT partner supporting IT operations. GRU is a passive participant for the City's ERP initiative. They are not a part of the ERP functional team or evaluation team.
31. Question: Is it the City's intention to have the winning firm engaged full time for the entire ERP implementation?  
Answer: Yes, we want the IT Consultant firm representation throughout the entire ERP initiative; however, the City is open to hear your recommendations about successful engagement model with the same expertise in projects of this nature.
32. Question: Can the City confirm its daily billable work hours (7 billable hours per day, 8 billable hours per day, etc.) and overall hours each day (9am – 5 pm, 8am-4pm, etc.)  
Answer: Monday-Friday 8am-5pm
33. Question: Can the City confirm all City Holidays for the calendar year?  
Answer: These are the City Holidays for FY2018, which spans a calendar year.  
  
Veterans' Day Friday, November 10, 2017(observance date)  
Thanksgiving Day Thursday, November 23, 2017  
Day after Thanksgiving Friday, November 24, 2017  
Christmas Day Monday, December 25, 2017  
Additional Holiday Tuesday, December 26, 2017  
New Year's Day Monday, January 1, 2018  
Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Birthday Monday, January 15, 2018  
Memorial Day Monday, May 28, 2018  
Independence Day Wednesday, July 4, 2018  
Labor Day Monday, September 3, 2018
34. Question: Page 12 of Addendum 1 asks if "Key staff includes the Enterprise Solution Architect and IT Technical experts". However, these specific roles/personnel are not mentioned in the RFP. Does the City expect us to provide two specific individuals, one being an Enterprise Solution Architect and the other an IT Technical expert?  
Answer: Not necessarily. The City is looking for an IT Consulting Firm to implement the services outlined in this RFP; we do ask that you provide your best team approach for proposal.

35. Question: When was the last Cyber/Information Security Assessment/Audit that was performed on the City, and who performed it?

Answer: Please refer to Addendum 1.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: Each Proposer shall acknowledge receipt of this Addendum No. 2 by his or her signature below, **and a copy of this Addendum to be returned with proposal.**

CERTIFICATION BY PROPOSER

The undersigned acknowledges receipt of this Addendum No. 2 and the Proposal submitted is in accordance with information, instructions, and stipulations set forth herein.

PROPOSER: \_\_\_\_\_

BY: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

CITY OF \_\_\_\_\_ FINANCIAL SERVICES  
GAINESVILLE PROCEDURES MANUAL

**41-423      Prohibition of lobbying in procurement matters**

Except as expressly set forth in Resolution 060732, Section 10, during the black out period as defined herein no person may lobby, on behalf of a competing party in a particular procurement process, City Officials or employees except the purchasing division, the purchasing designated staff contact. Violation of this provision shall result in disqualification of the party on whose behalf the lobbying occurred.

Black out period means the period between the issue date which allows for immediate submittals to the City of Gainesville Purchasing Department for an invitation for bid or the request for proposal, or qualifications, or information, or the invitation to negotiate, as applicable, and the time the City Officials and Employee awards the contract.

Lobbying means when any natural person for compensation, seeks to influence the governmental decision making, to encourage the passage, defeat, or modification of any proposal, recommendation or decision by City Officials and Employees, except as authorized by procurement documents.