

ADDENDUM NO. 2

Barnstable County Purchasing Division
PO Box 427
Barnstable, MA 02630

DATE ISSUED: May 16, 2012
TO: All Bidders of Record
SUBJ: The County of Barnstable, on behalf of the Cape Cod Commission and its member towns and Nantucket is seeking proposals for Permit, License and Inspection Software and Related Services.

ADDENDUM NO. 2

The following are questions submitted by a potential bidder and the responses to the questions:

1. There is reference on pg. 6 of the main RFP under Project Goals - "The work involved in the time frame requested with the desired scope is delivering the three (3) pilots and a limited number of other communities with the exact same configuration as the pilots except for rates by December 31, 2012."

For the purposes of determining the extent of the configuration effort involved:

- a. Has the County decided which workflows (permit, compliance or licensing) they intend to have configured in the 3 pilots?

Response: Yes, as identified in the business requirements spreadsheet, The County is looking to implement items identified as Critical and as many items identified as High, Medium and Low as possible. The emphasis is on the Critical items.

- b. Does the County have a sense as to how similar the required forms and workflow are for these initial three pilot sites? i.e. should the assumption be made that all pilots sites will have distinct and unique business processes resulting in 3 different workflows with different forms?

Response: Yes, having variations for each community should be the worst case assumption; however, since we are governed by Massachusetts law, the differences are not dramatic.

- c. To what extent will the County be looking to standardize across towns or communities on the forms & workflows for permits, licensing and inspections?

Response: Where there are state forms and minor variations in non-state forms, The County will attempt to promote standardization to reduce cost and time to implement, however, the towns are free to deviate from the standard.

- d. Can the County please quantify what is meant by “a limited number of other communities with the exact same configuration”

Response: Currently there are a total of 5 communities that would like to deliver some level of functionality for the first implementation. To the extent possible we would like to copy some functionality from the 3 pilots to accommodate the 2 additional towns. In addition, a goal of having a solution that is configurable by The County should allow for contributions by The County in configuring the additional communities. Many communities are initially filling gaps in their existing process while others are looking to implement the full solution.

- e. With the exception of “rates”, does the County expect a full end-to-end system including public portal, full reports development, data conversion, training and interfaces to 3rd party systems to be completed by Dec. 31, 2012?

Response: Yes, based on those items listed as Critical and as many High, Medium and Low priority items as possible. To the extent possible, The County would like to base its development on using best practice templates or configurations previously developed by the vendor. The County has experience interfacing with certain common Financial Management, Assessing and GIS systems and is negotiating interfaces with critical state databases in parallel with the RFP process to prepare for the implementation.

- f. Does the Commission have any flexibility around the implementation deadline of Dec. 31, 2012?

Response: The state grant funding this project requires a 12/31/2012 implementation. Having a vendor that can rapidly implement solutions is key to deploying to the rest of the region after the pilot and for potentially deploying to other communities throughout the state. The Commission has been advised by the state that, if necessary, the state would consider a request for a two week extension.

2. What is the anticipated number of system users that need to be licensed for:

- a. The initial 3 pilot sites

Response: Subject to change, the initial view is that 65 named users would be implemented for the pilot related to the Critical processes. This may increase depending on the pricing and scope of functionality that can be delivered by the vendor. During the development phase a smaller number of licenses will be needed prior to implementation.

- b. The total of the 15 towns within Barnstable County

Response: Subject to change and not including users that will use a potential Server Order, Work Order and Asset Management solution, the region estimates 255 named users could eventually use the system. This may increase depending on the pricing and scope of functionality that can be delivered by the vendor and will increase as more functionality is deployed.

3. Prior to committing to the submission of a response, this potential bidder would like to determine whether the Cape Cod Commission has reasonable budget expectations for the work being described. Can the County identify the amount of funds or range of funds that are intended to be set aside for:

a. The initial 3 pilot implementation

Response: The region will be using a \$500,000 state grant along with additional Cape Cod Commission regionalization funding to be determined to put in place the infrastructure and provide for services to implement the solution. The infrastructure is to include interface to common systems used in the region and throughout the state. In addition, the funding will include converting from the limited number of systems utilized by the pilots. Other infrastructure funding to include, but is not limited to, vendor project management, forms analysis, configuration, training and implementation. User license fees will be paid by the individual municipalities based on their need and depending on the remaining grant funding. The County, in parallel with the RFP process, continues to gather forms, rules, rates as well as developing “to be” process flows and interface information to be ready once a vendor is selected.

b. The expansion to all 15 or 16 towns in Barnstable and Nantucket County.

Response: To be determined based on the RFP pricing.

4. There is a reference on Pg. 9 to the County providing written responses to questions in the form of an Addendum. The schedule identified on Pg. 19 identifies the questions deadline as May 29 and that answers will be posted by June 6.

- a. Will the County consider either answering questions as they are submitted or extend the amount of time to 3 weeks between all questions being answered and the proposal due date? The purpose of this questions is to help guide bidder decisions about whether to attend the bidders conference and/or answer the RFP. If bidders are waiting for answers until June 6 to determine whether to bid, and the requirement is to courier the response on June 13 to meet the June 14 submission deadline, there would be less than 5 business days left to prepare a proposal once all questions are answered)

Response: Bidder’s questions will be answered as quickly as possible throughout the RFP process.

5. Under Section 4. Conversion Plan on pg. 13 of the main RFP there is a statement that reads: *“in addition to converting from other systems describe the process of upgrading to the latest software release”*.

- BMSI (1 total– no pilot sites)
- GeoTMS (7 total, 3 from potential pilots sites)
- Hawkeye (1 total – a potential pilot but will not convert data from this system – the potential pilot will continue to use this system for at least a two year period)
- Municipality (1 total – no pilot sites)
- Munis (1total- no pilot sites)
- Home Grown Microsoft Access Database Solutions (3 total, 1 pilot site)
- Facilitating conversion from Paper System (1 total, no pilot sites)

- a. Which of these systems listed are currently in use across Barnstable and Nantucket County and in what quantity?

Response: See above, there are also occurrences of spreadsheets and other solutions for some functions, however, the main applications are listed above.

- b. Will data need to be migrated to the newly installed application for all identified existing systems?

Response: Yes, data for only the pilot sites will be migrated for the first phase of the project.

- c. While a data conversion plan and process and timeframes can be proposed, there is currently not enough information contained in the RFP to accurately determine the effort involved or the subsequent fixed price of a data conversion plan. A preliminary analysis or high level review would be required to determine the extent of the work and costs involved. As the risks can be high and the ranges wide with data conversion, will the Commission consider permitting an exception to the submission of fixed prices for this activity?

Response: If a bidder is unfamiliar with and has not previously converted from these vendor packages, please provide a data conversion range based on converting from similar systems. For evaluation purposes, The County will use the high end of the range when comparing bidder responses.

- d. Can the County please confirm what the Commission's expectations are for the completion of data migration for:

- i. The initial 3 pilots

Response: The 5 potential pilot sites use 2 major software platforms. The pilot sites use either GeoTMS or Microsoft Access as the main system solution with some instances of Excel, paper systems, etc. If the bidder is GeoTMS, we would like a data migration plan to upgrade their existing system to the latest version of their software and for converting from Microsoft Access databases. If the bidder is other than GeoTMS, we would like the bidder to price and describe the conversion plan from GeoTMS and Microsoft Access databases.

- ii. All 15 or 16 towns in Barnstable and Nantucket County

Response: The County would like to receive information on whether the bidder has familiarity with, and has previously converted from the systems listed. In addition, The County would like information on the Bidders conversion plan and pricing.

Elaine Davis
Chief Procurement Officer

