

Description

Issuing Procurement Unit Utah Division of Purchasing & General Services
Conducting Procurement Unit Utah Division of Purchasing & General Services

Citizen Engagement Platform

SOLICITATION # KM21-47

This Request for Proposals ("RFP"), having been determined to be the appropriate procurement method to provide the best value to the Conducting Procurement Unit, is designed to provide interested Offerors with sufficient basic information to submit proposals. This Request for Proposals ("RFP") is issued in accordance with the Utah Procurement Code and applicable administrative rules of the Utah Administrative Code. If any provision of this RFP conflicts with the Utah Procurement Code or Utah Administrative Code, then the Utah Procurement Code or Utah Administrative Code will take precedence.

Purpose of this Solicitation

The purpose of this RFP is for the State of Utah in conjunction with NASPO ValuePoint to conduct a solicitation and implement NASPO ValuePoint Master Agreements with vendor(s) to provide versatile online Citizen Engagement Platforms. While this RFP is not for a specific solution, States have independently researched and identified a need for online platforms where citizens can access government applications and services available on the web, mobile, and screen-less devices.

The State is looking for a variety of solutions to make available to Participating States with options and flexibility to use these services for their differing customer bases, technology platforms, and revenue models. The awarded Citizen Engagement Platforms are to be of interest to public entities at all levels of government.

This RFP and resulting contract award(s) is a solutions-based solicitation; meaning the State of Utah is seeking equipment, products, and/or services that meet the requirements of this RFP and that are commonly desired or are required by law or industry standards. Offerors may include related equipment, accessories, and services to the extent that these solutions are complementary to the equipment, products, and/or services identified in this RFP.

Given the cooperative nature of this RFP, it is expected that offerors shall propose a wide array of solutions, equipment, products, and/or services at lower prices and with better value than what they would ordinarily offer to the public or to a single government entity.

Background of the Conducting Procurement Unit

NASPO ValuePoint a division of the National Association of State Procurement Officials ("NASPO"), a 501(c)(3) limited liability company dedicated to strengthening the procurement community through education, research, and communication. NASPO is made up of the directors of the central purchasing offices in each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia and the territories of the United States. NASPO ValuePoint facilitates administration of the NASPO cooperative group contracting consortium of state chief procurement officials for the benefit of state departments, institutions, agencies, and political subdivisions and other eligible entities (i.e., colleges, school districts, counties, cities, some nonprofit organizations, etc.) for all states, the District of Columbia, and territories of the United States. For more information consult the following websites: www.naspovaluepoint.org and www.naspo.org.

State agencies and political subdivisions across the nation administer numerous websites and online applications. As this use is only going to increase this RFP would establish a new NASPO ValuePoint portfolio for Citizen Engagement Platforms with the Categories available as listed below.

Award Categories

This RFP includes the following Categories for which Offerors may submit a proposal to qualify for one or multiple Categories -

1. **Platform Management:** A software solution that will offer a variety of applications to help customers (i.e., public entities) manage systems across platforms. Platform management will answer questions and contain solutions that remember, remind, and respond to users.
2. **Master Data Management:** A software solution that will provide the means to associate various records pertaining to an individual. Includes technology to ensure uniformity and accuracy of master data assets and coordination of data across all platforms. Allows a public entity to create and manage a central, persistent system of record or index of record for master data. Solution supports ongoing master data stewardship and governance requirements through workflow-based monitoring and corrective-action techniques.

3. **Chatbots and Customer Service:** A software solution that provides Robotic Process Automation (RPA) to assist government agencies by responding to frequently asked questions quickly to complete a transaction or find information.
4. **Customer Engagement:** A software solution that provides a centralized platform to manage multiple interactions with customers. Provides a platform for studying customer behavior through all channels and touchpoints of interaction such as phone, in-person, or online.
5. **Social Listening:** A software solution that allows entities to view the “voice of the customer” across all input channels such as through email, web forms, social media, and inbound calls. Solution utilizes a dashboard to effectively identify issues, satisfaction, and needs.

An individual proposal must be submitted for each Category Offeror is seeking an award in.

Additional Value Add Items / Services may be proposed by an Offeror within an Award Category it is seeking an award in. Such value add items / services are to be included within Offeror's proposal within its Attachment D(3) - Value Added (VA) Items submission. Such value added solutions may include, but are not limited to, solutions as - identity management, referrals engine, user behavior analytics, digital wallets, web hosting, Website & web app development, eCommerce services and payment processing, etc.

Expectations for Deliverables by the Conducting Procurement Unit

A successful Offeror under this RFP is able to minimally demonstrate through its proposed Level of Expertise, Risk Assessment, Value Add, Service Plan, and Real World Use Plan the following for each Category they are seeking an award in -

1. Provides onboarding and implementation services.
2. Demonstrated experience implementing the proposed solution.
3. Demonstrated experience integrating solution into existing public entity systems..
4. Demonstrated capacity to manage customer engagement platforms for large entities experiencing high website traffic.
5. Is able to successfully manage multiple projects simultaneously.
6. Provide an interactive demonstration of services offered.
7. Provides a live website for the State's Sourcing Team (Evaluation Team) to review a sample of the proposed solution in practice.
8. Demonstrated full support services available to citizens / users at any time, including nights and weekends. Continuous support requested, with minimal downtime.
9. Demonstrated capacity to perform work.
10. Demonstrated ability to travel pursuant to Participating State needs.
11. Demonstrated experience and protocol for handling sensitive data.
12. It is the original software publisher for the proposed solution. *Proposals will NOT be accepted from software resellers or system implementers / integrators who are not the actual publisher for the software solution being proposed.*

If at any time during the evaluation process or resulting contract term it is determined that Offeror does not meet any one of the Expectations or Requirements outlined within this RFP, the State may reject an Offeror's proposal /awarded contract.

Value Add Solutions That Involve Third-Party Software Solutions

Offeror must be an original software publisher of the solution offered within the Category it is seeking an award in. An Offeror may nonetheless submit value added solutions that involve third-party software solutions. An Offeror that chooses to offer third-party software solutions as part of their value-added offerings must submit copies of all third-party end user licensing agreements (distributed with such software) as supplemental documents with its proposal. These documents are to be uploaded as part of its responses to Question 9.5 within the Questions section regarding exceptions to the Terms and Conditions.

The supplemental documents will be included as exhibits in the awarded subsequent Master Agreement for the Offeror, but it will be at the discretion of each Participating State or Participating Entity to review, negotiate and/or utilize these documents within their Participating Addendum. Purchasing Entities that acquire third-party software solutions shall be subject to the end user licensing agreements distributed with such software, unless otherwise stated in a Participating Addendum or as negotiated between the Purchasing Entity and third-party software provider.

Project Goals for the Conducting Procurement Unit

The Goals for this solicitation include -

1. Provide multiple options to Participating States for Customer Engagement Platforms that meet the Expectations and Requirements outlined in this RFP.
2. Allowing Offerors the flexibility within the defined Categories to demonstrate they are the industry expert for the Categories they are seeking an award in, through provided metrics.
3. Allowing Offerors the flexibility to propose value added items/solutions/services related to the Categories they are seeking an award in.

Closing Date and Time

The closing date and time for this sourcing event is provided below in the **Anticipated Schedule**. If your time zone is different from that shown, your profile may be set to a different time zone. Please see the attachment titled "Changing Your Time Zone" in the Buyer Attachments section for directions on how to update your profile. It is your responsibility to make sure you submit your response by the date and time indicated above.

Contract Award

It is anticipated that this RFP will result in multiple contract awards. The methodology or formula that will be used to determine the number of contract awards is all those vendors who meet all mandatory minimum requirements, required score thresholds and achieve at least 75% of the total points available qualify for an award, pending successful Terms and Conditions (T&Cs) negotiations.

Contract negotiations for a master agreements (contracts) will only begin with those vendors meeting this award threshold after they have provided a verified request from an entity eligible to use the Master Agreement indicating the entity's intent and need to use the resulting Master Agreement.

Additional Agreement with NASPO - Upon request by NASPO ValuePoint, awarded Contractor shall enter into a direct contractual relationship with NASPO ValuePoint related to Reseller's obligations to NASPO ValuePoint under the terms of the Master Agreement, the terms of which shall be the same or similar (and not less favorable) than the terms set forth in the Master Agreement.

The State of Utah Division of Purchasing does not guarantee any purchase amount under an awarded contract. Estimated quantities are for solicitation purposes only and are not to be construed as a guarantee.

Future Procurements

The State of Utah reserves the right and may reopen this solicitation, or create a new solicitation if it determines there may be more competition for the procurement item than when the original solicitation was posted.

Length of the Contract

The contract resulting from this RFP will be for FIVE (5) years with 2 one-year renewal options available, or the time identified by the awarded vendors during the clarification phase.

Anticipated Schedule

The following is the anticipated schedule for this procurement. The Division reserves the right to alter these dates. All deadlines are prevailing (Daylight or Standard) Mountain Time.

ACTIVITY	DATE
RFP Issued	April 1, 2021
Offeror Webinar Google Meeting (https://meet.google.com/ntp-viio-uvvm)	April 5, 2021 at 1:00pm MDT
This webinar will be recorded, with the recording published as an amendment to the RFP at the conclusion of the webinar.	
Deadline for Questions during the Question and Answer Period	April 27, 2021 at 1:00pm MDT
RFP Offeror Submittals Due Date	May 17, 2021 at 1:00pm MDT
Identification of Potential Awarded Offeror	June 11, 2021 (tentative)
Clarification Kick-Off Meeting (remote)	June 11, 2021 (tentative)
Signing of Contract	As Needed - Refer to Contract Award Section for details impacting timeline
Anticipated Authorization to Proceed	As Needed - Refer to Contract Award Section for

details impacting timeline

It is the sole responsibility of the Offerors to examine, with appropriate care and diligence prior to submitting its response to the RFP, the RFP and all conditions which may in any way affect its response or performance under the Contract (if awarded).

Participating State / Entity Use

In addition to the Lead State (State of Utah) conducting this solicitation, the other States that have requested to be named in this RFP as potential users of the resulting Master Agreement are listed in Attachment I. Other entities may become Participating Entities after award of the Master Agreement. Some States may have included special or unique Terms and Conditions for their state that will govern their state Participating Addendum in Attachment I. These Terms and Conditions are being provided as a courtesy to proposers to indicate which additional Terms and Conditions may be incorporated into that state Participating Addendum after award of the Master Agreement. Each State reserves the right to negotiate additional Terms and Conditions in its Participating Addendums.

The Lead State will not address questions or concerns or negotiate other States' terms and conditions. The Participating States must negotiate these Terms and Conditions directly with the supplier.

Attachment I also includes estimated annual spend volume from States that have indicated an interest in participating (some states did not provide an estimate). No minimum or maximum level of sales volume is guaranteed or implied.

Each Participating Entity has the option to select one or more award Categories or services from the resulting Master Agreement(s) during the execution of the Participating Addendum process.

Each Participating Entity has the option to negotiate an expanded product line within the product category offering and within the scope of this RFP during the Participating Addendum process.

Canadian Participation: Subject to the approval of the Contractor, any Canadian provincial government or provincially funded entity in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Northwest Territories, Nunavut, Yukon, and Newfoundland and Labrador, including municipalities, universities, community colleges, school boards, health authorities, housing authorities, agencies, boards, commissions, and crown corporations, may be eligible to use Contractor's Master Agreement.

The resulting Master Agreement will be awarded with the understanding and agreement that it is for the sole convenience of the Participating Entities. The Participating Entities reserve the right to obtain like goods or services from other sources when necessary.

This RFP is designed to provide interested offerors with sufficient basic information to submit proposals meeting minimum requirements, but is not intended to limit a proposal's content or exclude any relevant or essential data. Proposals must be concise and as short as possible to allow for efficient evaluation. Blanket marketing material and unnecessary elaborate brochures or representations beyond what is sufficient to present a complete and effective proposal are not acceptable.

Prerequisites

★ Required to Enter Bid

1 ★ Instructions To Vendor :

Vendors must complete and upload Attachments B, C, and D.

Certification

I certify that I have read and agree to this prerequisite.

Vendor Must Also Upload a File:

No

Prerequisite Content:

The objective criteria, or mandatory minimum requirements, that will be used to evaluate this solicitation are the completion of Attachments B, C, and D (including D1, D2, D3, D4, and D5).

Attachments C and D (including D1, D2, D3, D4 and D5) must be completed for each Category a vendor is seeking an award in.

Attachments B, C, D, D.4, and D.5 can be found in the Buyer Attachment section of this solicitation.

Vendors must complete the forms and then upload their responses to Questions Groups 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 as appropriate, and depending on the Award Categories Offeror is seeking an award in.

2 ★ **Instructions To Vendor :**

Vendors must complete and upload Attachments C, D (includes D1, D2, and D3), D.4, and D.5.

Certification

I certify that I have read and agree to this prerequisite.

Vendor Must Also Upload a File:

No

Prerequisite Content:

To determine which proposal provides the best value to the State, the evaluation committee will evaluate each responsive and responsible proposal that has not been disqualified or rejected using the subjective criteria listed in this prerequisites section.

The subjective criteria are located in -

- Attachment D – Project Capability in attachment D1, D2, and D3,
- Attachment D.4 - Service Plan,
- Attachment D.5 - Real World Use Plan, and
- Attachment C - Cost Proposal Form.

Vendors must review and complete Attachment C and D (including D4) as described in the provided templates.

3 ★ **Instructions To Vendor :**

All proposals in response to this RFP will be evaluated in a manner consistent with the Utah Procurement Code, Administrative Rules, policies and the evaluation criteria in this RFP. Offerors bear sole responsibility for the items included or not included within the proposal submitted by the Offeror. Each area of the evaluation criteria must be addressed in detail in the proposal.

Certification

I certify that I have read and agree to the terms above.

Vendor Must Also Upload a File:

No

Prerequisite Content:

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

Stage 1: Initial Review

In the initial phase of the evaluation process, the conducting procurement unit will review all proposals timely received. Non-responsive proposals not conforming to RFP requirements or unable to meet the mandatory minimum requirements will be eliminated from further consideration.

Objective Criteria

Scoring Methodology

Completed Attachment B - Key Personnel Form	Pass / Fail
Completed Attachment C - Price Proposal Form	Pass / Fail
Completed Attachment D - Project Capability (including the D.4 - Service Plan and D.5 - Real World Use Plan)	Pass / Fail
Addresses each of the Expectations outlined in the solicitation	Pass / Fail
Offeror is the original software publisher for its proposed solution. Proposals will not be accepted from software resellers	Pass / Fail
Proposal is submitted according to the requirements of the published RFP	Pass / Fail
Submission submitted in SciQuest on time (Vendor clicked submit and uploaded and answered all necessary documents and questions)	Pass / Fail

Stage 2: Technical Proposal Evaluation

Solicitation responses that have received a passing score in each of the objective scoring criteria will then be evaluated by an evaluation committee appointed by the conducting procurement unit against the proposal evaluation criteria noted in this solicitation. Proposals will be evaluated against the evaluation criteria as follows:

<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Scoring Methodology</u>	<u>Total Possible Points</u>
Attachment D1 - Level of Expertise Plan (LE)	1, 5, or 10	1,000 points
Attachment D2 - Risk Assessment Plan (RA)	1, 5, or 10	250 points
Attachment D3 - Value Added Plan (VA)	1, 5, or 10	250 points
Attachment D4 - Service Plan	1, 5, or 10	750 points
Attachment D.5 - Ease of Use Functionality	1, 5, or 10	750 points
Attachment D.5 - Real World Examples	1, 5, or 10	500 points
Attachment D.5 - Data Privacy Controls	1, 5, or 10	500 points
Attachment C - Cost Proposal Form	1, 5, or 10	1,750 points
Total Technical Score		5,750 points

The evaluation team will score the above criteria using the scoring methodology outlined within the Attachment H - Interactive Scorecard. Vendor proposals will be scored individually per Category they submit a proposal for.

The evaluation committee, for this RFP, will tally the final scores for criteria other than cost to arrive at a consensus score by the following method: an average of the individual scores.

Only those Offerors still remaining in the evaluation and that achieve a minimum score threshold of 75% of the total points available from Stage 2 for the Category they are seeking an award in will qualify for an award determination in that Category. Offerors with a score of less than the minimum required technical points for the given Category will be deemed non-responsive and ineligible for further consideration for that Category.

Refer to the provided Attachment H - Interactive Scorecard for an illustration for how this scoring methodology will be applied against the points available for each Category.

4 ★ **Instructions To Vendor :**

Offerors may request that part of its proposal be protected by submitting a Claim of Business Confidentiality Form. See the Buyers Attachment section.

Certification

I certify that I have read and agree to the terms above.

Vendor Must Also Upload a File:

No

Prerequisite Content:

Pricing may not be classified as confidential or protected and will be considered public information.

Process for Requesting Non-Disclosure: To protect information under a Claim of Business Confidentiality, an Offeror must complete the Claim of Business Confidentiality form, at the time the proposal is submitted, with the following information:

- Include a concise statement of reasons supporting the claim of business confidentiality (Subsection 63G-2-309(1)).
- Submit an electronic “redacted” (excluding protected information) copy of the proposal. Copy must clearly be marked “Redacted Version.”

The Claim of Business Confidentiality form is attached to this solicitation as Attachment G - Claim of Business Confidentiality. An entire proposal cannot be identified as “**PROTECTED**”, “**CONFIDENTIAL**” or “**PROPRIETARY**”.

Redacted Copy: If an Offeror submits a proposal that contains information claimed to be confidential or protected, the Offeror **MUST** submit two separate proposals: one redacted version for public release, with all protected business confidential information either blacked-out or removed, clearly marked as "Redacted Version"; and one non-redacted version for evaluation purposes clearly marked as "Protected Business Confidential."

All materials submitted become the property of the State of Utah. Materials may be evaluated by anyone designated by the State as part of the evaluation committee. Materials submitted may be returned only at the State's option.

5 ★ **Instructions To Vendor :**

Offeror may take exception and/or propose additional language to the Standard Terms and Conditions that have been attached to this RFP, only as provided herein.

Certification

I certify that I have read and agree to the terms above.

Vendor Must Also Upload a File:

No

Prerequisite Content:

Any contract resulting from this RFP will include, but not be limited to the Standard Terms and Conditions.

Exceptions and/or additions to the Standard Terms and Conditions are strongly discouraged. However, any requested exceptions and/or additions to the Standard Terms and Conditions must be submitted as an answer to the corresponding question in the Question Section of this solicitation. Exceptions and/or additions submitted after the date and time for receipt of proposals will not be considered. Offerors may not submit requests for exceptions and/or additions by reference to a vendor's website or URL. URLs provided with a proposal may result in that proposal being rejected as non-responsive. Offerors may submit questions during the Question and Answer period regarding the Standard Terms and Conditions.

The State may refuse to negotiate exceptions and/or additions that are determined to be excessive; that are inconsistent with similar contracts of the procurement unit; to warranties, insurance, or indemnification provisions that are necessary to protect the procurement unit after consultation with the Attorney General's Office or other applicable legal counsel; where the solicitation specifically prohibits exceptions and/or additions; or that are not in the best interest of the procurement unit.

In a multiple award, the State reserves the right to negotiate exceptions and/or additions to terms and conditions in a manner resulting in expeditious resolutions. This process may include beginning negotiations with the Offeror having the least amount of exceptions and/or additions and concluding with the Offeror submitting the greatest number of exceptions and/or additions. Contracts may be executed and become effective as negotiations are completed.

For any proposed change(s), Offeror must provide the NASPO ValuePoint Standard Terms and Conditions (Attachment A) for this solicitation in Microsoft Word format with redline edits. Additional terms or documents must be submitted in separate Microsoft Word documents. Offeror must also provide the name, contact information, and access to the person(s) that will be directly involved in legal negotiations.

Any mandatory required acceptance of an Offeror's terms and conditions may result in the proposal being determined to be non-responsive.

An award resulting from this RFP is subject to successful contract terms and conditions negotiation (if required). The State may reject a proposal if the offeror who submitted the proposal fails to sign a contract within 90 days after the contract award.

6 ★ **Instructions To Vendor :**

The issuing procurement unit may not accept a proposal after the time for submission of a proposal has expired.

Certification

I certify that I have read and agree to the terms above.

Vendor Must Also Upload a File:

No

Prerequisite Content:

Offeror acknowledges that after completing the solicitation it must click on the link in the left hand menu bar labeled “Review & Submit”, then check the box under the “Certification” heading to certify their bid. Then click the blue box labeled “Submit Response” in order to submit their bid.

Once the response has been submitted, Vendor will receive a confirmation that the response was successfully submitted. Vendors who fail to submit their response will not have their response reviewed and will be ineligible for further consideration under this solicitation.

When submitting a proposal or modification to a proposal electronically, Offerors must allow sufficient time to complete the online forms and upload documents. This RFP will close at the closing time posted on SciQuest. If an Offeror is in the middle of uploading a proposal when the closing time arrives, SciQuest will stop the process and the proposal or modification to a proposal will not be accepted.

It is the Offeror's responsibility to ensure that they have completed all requirements, read and reviewed all documents, submitted all required information, uploaded all required forms, and submitted their proposal prior to the closing time. Even if an Offeror completes all sections, but does not submit their proposal, the State of Utah Division of Purchasing will not be able to receive their proposal and they will be deemed non-responsive.

Be aware that entering information and uploading documents onto SciQuest may take time. Offerors should not wait until the last minute to submit a proposal. Offerors are strongly encouraged to start the submission process early in order to allow sufficient time for completing their proposal. If an offeror is still working on its proposal when the solicitation closes then when the screen refreshes to the next page, it will receive a 500 Session Timed Out Application Error. After reopening the solicitation an offeror will see that the solicitation is closed and it will not be allowed to submit its proposal. As such, it is strongly recommended that proposals be uploaded and completed at least two days before any established deadline in the solicitation so that a proposal will not be received late and be ineligible for award consideration.

7 ★ **Instructions To Vendor :**

Additional information regarding this solicitation.

Certification

I certify that I have read and agree to the terms above.

Vendor Must Also Upload a File:

No

Prerequisite Content:

Addenda

Offerors are encouraged to review this RFP prior to the deadline to submit a proposal, even if a proposal has been submitted, in case an addendum has been issued by the issuing procurement unit.

Addenda shall be published within a reasonable time prior to the deadline that proposals are due, to allow prospective offerors to consider the addenda in preparing proposals. Publication at least 5 calendar days prior to the deadline that proposals are due shall be deemed a reasonable time. Minor addenda and urgent circumstances may require a shorter period of time. After the due date and time for submitting a proposal to this RFP, at the discretion of issuing procurement unit, addenda to this RFP may be limited to Offerors that have submitted proposals, provided the addenda does not make a substantial change to this RFP.

Question and Answer Period

The Question and Answer period closes on date and time specified on SciQuest. All questions must be submitted through SciQuest during the Question and Answer period. Answers from the State will be posted on SciQuest. Questions may include notifying the State of any ambiguity, inconsistency, scope exception, excessively restrictive requirement, or other errors in this RFP. Questions are encouraged.

Questions may be answered individually or may be compiled into one document.

Questions may also be answered via an addendum. An answered question or an addendum may modify the specification or requirements of this RFP. Answered questions and addenda will be posted on SciQuest. Offerors should periodically check SciQuest for answered questions and addenda before the closing date. It is the responsibility of the Offerors to submit their proposals as required by this RFP, including any requirements contained in an answered question and/or addenda.

Property of the Division

All documents submitted by the Offeror in response to this RFP become the property of the Division and will not be returned to the Offeror, except for the protected records as described below. (Government Records Access and Management Act (GRAMA)).

Errors

If the Offeror identifies any mistake, error, or ambiguity in the RFP at any time during the procurement process, it is the duty of the Offeror to notify the Division of the recommended correction in writing.

Prohibited Activities

Offerors are prohibited from communications regarding this RFP with the conducting procurement unit staff, evaluation committee members, or other associated individuals EXCEPT for the State of Utah Division of Purchasing procurement officer overseeing this RFP.

If the Offeror or anyone representing the Offeror offers or gives any advantage, gratuity, bonus, discount, bribe, or loan of any sort to the State of Utah or any of its employees, agents or representatives at any time during this procurement process the Division will immediately disqualify the Offeror.

Late Proposals

The Division will not consider any late Proposals. Proposals received after the deadline for submittal of Proposals will be returned to the Offeror, unopened.

State Rights

The State may investigate the qualifications of any Offeror under consideration, may require confirmation of information furnished by an Offeror, and may require additional evidence of qualifications to perform the Work described in this RFP. The State reserves the right, in its sole and absolute discretion, to:

1. Reject any or all Proposals.
2. Issue a new RFP.
3. Cancel, modify, or withdraw the entire RFP.
4. Cancel the award of any Contract before execution without liability.
5. Issue Addenda, supplements, and modifications to the RFP.
6. Modify the RFP process (with appropriate notice to Proposers).
7. Appoint an Evaluation and Selection Committee and evaluation teams to review Proposals, and seek the assistance of outside technical experts in Proposal evaluation.

8. Revise and modify, at any time before the Proposal Due Date, the factors it considers in evaluating Proposals and to otherwise revise or expand its evaluation methodology. The Division may extend the Proposal Due Date if such changes are deemed by the Division, in its sole discretion, to be material and substantive.
9. Hold meetings and/or exchange correspondence with the Proposers responding to this RFP to seek an improved understanding and evaluation of the Proposals. If individual informational meetings are held, the Division affords all Proposers an opportunity to participate in such meetings.
10. Seek or obtain data from any source that has the potential to improve the understanding and evaluation of the Proposals.
11. Waive weaknesses, discrepancies, informalities, omissions or minor irregularities in Proposals, and seek and receive clarifications to a Proposal.
12. Hold the Proposals under consideration for the duration of the Contract Award Period.
13. Refuse to consider a Proposal, once submitted, or reject a Proposal if such refusal or rejection is based upon, but not limited to, the following:
 1. Default on the part of an Offeror under previous contracts with the State;
 2. Unsatisfactory performance of previous work by Offeror under previous contracts with the State;
 3. Debarment or suspension under Division or Federal regulations to the Offeror;
 4. Any other reason affecting the Proposer's ability to perform, or record of business integrity; and/or
 5. The Proposer is not otherwise qualified and eligible to receive an award of the Contract under applicable laws and regulations.

Disclaimers

This RFP does not commit the State to enter into a Contract, nor does it obligate the State to pay for any costs incurred in preparation and submission of Proposal(s) or in anticipation of a Contract. By submitting a Proposal, a Proposer disclaims any right to be paid for such costs.

In no event is the State to be bound by, or liable for, any obligations with respect to the Work or the Project until such time (if at all) as the Contract, in form and substance satisfactory to the State, has been executed and authorized by the Division and approved by all required authorities.

Offerors are responsible to review Part 16 of the Utah Procurement Code and applicable rules to understand the State's protest process. Any protest not set forth in writing within the time limits specified in Part 16 is null and void and will not be considered.

In submitting a Proposal in response to this RFP, the Proposer is specifically acknowledging these disclaimers.

Proposal Revisions

During the clarification phase the State may enter into a discussion with the selected Offeror to determine final costs based on the final scope of work approved by the State and the vendor. During these discussions the selected Offeror's total price may not go higher than originally priced.

Equivalent Specification

Wherever in this RFP, an item is defined by using a trade name, brand name, or a manufacturer and/or model number, it is intended that the words, "or equivalent" apply; and invites the submission of equivalent products by the Offerors.

Samples

Offerors may be required to submit product samples to assist the chief procurement officer or head of a procurement unit with independent procurement authority in evaluating whether a procurement item meets the specifications and other requirements set forth in the request for proposals. Product samples must be furnished free of charge unless otherwise stated in the invitation for proposals, and if not destroyed by testing, will upon written request within any deadline stated in the invitation for proposals, be returned at the Offeror's expense. Samples must be labeled or otherwise identified as specified in the invitation for proposals by the procurement unit.

New Technology

Pursuant to Utah Administrative Rule R33-12-502 the awarded contract(s) may be modified to incorporate new technology or technological upgrades associated with the procurement item being solicited, including new or upgraded: (i) systems; (ii) apparatuses; (iii) modules; (iv) components; and (v) other supplementary items. Further, a maintenance or service agreement associated with the procurement item under the resulting contract(s) may be modified to include any new technology or technological upgrades. Any contract modification incorporating new technology or technological upgrades will be specific to the procurement item being solicited and substantially within the scope of the original procurement or contract.

If the State of Utah Department of Technology Services is conducting this RFP then the Department of Technology Services has the authority to allow any and all State of Utah Executive Branch Agencies to participate in any contract resulting from this RFP in the event a procurement need arises. Allowing additional Executive Branch Agencies to participate in a contract resulting from this RFP will require a contract amendment and participation will be limited to the procurement items or scope of work identified in this RFP. All technology contract amendments will be issued in accordance with State of Utah Technology Governance Act § 63F-1-205, Utah Procurement Code, and Utah Administrative Rule R33-12-502.

The State of Utah Division of Purchasing does not guarantee any purchase amount under an awarded contract. Estimated quantities are for solicitation purposes only and are not to be construed as a guarantee.

8 ★ **Instructions To Vendor :**

Offeror must guarantee its pricing for the period described in this RFP.

Certification

I certify that I have read and agree to this prerequisite.

Vendor Must Also Upload a File:

No

Prerequisite Content:

Pricing must be guaranteed as provided within the Attachment A NASPO ValuePoint Terms and Conditions. Refer to Attachment A section VI.

Buyer Attachments

Description of Solicitation Process - Customer Engagement Platform.docx	Description of Solicitation Process - Customer Engagement Platform.docx	../Attachments/Description of Solicitation Process - Customer Engagement Platform.docx
Attachment A - NASPO ValuePoint Terms and Conditions (final 4.1.2021).docx	Attachment A - NASPO ValuePoint Terms and Conditions (final 4.1.2021).docx	../Attachments/Attachment A - NASPO ValuePoint Terms and Conditions (final 4.1.2021).docx
Attachment B - Key Personnel Form	ATTACHMENT+B+Key+Personnel+Proposal+Form+-+Updated.docx	../Attachments/ATTACHMENT+B+Key+Personnel+Proposal+Form+-+Updated.docx
Attachment C - Price Proposal Form (final 4.2.2021).docx	Attachment C - Price Proposal Form (final 4.2.2021).docx	../Attachments/Attachment C - Price Proposal Form (final 4.2.2021).docx
Attachment D - Project Capability Templates (amended 4.20).docx	Attachment D - Project Capability Templates (amended 4.20).docx	../Attachments/Attachment D - Project Capability Templates (amended 4.20).docx
Examples of Attachment D	Examples for Attachment D.docx	../Attachments/Examples for Attachment D.docx
Attachment D.4 - Service Plan Template (amended 4.20).docx	Attachment D.4 - Service Plan Template (amended 4.20).docx	../Attachments/Attachment D.4 - Service Plan Template (amended 4.20).docx
Attachment D.5 - Real World Use Plan Template (amended 4.20).docx	Attachment D.5 - Real World Use Plan Template (amended 4.20).docx	../Attachments/Attachment D.5 - Real World Use Plan Template (amended 4.20).docx
Attachment E - Clarification Phase Guide	ATTACHMENT+E+Clairfication+Phase+Guide (1).docx	../Attachments/ATTACHMENT+E+Clairfication+Phase+Guide (1).docx
Attachment F - Weekly Risk Report Guide	ATTACHMENT+F+Weekly+Risk+Reporting+System+Guide.docx	../Attachments/ATTACHMENT+F+Weekly+Risk+Reporting+System+Guide.docx
Attachment F1 - WRR Template.xlsx	Attachment F1 - WRR Template.xlsx	../Attachments/Attachment F1 - WRR Template.xlsx
Attachment G - Claim of Business Confidentiality.pdf	Attachment G - Claim of Business Confidentiality.pdf	../Attachments/Attachment G - Claim of Business Confidentiality.pdf
Attachment H - Interactive Scorecard (amended 4.2.2021).xlsm	Attachment H - Interactive Scorecard (amended 4.2.2021).xlsm	../Attachments/Attachment H - Interactive Scorecard (amended 4.2.2021).xlsm
Attachment I - Potential Participation (updated 4-15).pdf	Attachment I - Potential Participation (updated 4-15).pdf	../Attachments/Attachment I - Potential Participation (updated 4-15).pdf
Attachment J - Detailed Reporting Template - Citizen Engagement Platform.xlsx	Attachment J - Detailed Reporting Template - Citizen Engagement Platform.xlsx	../Attachments/Attachment J - Detailed Reporting Template - Citizen Engagement Platform.xlsx
Attachment J.1 - Quarterly Detailed Sales Report Instructions - Citizen Engagement Platform.docx	Attachment J.1 - Quarterly Detailed Sales Report Instructions - Citizen Engagement Platform.docx	../Attachments/Attachment J.1 - Quarterly Detailed Sales Report Instructions - Citizen Engagement Platform.docx
Recording - Solutions Based Pre-Proposal Webinar - KM21-47 (4.5.2021)		https://drive.google.com/file/d/1idi4ytKrtI2NyM-M-PMdDzIzE5jeg9jr/view?usp=sharing
Solutions Based Pre-Proposal Webinar - KM21-47 4.5.2021.pptx	Solutions Based Pre-Proposal Webinar - KM21-47 4.5.2021.pptx	../Attachments/Solutions Based Pre-Proposal Webinar - KM21-47 4.5.2021.pptx
Changing your Time Zone	Changing Your Time Zone.pptx	../Attachments/Changing Your Time Zone.pptx

Questions

★ Vendor Response Is Required

Page 1

Group 1: Acceptance of Prerequisites

- 1.1 Offeror acknowledges that it is the offerors responsibility to upload any and all documents in responding to the solicitation. If the vendors fails to upload a document, uploads an incorrect document, uploads a blank document, or uploads any document incorrectly the State of Utah may not allow the vendor to make changes following the closing of the solicitation. ★
Yes/No
- 1.2 Is Offeror presently or has Offeror ever been debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, or declared ineligible by any governmental department or agency, whether international, national, state, or local? ★
Yes/No
- 1.3 Offeror acknowledges that they do not have financial ties to individuals or entities on an OFAC sanctions list. ★
Yes/No
- 1.4 If Offeror has any information that is not already provided within its proposal that if known to the State would impact the State's determination on offeror's responsiveness for a contract award (i.e., legal action, recent turn-over in major personnel, loss of a major contract, any alleged violations of federal, state or local regulations, etc.), please mark "yes" to this question and upload such information in the space provided below. Otherwise, please mark "no". Please see UCA 63G-6a-120 & 902 for additional details. ★
Yes/No
- 1.5 Please upload information impacting Offeror's responsiveness here. ★
File Upload
- 1.6 Offeror acknowledges that it must acquire and maintain all applicable federal, state, and local licenses before the contract is entered into. Licenses must be maintained throughout the entire contract period. Persons doing business as an Individual, Association, Partnership, Corporation, or otherwise shall be registered with the Utah State Division of Corporations and Commercial Code. NOTE: Forms and information on registration may be obtained by calling (801) 530-4849 or toll free at 877-526-3994, or by accessing: www.commerce.utah.gov. ★
Yes/No
- 1.7 In the event that an Offeror offers pricing discounts for educational entities that (1) are applicable to this solicitation and (2) result in lower pricing than what is generally offered to other governmental entities, please attach a separate cost proposal labeled "Educational Pricing" to your proposal. This cost proposal for Educational Pricing is to be submitted in addition to the original Cost Proposal Form and will only be available to authorized end users. The Educational Pricing will not be used to evaluate costs. Offeror acknowledges that it has read and understands this question. ★
Yes/No
- 1.8 Does Offeror have an outstanding tax lien in the State of Utah? If yes, Offeror must provide a statement regarding its outstanding tax lien. ★
Yes/No
- 1.9 If awarded a State Cooperative Contract Offeror understands that its resulting contract may be terminated for convenience, without cause, if there is no reported spend for any one fiscal year of its contract. ★
Yes/No

Group 2: Vendor Information

- 2.1 Please provide your firm's legal company name. ★
Text (Multi-Line)

- 2.2** Please provide your federal tax identification number. (If the vendor is sole proprietor please do not provide your social security number.) ★
Text (Multi-Line)
- 2.3** Please provide your firm's contact information for the resulting contract, including the name, phone number, and email address of your firm's authorized representative. ★
Text (Multi-Line)
- 2.4** Please provide your ordering address and the remit to address. Please clearly identify each address. ★
Text (Multi-Line)
- 2.5** Please provide your firm's State of Utah Sales Tax ID Number. If you do not have a State of Utah Sales Tax ID Number, please write "N/A". ★
Text (Multi-Line)
- 2.6** Identify your firm's type of business. ★
Dropdown List (Pick One)
Partnership
Government
Sole Proprietor
Limited Liability Company
Not-for-Profit Corporation
For-Profit Corporation
- 2.7** Identify your company's Point of Contact for this solicitation, include the point of contact's phone number and email address. ★
Text (Multi-Line)
- 2.8** Is Offeror (owners, principles, partners) a retiree currently receiving benefits through the Utah Retirement Systems (URS)? ★
Yes/No
- 2.9** Is Offeror an employee of the State of Utah? If yes, then Offeror must submit an external employment form signed by Offeror's manager at the State of Utah. ★
Yes/No
- 2.10** Upload your external employment form signed by Offeror's manager at the State of Utah. ★
File Upload

Group 3: Award Category Selection

- 3.1** Offeror affirms "yes" that it is the original software publisher for each software solution it is proposing within its proposal, for each Category it is submitting a proposal for. Failure to affirm "yes" may result in disqualification of Offeror's proposal. ★
Yes/No
- 3.2** Select ALL Categories you are seeking an award in. ★
Multiple Select (Pick Many)
Platform Management
Master Data Management
Chatbots and Customer Service
Customer Engagement
Social Listening
- 3.3** Upload your completed response for Attachment B: Key Personnel Proposal Form. ★
File Upload

Group 4: Category 1 - Platform Management

- 4.1** If responding to Category 1 - Platform Management, upload your completed Attachment C - Price Proposal Form here. ★
File Upload

- 4.2 If responding to Category 1 - Platform Management, upload your completed Attachment D - Project Capability here.
File Upload
- 4.3 If responding to Category 1 - Platform Management, upload your completed Attachment D.4 - Service Plan here.
File Upload
- 4.4 If responding to Category 1 - Platform Management, upload your completed Attachment D.5 - Real World Use Plan here.
File Upload
- 4.5 If responding to Category 1 - Platform Management, Offeror shall upload its complete detailed product offering / price catalog here. This document is to include the complete pricing details for all solutions, hardware, and services Offeror is seeking to offer through an awarded contract (including any pricing for its proposed value add options). Where applicable, such catalog should incorporate tiered pricing. This document is separate from the Attachment C - Cost Proposal Form.
File Upload

Group 5: Category 2 - Master Data Management

- 5.1 If responding to Category 2 - Master Data Management, upload your completed Attachment C - Price Proposal Form here.
File Upload
- 5.2 If responding to Category 2 - Master Data Management, upload your completed Attachment D - Project Capability here.
File Upload
- 5.3 If responding to Category 2 - Master Data Management, upload your completed Attachment D.4 - Service Plan here.
File Upload
- 5.4 If responding to Category 2 - Master Data Management, upload your completed Attachment D.5 - Real World Use Plan here.
File Upload
- 5.5 If responding to Category 2 - Master Data Management, Offeror shall upload its complete detailed product offering / price catalog here. This document is to include the complete pricing details for all solutions, hardware, and services Offeror is seeking to offer through an awarded contract (including any pricing for its proposed value add options). Where applicable, such catalog should incorporate tiered pricing. This document is separate from the Attachment C - Cost Proposal Form.
File Upload

Group 6: Category 3 - Chatbots and Customer Service

- 6.1 If responding to Category 3 - Chatbots and Customer Service, upload your completed Attachment C - Price Proposal Form here.
File Upload
- 6.2 If responding to Category 3 - Chatbots and Customer Service, upload your completed Attachment D - Project Capability here.
File Upload
- 6.3 If responding to Category 3 - Chatbots and Customer Service, upload your completed Attachment D.4 - Service Plan here.
File Upload
- 6.4 If responding to Category 3 - Chatbots and Customer Service, upload your completed Attachment D.5 - Real World Use Plan here.
File Upload

- 6.5 If responding to Category 3 - Chatbots and Customer Service, Offeror shall upload its complete detailed product offering / price catalog here. This document is to include the complete pricing details for all solutions, hardware, and services Offeror is seeking to offer through an awarded contract (including any pricing for its proposed value add options). Where applicable, such catalog should incorporate tiered pricing. This document is separate from the Attachment C - Cost Proposal Form. ★
File Upload

Group 7: Category 4 - Customer Engagement

- 7.1 If responding to 4 - Customer Engagement, upload your completed Attachment C - Price Proposal Form here.
File Upload
- 7.2 If responding to Category 4 - Customer Engagement, upload your completed Attachment D - Project Capability here.
File Upload
- 7.3 If responding to Category 4 - Customer Engagement, upload your completed Attachment D.4 - Service Plan here.
File Upload
- 7.4 If responding to Category 4 - Customer Engagement, upload your completed Attachment D.5 - Real World Use Plan here.
File Upload
- 7.5 If responding to Category 4 - Customer Engagement, Offeror shall upload its complete detailed product offering / price catalog here. This document is to include the complete pricing details for all solutions, hardware, and services Offeror is seeking to offer through an awarded contract (including any pricing for its proposed value add options). Where applicable, such catalog should incorporate tiered pricing. This document is separate from the Attachment C - Cost Proposal Form. ★
File Upload

Group 8: Category 5 - Social Listening

- 8.1 If responding to Category 5 - Social Listening, upload your completed Attachment C - Price Proposal Form here.
File Upload
- 8.2 If responding to Category 5 - Social Listening, upload your completed Attachment D - Project Capability here.
File Upload
- 8.3 If responding to Category 5 - Social Listening, upload your completed Attachment D.4 - Service Plan here.
File Upload
- 8.4 If responding to Category 5 - Social Listening, upload your completed Attachment D.5 - Real World Use Plan here.
File Upload
- 8.5 If responding to Category 5 - Social Listening, Offeror shall upload its complete detailed product offering / price catalog here. This document is to include the complete pricing details for all solutions, hardware, and services Offeror is seeking to offer through an awarded contract (including any pricing for its proposed value add options). Where applicable, such catalog should incorporate tiered pricing. This document is separate from the Attachment C - Cost Proposal Form.
File Upload

Group 9: Amendments from May 4, 2021

- 9.1 In accordance with Utah Statute 63G-27-101, effective May 5, 2021, vendors contracting with the State to provide a good or service, including supplies, information technology, or construction services must certify they are not currently engaged in a boycott of the State of Israel and agrees not to engage in a boycott of the State of Israel for the duration of the contract (if awarded). Offeror is providing this certification in accordance with state law by selecting "Yes" to this question. ★

Yes/No

- 9.2 Offeror acknowledges on May 4, 2021 this RFP was amended to allow Offeror's (original software publishers) to submit value added solutions that involve third-party software solutions. ★

Yes/No

Group 10: Vendor's Submission

- 10.1 Offeror/Bidder understands and acknowledges that if Offeror/Bidder accessed the "View as PDF" document available on the Utah Public Procurement Place Business Opportunities website and did not login to Offeror/Bidder's account in the Utah Public Procurement Place system, that Offeror/Bidder may not be viewing the entire the sourcing event and therefore may not be viewing the complete sourcing event requirements. ★

Offeror/Bidder acknowledges that Offeror/Bidder has logged into Utah Public Procurement Place account and viewed the full sourcing event requirements including hyperlinks before submitting a response to a sourcing event.

Yes/No

- 10.2 I have either attended the pre-proposal meeting or viewed the webinar of the pre-proposal meeting. ★

Yes/No

- 10.3 If your firm is requesting parts of its proposal be protected please upload your Claim of Business Confidentiality Form (Attachment G) here as well as your redacted proposal.

File Upload

- 10.4 Potential Conflicts of Interest. Vendor must identify any conflict, or potential conflict of interest, that might arise during the contract. If no conflicts are identified or expected, write "None" in this section. ★

Text (Multi-Line)

- 10.5 Any exceptions to the Terms and Conditions must be uploaded here in the format outlined in Prerequisites: Standard Terms and Conditions (Exceptions and Negotiations). Further, any vendor terms and end user agreements (EULAs) required by your firm must also be uploaded here in the format outlined in Prerequisites: Standard Terms and Conditions (Exceptions and Negotiations). Exceptions and/or additions submitted after the date and time for receipt of proposals will not be considered. If you have no exceptions or additions, upload a document stating "None". ★

File Upload

- 10.6 Offeror acknowledges that the State of Utah may sign participating addendums with national cooperatives that also meet the scope of this solicitation and contract(s) awarded from this solicitation if it is in the best interest of the State. Any participating addendums with national cooperatives will be reviewed for alignment with the Utah Procurement Code. ★

Yes/No

- 10.7 Offeror affirms that yes that pursuant to the Code of Federal Regulations 2 CFR 200.216 - Prohibition on certain telecommunication and video surveillance services or equipment, that none of the goods (including component parts) or services offered within its proposal are from the entity Huawei Technologies Company or ZTE Corporation (or any subsidiary or affiliate of such entities). ★

Yes/No

Vendor understands and acknowledges that its response, including all uploaded documents, will not be considered received by the State of Utah unless the Vendor clicks submit.

Even if Vendor uploads all required documents and responds to all required questions its response will not be considered if it does not click submit.

10.8

Offeror acknowledges that after completing the solicitation it must click on the link in the left hand menu bar labeled "Review & Submit", then check the box under the "Certification" heading to certify their bid. Then click the blue box labeled "Submit Response" in order to submit their bid.

★

Once the response has been submitted, Vendor will receive a confirmation that the response was successfully submitted. Vendors who fail to submit their response will not have their response reviewed and will be ineligible for further consideration under this solicitation.

Yes/No

Q&A Board

Subject = Purpose of the Solicitation (Rackspace Government Solutions)		Public Thread
Q: For NASPO ValuePoint, what is the process for adding or removing SKUs/ products from the list? Either from year to year, or otherwise as needed?	Question added by: Josiah Helms	4/27/2021 12:41 PM MDT
A: All catalog updates must be coordinated through the State of Utah (as the Lead State). Catalog additions shall comply with the terms and conditions of the awarded master agreement, and shall not exceed Offeror's awarded scope.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/30/2021 10:22 AM MDT
Subject = Award Categories (Rackspace Government Solutions)		Public Thread
Q: If the Offeror may propose Value Add Items/ Services without responding to Award Categories 1-5, and provides answers to ATTACHMENT D (3) – VALUE ADDED (VA) ITEMS, what other documents does the State of Utah require from the Offeror?	Question added by: Josiah Helms	4/27/2021 12:40 PM MDT
A: A proposal will not be accepted where an Offeror does not respond to at least one of the listed Award Categories. Awards are based on the listed award Categories.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/30/2021 10:21 AM MDT
Subject = Award Categories (Rackspace Government Solutions)		Public Thread
Q: If the Offeror may propose Value Add Items/ Services without responding to Award Categories 1-5, will the State of Utah consider the Offeror responsive if they only provide answers to ATTACHMENT D (3) – VALUE ADDED (VA) ITEMS?	Question added by: Josiah Helms	4/27/2021 12:40 PM MDT
A: A proposal will not be accepted where an Offeror does not respond to at least one of the listed Award Categories. Awards are based on the listed award Categories.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/30/2021 10:22 AM MDT
Subject = Award Categories (Rackspace Government Solutions)		Public Thread
Q: Will the State of Utah consider a response for Value Add Items / Services from an Offeror who is not responding to Award Categories 1 -5?	Question added by: Josiah Helms	4/27/2021 12:40 PM MDT
A: No.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/30/2021 10:22 AM MDT
Subject = Attachment B (IBM Corporation)		Public Thread
Q: Since each category represents a different area of specialization and technical expertise, may offerors submit more than one copy of Attachment B Key Personnel, or include multiple people in the response?	Question added by: Michael Kipp	4/27/2021 12:12 PM MDT
A: Offeror may list one individual per Category it is seeking an award within the same Attachment B.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/30/2021 10:21 AM MDT
Subject = General (IBM Corporation)		Public Thread
Q: If an offeror has more than one potential solution for one of the response categories, is there a way to submit more than one set of response templates for a single category, so that we have the full page allotment to describe each solution?	Question added by: Michael Kipp	4/27/2021 12:12 PM MDT
A: Offeror may propose any number of solutions. However, an additional allotment for pages will not be given.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/30/2021 10:20 AM MDT
Subject = Schedule C (Microsoft.com)		Public Thread

Q: We provide a set price to our resellers and the resellers set the final price with the end customer. Pricing is also subject to change monthly, so the price list that would apply depends on when the purchase is being made and what is purchased. How do you envision we provide pricing for Schedule C and the product catalogue based on these variables?

Question added by: Mike Graef

4/27/2021 12:06 PM
MDT

A: Proposed pricing is to comply with the terms outlined within the published RFP. Specifically, Attachment A section VI - Pricing, Payment & Leasing outlines certain requirements on guaranteed pricing that the proposal here does not comply with.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/30/2021 10:19 AM
MDT

Subject = Schedule C (Microsoft.com)

Public Thread

Q: How does the state plan to evaluate the Schedule C pricing without a set scope or concept of a solution? Would the state consider providing an example use case for Schedule C creating more equality among vendors?

Question added by: Mike Graef

4/27/2021 12:00 PM
MDT

A: State will evaluate the proposed Attachment C - Price Proposal Form based on the information provided in Attachment C, the Attachment H - Interactive scorecard and the scoring methodology and weighting outlined therein, the document on "Description of Solicitation Process", and the published RFP. Given the variety of solutions available on the market for resolving the purpose, background, award Categories, and intent to allow vendors the flexibility to demonstrate they are the industry expert the State will not be providing a specific example use case that would narrow proposed solutions to a limited use.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/30/2021 10:19 AM
MDT

Subject = Real World Examples (IBM Corporation)

Public Thread

Q: Our client solutions always contain PII and/or HIPAA data. The portals that we build and support are proprietary and contain protected data. Thus, it is not possible in most cases to provide a URL to use and test out our platform. As alternative to the requirement in the Real World Examples section of Appendix D, "Offeror must provide five (5) links/URLs for the evaluation committee to use and test out Offeror's platform." is it acceptable to provide links to product demonstrations, customer testimonials, etc. for the evaluation to consider?

Question added by: Michael Kipp

4/27/2021 11:53 AM
MDT

A: As this is a solutions based RFP, if Offeror doesn't have the requested information on this specific item it is up to the Offeror to determine what other information it would propose to substitute for the requested information in demonstrating its solution / services that it is proposing are the best in the industry.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/30/2021 10:18 AM
MDT

Subject = Location for customer references? (Synchronous Technologies Group Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: We briefly refer to other customers we have performed for in Attachment D-1. Is there one single place for references where we could include dates of service, description of work, etc.? Real World examples (D-5) might have links to some, but if they are using our platform in a way that is not publicly accessible, we would still want to be able to reference them.

Question added by: Lars Helgeson

4/27/2021 10:27 AM
MDT

A: No. As this is a solutions based RFP it is up to the Offeror to assess where and what reference details it will provide based on the requested information in demonstrating its solution / services that it is proposing are the best in the industry.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/30/2021 10:18 AM
MDT

Subject = Schedule C (Microsoft.com)

Public Thread

Q: Schedule C is an implementation-based hypothetical exercise, including project timelines, deliverables, and contract renewals. We are a platform company that offers software on which the State can build infinite capabilities. Our software is license-based, which allows the state to purchase the licenses and then create whatever solutions are necessary in our platform and our cloud. How would the state like to see a hypothetical budget-based price proposal for software and cloud licensing?

Question added by: Mike Graef

4/27/2021 7:51 AM MDT

A: State will not instruct vendors on how to best demonstrate its proposed solutions / services meet the requisite threshold for award. As a solutions based RFP, it is up to the Offeror to assess how it will structure its proposal based on the information and structure requested, in demonstrating it is the industry expert.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/30/2021 10:17 AM MDT

Subject = Resellers (Microsoft.com)

Public Thread

Q: Our business model is to offer our software licenses exclusively through resellers enabling fair and competitive pricing models for state and agency contracts. Can the state please confirm that agencies wishing to purchase software licenses via this contracting model will be able to do so via our previously approved reseller entities?

Question added by: Mike Graef

4/27/2021 7:49 AM MDT

A: Under this RFP there have been no previously approved reseller entities. Master agreements will only be with the software publisher. Under the structure of the resulting master agreements a master agreement holder may utilize distributors / resellers through its master agreement to extend its solutions / services to purchasing entities.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/30/2021 10:17 AM MDT

Subject = Scope of Award (Policy Confluence, Inc)

Public Thread

Q: Does a contract award guarantee business or does that mean we become an approved vendor that entities can choose to work with?

Question added by: Robert Kane

4/27/2021 7:41 AM MDT

A: As provided in the published RFP - "State of Utah Division of Purchasing does not guarantee any purchase amount under an awarded contract. Estimated quantities are for solicitation purposes only and are not to be construed as a guarantee." An awarded master agreement opens the opportunity for public entities with a PA to do business with your firm, but does not guarantee any purchase.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/30/2021 10:16 AM MDT

Subject = Contract Executions (Policy Confluence, Inc)

Public Thread

Q: Is the expectation to award several contracts in each category?

Question added by: Robert Kane

4/27/2021 7:40 AM MDT

A: There is the potential for multiple awards per Category as provided in the published RFP.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/30/2021 10:15 AM MDT

Subject = 3rd Party Solution (SAP Public Services, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: Are we able to include a 3rd party solution that will be contracted on our contract paper? The solution is a component of our overall offering.

Question added by: Rob Beckley

4/26/2021 12:23 PM MDT

A: Yes, please refer to the RFP's section on - "Value Add Solutions that Involve Third-Party Software Solutions" for further details.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

5/4/2021 8:54 AM MDT

Subject = Pricing - Catalog (Tata Consultancy Services)

Public Thread

Q: In main RFP on Page 9 under 'Group 3: Vendor's Submission', it is mentioned that Offeror shall upload its complete detailed product offering / price catalog here, for each Category it is seeking an award in. This document is separate from Attachment C-Cost Proposal form. Request to elaborate on the price catalog. What is the difference between attachment C and price catalog ? Thanks.

Question added by: Anuraag Malaviya

4/26/2021 11:34 AM MDT

A: This price catalog is the Offeror's complete, detailed catalog with all solutions and services that Offeror is seeking to offer under its awarded master agreement. Due to the constraints imposed by Attachment C, this detailed information is not already provided therein. This price catalog is intended to be attached to the resulting master agreement.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/30/2021 10:23 AM MDT

Subject = Procurement Schedule (Tata Consultancy Services)

Public Thread

Q: Tentative Clarification Kick-Off Meeting is June 2, 2021. Could you please let us know the tentative contract signing date and authorization to proceed date?

Question added by: Anuraag Malaviya

4/26/2021 11:33 AM MDT

A: As provided in the RFP, it depends on whether the awarded vendor has provided an actual end user (Participating State) who has requested the use of its master agreement. Contract negotiations for a master agreement (contract) will only begin with those Offeror's meeting the award threshold after the Offeror has provided a verified request from an entity eligible to use the Master Agreement indicating the entity's intent and need to use the resulting Master Agreement.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/30/2021 10:23 AM MDT

Subject = Location - Project Activities (Tata Consultancy Services)

Public Thread

Q: Vendor understands that transmit, process, and store State's data should be within the continental United States. Can the vendor leverage its offshore location (outside continental United States) for performing the project activities keeping the data within US ?

Question added by: Anuraag Malaviya

4/26/2021 11:31 AM MDT

A: So long as the terms and conditions of the master agreement are complied with, this is acceptable.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/30/2021 10:23 AM MDT

Subject = Attachment D (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: The text fields (labeled "Click or tap here to enter text.") in Attachment D – Project Capability Template do not allow for any formatting, including adding tables, bulleted lists, etc. Please provide a revised template (as used for Attachments D.4 and D.5) that allows for the inclusion of formatted elements.

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/26/2021 10:26 AM MDT

A: When providing your you may remove the text field, and then provide the formatting, tables, formatting, and bulleted lists you would like to offer.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/30/2021 10:26 AM MDT

Subject = Master Agreement Terms (Adobe)

Public Thread

Q: We typically license our products via distributors and resellers. If we use a fulfillment partner as a subcontractor, would we (the software publisher) or the fulfillment partner be party to the Master Agreement?

Question added by: Jennie Strobeck

4/26/2021 7:09 AM MDT

A: Master agreements will only be awarded to a software publisher. Master agreements will not be awarded to a fulfillment partner (subcontractor).

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/26/2021 8:14 AM MDT

Subject = Terms & Conditions (Tata Consultancy Services)

Public Thread

Q: 1. Attachment 1 (Potential Participation) also has terms and conditions of different states (including terms and conditions of Utah on page 61) which is different from NASPO ValuePoint Master Agreement terms and conditions. Are these these terms and conditions applicable to us and whether offerors may comment on or document exceptions at this time? If yes, then whether only terms and conditions of Utah in page 61 is applicable to us? Could the word version of the Attachment I be made available to us?

Question added by: Anuraag Malaviya

4/25/2021 11:20 PM MDT

A: These Terms and Conditions within Attachment I are provided as a courtesy to offerors to indicate which additional Terms and Conditions may be incorporated into an individual State's Participating Addendum after award of the Master Agreement. At this phase in the process comments / exceptions to the Attachment I terms are not being requested.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/26/2021 8:19 AM MDT

Subject = Subcontractor roles (Adobe)

Public Thread

Q: with the removal of the subcontractor restriction, will a bid be accepted where a publisher leverages a distributor to act as a fulfillment source on our behalf?

Question added by: Jennie Strobeck

4/23/2021 12:48 PM MDT

A: Proposals will still only be accepted from the original software publisher. Distributors, integrators, value added resellers, fulfillment sources, etc. still do not qualify for an award under this solicitation.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/23/2021 1:22 PM MDT

Subject = Attachment E - Service Assumptions (Medallia)

Public Thread

Q: With respect to Attachment E, Service Assumptions, can you clarify the intent of this section. How is "Service Assumptions" defined and/or provide examples of "Service Assumptions". Thanks.

Question added by: Matt Halliday

4/23/2021 12:38 PM MDT

A: I believe you were meaning to refer to the Attachment D.4 - Service Plan, and the Service Assumptions shown in that document. If I am incorrect, please clarify. The Service Assumptions requested in this attachment are further described within document "Description of Solicitation Process". As provided therein - you are asked to provide "a brief summary of the major assumptions that have been made in preparing the proposal. This should include items/tasks that the Offeror has assumed the State will perform, items/tasks required from the State, and items/tasks that have not been included in the proposal (items that the Offeror feels are outside the scope of work)."

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/23/2021 1:43 PM MDT

Subject = Purchase of services (Deloitte Consulting)

Public Thread

Q: How will participating States plan to purchase the installation, configuration and customization services from system integrators partnering with the original software publishers?

Question added by: Ron Baldwin

4/22/2021 1:22 PM MDT

A: This can be purchased through the awarded master agreement with the software publisher. The restriction against the software publisher from using a 3rd party subcontractor has been removed.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/23/2021 11:00 AM MDT

Subject = Service Plan (Microsoft.com)

Public Thread

Q: May we add in a table to the Word document to organize our responses and maximize space for D.4 Service Plan?

Question added by: Mike Graef

4/22/2021 9:50 AM MDT

A: Yes, that would be appropriate.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/22/2021 10:01 AM MDT

Subject = Attachment C – Price Proposal (PCC Technology Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: In Attachment C – Price Proposal, there is a hypothetical budget of \$700,000 total over a 5 year term per category. Our citizen engagement platform provides modular applications across different levels of the public sector and typically costs more than the hypothetical budget based on client needs. Can vendors alter the hypothetical budget in Attachment C and suggest other budgets so we can accurately portray how the cost of our software breaks down?

Question added by: Mattie Scull

4/22/2021 8:42 AM MDT

A: What you have described would not inherently disqualify your proposal. However, vendors who are not able to meet the hypothetical budget should demonstrate the ROI and value add for its solution, even though it may exceed the provided budget.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/23/2021 10:55 AM MDT

Subject = Schedule C (Microsoft.com)

Public Thread

Q: Should Schedule C including pricing for only software or implementation as well?

Question added by: Mike Graef

4/21/2021 11:46 AM MDT

A: It should include implementation as well.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/23/2021 10:55 AM MDT

Subject = Webinar Clarification (Microsoft.com)

Public Thread

Q: Regarding the live Webinar presentation, please clarify if the Level of Expertise examples should be project-specific (like a case study), or more general across multiple/all clients.

Question added by: Mike Graef

4/21/2021 11:46 AM MDT

A: It is up to the Offeror on the approach it will take to demonstrate it is the industry expert in resolving the goals, objectives, and proposed qualifications from the Offeror under this RFP.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/23/2021 10:55 AM MDT

Subject = D.5 Real-world Examples (Microsoft.com)

Public Thread

Q: For MDM management, we are not able to provide access to live customer sites--what else can we provide to meet this requirement?

Question added by: Mike Graef

4/21/2021 11:45 AM MDT

A: It is up to the Offeror to determine what it would propose in place of the requested information to demonstrate it is the industry expert in resolving the goals, objectives, and proposed qualifications from Offeror under this RFP.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/23/2021 10:56 AM MDT

Subject = D.5 Real-world Examples (Microsoft.com)

Public Thread

Q: Regarding the URL links, how do we demonstrate MDM and other back-end areas that are not seen from a public-facing site?

Question added by: Mike Graef

4/21/2021 11:45 AM MDT

A: It is up to the Offeror to assess what metrics and information it would put forth in demonstrating it is the industry expert in resolving the goals, objectives, and proposed qualifications from Offeror under this RFP.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/23/2021 10:56 AM MDT

Subject = Attachment B (Microsoft.com)

Public Thread

Q: Should bidders submit an Attachment B for each category we're bidding on or just one across all categories? If one for each category, please add a field for upload per category in the online portal.

Question added by: Mike Graef

4/21/2021 11:44 AM MDT

A: Just one across all Categories is sufficient.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/23/2021 10:57 AM MDT

Subject = Executive Summary (Microsoft.com)

Public Thread

Q: Are bidders allowed to submit an Executive Summary outlining our differentiators? Will this information be considered for contract award?

Question added by: Mike Graef

4/21/2021 11:43 AM MDT

A: At this phase of the procurement process an Executive Summary is not requested. Offeror's may nonetheless incorporate its differentiators within the contents of its proposal to the Level of Expertise Plan, Risk Assessment Plan, Value Added Plan, Service Plan, Ease of Use Functionality, Real World Examples, Data Privacy Controls, and Cost Proposal.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/23/2021 10:57 AM
MDT

Subject = Amendments Reasons (Synchronous Technologies Group Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: Is there a place which lists the changes that were made to an Amendment that is being re-released? If we've already started adding answers/content to a document that is now amended, it would be helpful to pinpoint the changes for us.

Question added by: Lars Helgeson

4/21/2021 10:18 AM
MDT

A: Amendment changes can be seen by selecting "Amendment Changes" within the sourcing event. See attached screenshot for reference. Please note, this feature however does not show the exact contents of a document uploaded in the system that was modified. If you have questions on a specific Attachment please clarify which Attachment you are referring to.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/21/2021 10:45 AM
MDT

Amendment Changes - Screenshot.PNG - ../Attachments/QABoardAttachments/Amendment Changes -

Subject = Professional Services (salesforce)

Public Thread

Q: There are several requirements in the RFP which will require implementation professional services not provided by the software publisher I represent. Normally we would work with a third party SI partner who responds to the RFP with support from the Software Publisher's product team. So (as the software publisher) we cannot respond to these professional services requirements in the RFP. Because it is stated that the response must come from the software publisher and we cannot engage a third party Systems Integration partner to respond, we wouldn't be able to respond to any of the professional services requirements in the RFP. Would this disqualify our response? If we have interpreted the above requirements accurately, this appears to limit the competitive bid results for Utah/ NASPO as this would eliminate most if not all of the vendors who are already on NASPO from participating in the process.

Question added by: Cameron Spruill

4/20/2021 3:29 PM MDT

A: The restriction against the software publisher from using a 3rd party subcontractor has been removed.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/23/2021 10:58 AM
MDT

Subject = Resellers (salesforce)

Public Thread

Q: The RFP States: "Proposals will NOT be accepted from software resellers." Because our software reseller (e.g., Carahsoft) is the owner of an existing NASPO contract, the Software Publisher I represent requires that any RFP response be delivered through the reseller, not the Software Publisher directly. Does this disqualify our response?

Question added by: Cameron Spruill

4/20/2021 3:25 PM MDT

A: If the proposal is not received from the described Software Publisher, yes this would disqualify the response.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/23/2021 10:58 AM
MDT

Subject = Contract Award (salesforce)

Public Thread

Q: RFP States: "Contract Award - Contract negotiations for a master agreements (contracts) will only begin with those vendors meeting this award threshold after they have provided a verified request from a an entity eligible to use the Master Agreement indicating the entity's intent and need to use the resulting Master Agreement. Additional Agreement with NASPO - Upon request by NASPO ValuePoint, awarded Contractor shall enter into a direct contractual relationship with NASPO ValuePoint related to Reseller's obligations to NASPO ValuePoint under the terms of the Master Agreement, the terms of which shall be the same or similar (and not less favorable) than the terms set forth in the Master Agreement." If a "Software Publisher" who already has an existing cooperative contract established with NASPO (in force and available to Utah and all NASPO participating states) through a reseller (e.g., Carahsoft) and we are not allowed to negotiate a new contract with Utah, NASPO or other states, does this disqualify our response?

Question added by: Cameron Spruill

4/20/2021 3:24 PM MDT

A: Please clarify your question. Master agreements will only be awarded to a software publisher and not a software reseller.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/23/2021 10:59 AM MDT

Subject = Licensing/Registering in state of Utah (Compart NA)

Public Thread

Q: Do I need to register in state of Utah for this RFP if I have a Fed ID number already?

Question added by: Deborah Meyer

4/19/2021 4:14 PM MDT

A: No.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/21/2021 10:51 AM MDT

Subject = Software Publisher v. Integrator - Eligibility (Red River Technology LLC)

Public Thread

Q: The response to this question on 4/7/2021 at 5:49 PM EDT that "The software publisher may partner with an integrator. However, the proposal to the State and the resulting master agreement must be with the original software publisher." If Company A is the software publisher for a platform (e.g., ServiceNow as traded under NOW on the NYSE, AWS, Salesforce, others) and Company B is a system integrator certified to implement the platform of Company A – can you confirm that only Company A is an offeror eligible for award?

Question added by: Mike Rockenstein

4/19/2021 2:52 PM MDT

A: In the presented scenario, it is correct that only Company A would be eligible to be evaluated for an award.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/19/2021 3:50 PM MDT

Subject = Price Proposal Form (Accenture LLP)

Public Thread

Q: For the hypothetical price proposal, is the \$700K per year or \$700K total over 5 years?

Question added by: Chad Smith

4/19/2021 1:33 PM MDT

A: It is \$700k total over 5 years, for an individual Category.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/21/2021 10:46 AM MDT

Subject = Value Add Items (Accenture LLP)

Public Thread

Q: Are purchasing entites able to buy value add components as standalone SOWs without buying the primary solution too?

Question added by: Chad Smith

4/19/2021 1:32 PM MDT

A: Yes. However, third party solutions available as a value add should be directly related to the Offeror's proposed solution it is the software publisher for for the awarded Category.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

5/4/2021 9:07 AM MDT

Subject = Attachment D PC Submittal Checklist (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: Attachment D (1) states that bidders should “demonstrate the Offerors capability to meet the project’s requirements.” Is an Offeror allowed to submit the qualifications of an affiliate of the Offeror? In this case “affiliate” means a company wholly owned by Offeror’s parent company. Or is the Offeror’s ability to submit a proposal based solely on that company’s prior experience?

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/19/2021 10:47 AM
MDT

A: As this is a solutions based RFP, the State has not provided whether the qualifications of an affiliate (as you have described) of the Offeror should be offered. Rather, the responsibility is on the Offeror to determine which approach it deems best in demonstrating through its provided metrics the requirements, features, and characteristics it meets within its complete proposal.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/21/2021 10:46 AM
MDT

Subject = Attachment D.5 Real World Use Plan Checklist (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: Is the restriction for Offerors not to “add pictures” meant to preclude Offerors from including graphics in their responses to the Real World Use Plan section?

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/19/2021 9:23 AM MDT

A: Attachment D.5 has been amended to remove the restriction against adding pictures.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/21/2021 10:46 AM
MDT

Subject = Attachment D.4 Service Plan Checklist (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: Is the restriction for Offerors not to “add pictures” meant to preclude Offerors from including graphics in their responses to the Service Plan section?

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/19/2021 9:23 AM MDT

A: Attachment D.4 has been amended to remove the restriction against adding pictures.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/21/2021 10:47 AM
MDT

Subject = Attachment D PC Submittal Checklist (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: Is the restriction for Offerors not to “add pictures” meant to preclude Offerors from including graphics in their responses to the Project Capability Submittal section?

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/19/2021 9:23 AM MDT

A: Attachment D has been amended to remove the restriction against adding pictures.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/21/2021 10:47 AM
MDT

Subject = Anticipated Schedule (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: What is Utah’s estimated implementation timeline?

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/19/2021 9:21 AM MDT

A: It is unclear whether this question is asking about the implementation timeline for the resulting master agreements or implementing the system. Regarding the master agreements, the estimated timeline has been provided in the RFP. Regarding implementation of the proposed system, that is dependent on the timeline of individual Purchasing Entity’s, of which that information is not available at this phase of the solicitation process. As part of Offeror’s demonstration that it is the industry expert it may propose its own implementation timelines that it is capable of providing.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/21/2021 10:48 AM
MDT

Subject = Anticipated Schedule (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: What is Utah’s estimated go-live date?

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/19/2021 9:21 AM MDT

A: It is unclear whether this question is asking about the go-live date for the resulting master agreements or go-live date of Offeror’s proposed system. Regarding the master agreements, the estimated timeline has been provided in the RFP. Regarding go-live for the proposed system, that is dependent on the timeline of individual Purchasing Entity’s, of which that information is not available at this phase of the solicitation process. As part of Offeror’s demonstration that it is the industry expert it may propose its own implementation timelines that it is capable of providing.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/21/2021 10:48 AM
MDT

Subject = Definition of original software publisher (Accelare, Inc.)		Public Thread
Q: Would an implementation specialist delivering a solution built on cloud-based software, qualify as Original Software publisher?	Question added by: Hannah Cassidy	4/19/2021 7:39 AM MDT
A: Not enough information is provided here to provide an answer. The implementation specialist would also need to own the cloud software it is proposing.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/21/2021 10:49 AM MDT
Subject = Submission by a distributor (Accelare, Inc.)		Public Thread
Q: If the software publisher distributes their software through a distributor such as Carahsoft, can the distributor respond on the software publisher's behalf?	Question added by: Hannah Cassidy	4/19/2021 7:33 AM MDT
A: No.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/21/2021 10:50 AM MDT
Subject = Cost Proposal (Tata Consultancy Services)		Public Thread
Q: Cost proposal does not provide any scope/use case/Project to be delivered on Software Solution. Could you please tell us expectation here how to take up/address this question without knowing scope/use case/project. Is it expected that offeror could take/assume a use case/project for proposed software solution and define Deliverables & Schedule, Timelines, Billing and its Frequency etc.?	Question added by: Anuraag Malaviya	4/16/2021 2:24 PM MDT
A: Yes, it is expected that the Offeror would provide its assumptions on details as the exact use case/project, deliverables, schedules, timelines, billing, etc. that are not already provided in the RFP as part of Offeror's demonstration that it is the industry expert.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/21/2021 10:50 AM MDT
Subject = Vendor's Submission (Tata Consultancy Services)		Public Thread
Q: Offeror needs to provide pricing Catalogue for each participating Category. Offeror could provide the pricing for the Software Solution. Hosting charges and Configuration/Customisation charges for the services required by the states would not be included in pricing as RFP does not define any scope of Services required by States. Hosting and any configuration/customisation charges would be discussed during engagement with states. Is our understanding correct. Please clarify?	Question added by: Anuraag Malaviya	4/16/2021 2:23 PM MDT
A: If Offeror can offer hosting and any configuration/customization it should include that within its proposal.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/21/2021 10:51 AM MDT
Subject = Award Categories (Tata Consultancy Services)		Public Thread
Q: Is this RFP specific to SAAS offerings ? OR Offeror could propose the Software Solution or software where required Services/Projects of the states would be configured or customized and Software would be hosted on Premise/Public/Private cloud as per the requirement of State.?	Question added by: Anuraag Malaviya	4/16/2021 2:22 PM MDT
A: This RFP is not limited only to SaaS offerings.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/16/2021 3:01 PM MDT
Subject = Award Categories (Tata Consultancy Services)		Public Thread
Q: Scope of this RFP does not provide any online Services/Projects required by the states to be delivered on Software solution. Does the offeror can provide the Software Solution only and its pricing without considering hosting charges etc. ?	Question added by: Anuraag Malaviya	4/16/2021 2:21 PM MDT
A: As part of Offeror's demonstration that it is the industry expert for the related Category(ies) it is seeking an award in, Offeror should include all hosting charges etc. required to implement its solution/services.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/16/2021 2:59 PM MDT

Subject = Award Categories (Tata Consultancy Services)		Public Thread
Q: Does Platform management also cover the Back office processing of Customers' application like many citizen services require back office processing within Department ?	Question added by: Anuraag Malaviya	4/16/2021 2:21 PM MDT
A: Will you clarify your question on what you mean by "Back office processing of Customers' application"?	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/16/2021 2:57 PM MDT
Subject = Attachment G - Business Confidentiality (Synchronous Technologies Group Inc.)		Public Thread
Q: If we are not making any claim to Business Confidentiality, should we still include Attachment G or skip it? If we include it, how do you prefer we indicate "none?"	Question added by: Lars Helgeson	4/16/2021 2:01 PM MDT
A: Either approach is fine. The system will allow you to skip that question. You can also upload a document stating "None". It is up to you.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/16/2021 2:08 PM MDT
Subject = Overview of the Value-Added Section (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)		Public Thread
Q: Can a bidder submit a proposal that utilizes third party software to perform value-added services?	Question added by: Tere Ramserran	4/16/2021 11:06 AM MDT
A: Yes. Please refer to the RFP's section on - "Value Add Solutions that Involve Third-Party Software Solutions" for further details.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	5/4/2021 8:57 AM MDT
Subject = Expectations for Deliverables by the Con. Proc. Un (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)		Public Thread
Q: The requirement that only original software publishers may submit a proposal will likely limit the number of competitive proposals. Many otherwise qualified vendors utilize the software products of third parties to provide a complete solution. Moreover, software vendors do not always have the requisite experience to submit a qualified proposal. Would the agency consider removing the software publisher requirement to allow a larger number of vendors to submit proposals and thereby provide more competition and greater benefit to participating states?	Question added by: Tere Ramserran	4/16/2021 11:06 AM MDT
A: Thank you for the proposal. The requirement outlined in the RFP however remains unchanged.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/19/2021 3:55 PM MDT
Subject = Purchase Vehicle (Red River Technology LLC)		Public Thread
Q: Can UT confirm that this NASPO Citizen Engagement Platform Solicitation # KM21-47 operates in parallel to a NASPO Cloud Solutions contract (awarded under Solicitation #SK18008) for the same capabilities? Example – Vendor 1 was awarded (and is contracted) under Solicitation # SK18008 for a SaaS platform. The same SaaS platform also meets requirements of this Solicitation #KM21-47. With appropriate participating addenda or other entity-specific agreement, could a buyer purchase the SaaS platform under a contract awarded to Vendor 1 as a result of Solicitation # SK18008 IF o Vendor 1 does not participate in this Solicitation #KM21-47? o Vendor 1 is awarded a contract for the same SaaS platform under this Solicitation #KM21-47?	Question added by: Mike Rockenstein	4/15/2021 5:15 PM MDT
A: It is recognized that the scope of this solicitation (KM21-47) overlaps in part with the NASPO ValuePoint Cloud Solutions portfolio. However, these are two separate solicitations for separate contract portfolios. A contract award under KM21-47 does not result in an award under the Cloud Solutions portfolio, and an award under the Cloud Solutions portfolio does not result in an award under this KM21-47 solicitation.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/19/2021 3:54 PM MDT

Subject = Attachment B (IBM Corporation)		Public Thread
Q: For Attachment B, Key Personnel Proposal Form, do you require only the name of our project lead, or may we include a brief overview of the individual's background, skills, responsibilities, etc.?	Question added by: Michael Kipp	4/15/2021 1:58 PM MDT
A: The name and contact information for the Key Personnel is sufficient for purposes of this Attachment B.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/16/2021 1:28 PM MDT
Subject = Real World Examples (Red River Technology LLC)		Public Thread
Q: Within the "Description of Solicitation Process," the "Offeror must provide five (5) links/URLs for the evaluation committee to use and test out Offeror's platform." Please clarify whether these links/URLs are actual production links/URLs of customers, or links/URLs to internal development/test links.	Question added by: Mike Rockenstein	4/15/2021 10:33 AM MDT
A: As this is a solutions based RFP, it is up to the Offeror to determine which type of link/URL to propose in demonstrating its solution / services that it is proposing are the best in the industry.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/19/2021 3:52 PM MDT
Subject = NASPO (Oracle Corp)		Public Thread
Q: There are many categories for which vendors can make their products and services available via the NASPO Value Point portal. Some of the "awarded" categories appear to be broader than others. Is there anything precluding a participating State from selecting products and services from one of those broader categories listed on NASPO? For example: Vendor X is listed in the awarded category of IaaS, PaaS and SaaS, could that vendor and State complete a transaction for something that might fall into one of the 5 categories (Platform Management, Master Data Management, Chabots and Customer Service, Customer Engagement, and Social Listening) that are referenced in the Citizen Engagement Platform Solicitation # KM21-47?	Question added by: Monica Howard	4/15/2021 10:32 AM MDT
A: It is recognized that the scope of this solicitation (KM21-47) overlaps in part with the NASPO ValuePoint Cloud Solutions portfolio. It is the Participating State's determination which contract vehicle, either from the Cloud Solutions portfolio, this Citizen Engagement Platform portfolio, or some other contract vehicle that it will purchase its needs from.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/19/2021 3:53 PM MDT
Subject = NASPO Pre-Existing Agreement (Red River Technology LLC)		Public Thread
Q: Does the NASPO Citizen Engagement Platform solicitation #KM21-47 require an offeror to have a different pre-existing agreement with NASPO (such as NASPO Cloud Solutions)?	Question added by: Mike Rockenstein	4/15/2021 10:16 AM MDT
A: No.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/16/2021 12:00 PM MDT
Subject = Attachment B (Bang the Table USA LLC)		Public Thread
Q: Can you provide an example of how Attachment B: Key Personnel Proposal Form (Updated) should be completed by the vendor? Do we only list a name? What other information should be included.	Question added by: Michelle Stephens	4/14/2021 1:19 PM MDT
A: Within Attachment B: Key Personnel please provide the name and contact information for the individual listed.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/16/2021 11:59 AM MDT
Subject = Award Category - Further Refinement (Bang the Table USA LLC)		Public Thread

Q: The five "Award Categories" provide broad buckets, but not a clear definition (or examples of solutions in each category). We also find that they are very 'internal' focused processes. Is there an opportunity to create an additional category for "community engagement" platforms that relates to obtaining feedback from citizens as described as follows, and which is largely an externally facing process? "Community Engagement (citizen feedback, public involvement, public participation, public consultation) is a vital cornerstone of well-functioning democracies. It provides the means to obtain valuable feedback from stakeholders and citizens whose lives are impacted by government decision making." Alternatively, is there an opportunity to add subcategories to the existing buckets in order to further recognize and describe the differences that exist? For instance, 'Social Listening' might be changed to 'Social Listening and Citizen Engagement'. I would describe the 'Citizen Engagement' category as: "A software solution that removes barriers to citizen engagement processes by giving communities an easy and accessible means of providing feedback and getting involved in government decision making processes. A centralized platform for managing all community engagement activities within government organizations that increases citizen participation, enables diversity and inclusion goals, and provides internal efficiencies and controls." The International Association for Public Participation (IAP2) Levels of Public Participation may be helpful with further understanding community/citizen engagement as described above. It was designed to assist with the selection of the level of participation that defines the public's role in any public participation (i.e. citizen engagement) process. The Spectrum is used internationally, and it is referenced in many public participation plans and government engagement policies/frameworks. Additionally, there are crossovers between the award categories. For example, how is "social listening" that provides a "view to the voice of the customer" different from "Customer Engagement" where the platform is used to manage multiple interaction across channels? Clarity around the definitions and award categories will support the usability of the NASPO ValuePoint Citizen Engagement Platform Portfolio for the agencies by providing missing specificity to the term "Citizen Engagement Platform".

Question added by: Michelle Stephens

4/14/2021 1:18 PM MDT

IAP2 Spectrum.pdf - ../Attachments/QABoardAttachments/IAP2 Spectrum.pdf

A: Thank you for your input. The described Categories remain as outlined in the published RFP. It is intentional that the 5 Categories are broad without providing limiting examples of what must be proposed within these Categories.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/19/2021 3:49 PM MDT

Subject = Citizen Engagement Platform Definition (Bang the Table USA LLC)

Public Thread

Q: Has the term "Citizen Engagement Platform" been defined? The "Purpose of this Solicitation" section of the RFP notes "online platforms where citizens can access government applications and services available on the web, mobile, and screen-less devices" is an identified need by the States.

Question added by: Michelle Stephens

4/14/2021 1:12 PM MDT

A: The scope / breadth of this term is described by the 5 award Categories. Please refer to the descriptions provided for the 5 award Categories outlined in the RFP.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/19/2021 3:48 PM MDT

Subject = Attachment G – Claim of Business Confidentiality (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: The Attachment G form only has space for four separate confidentiality request references. Please confirm offerors who have more than four separate sections with confidential information can provide a second page with the page, paragraph and reason for the confidentiality claim(s).

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/13/2021 2:17 PM MDT

A: What you have described is appropriate.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 11:56 AM MDT

Subject = Platform Management Category (IBM Corporation)**Public Thread**

Q: Is it correct that in the above description a user is someone who is monitoring the state/health of a given system? Is this an IT person that is assessing, being alerted to, or being reminded to check on the health of a system (e.g. a system running out of memory, disk, or other physical resources)? Further, would you please provide examples around the statement, "will answer questions and contain solutions that remember, remind, and respond to users"?

Question added by: Michael Kipp

4/13/2021 2:12 PM MDT

A: Depending on the proposed context "user" could refer back to the customer or to an IT person as you have described. Examples of the statement include notifications to the user (customer) including, but not limited to push notifications, email, SMS, and in-app messages.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/19/2021 3:56 PM MDT

Subject = Proposal Format (Adobe)**Public Thread**

Q: How are professional services terms and conditions expected to be handled? (Or, how are software publishers expected to reflect implementation services, training services, and customizations?)

Question added by: Jennie Strobeck

4/13/2021 11:30 AM MDT

A: For the incorporation of professional services terms and conditions please refer to the Prerequisite on "Standard Terms and Conditions (Exceptions and Negotiations)". Regarding the reflection of implementation services, training services, and customizations, please clarify your questions. Those are to be reflected in your proposal.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 11:35 AM MDT

Subject = Qualifications (Adobe)**Public Thread**

Q: What sort of system of categories and qualifications are being considered for system integrators and vendors?

Question added by: Jennie Strobeck

4/13/2021 11:30 AM MDT

A: Offeror's who would solely fall in the category of a system integrator (i.e, system consultant or implementer) does not fall within the scope of this solicitation.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 11:36 AM MDT

Subject = Professional Services (Adobe)**Public Thread**

Q: How are professional services expected to be reflected in the solution?

Question added by: Jennie Strobeck

4/13/2021 11:29 AM MDT

A: As this is a solutions based RFP, the State has not provided the solution that vendors are to meet for exactly how the Offeror out to reflect / demonstrate its offered professional services . Rather, the responsibility is on the Offeror to identify the solution / services it offers, and then demonstrate through its provided metrics the requirements, features, and characteristics it meets within its proposed solution/services.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 11:37 AM MDT

Subject = Real World Examples (PayIt, LLC)**Public Thread**

Q: While we can provide URLs to live clients, in order to ensure the security of constituent data our solution requires a username and password. Would you be open to seeing links to walkthrough videos of each client solution presented in a URL, in addition to the link to the live client instance? At this time our clients are not comfortable sharing their sandbox instances for other agencies to test without direct supervision by Paylt or an agency stakeholder. As an alternate, we welcome the opportunity to demonstrate the live client solutions listed on the Real World Example Form presented to the evaluation team in a teleconference call on your schedule. Please indicate if either of these solutions are allowable.

Question added by: Meredith Luker

4/13/2021 10:10 AM
MDT

A: The opportunity for a virtual demo is not guaranteed during the evaluation process. Further, all information provided as part of an Offeror's proposal becomes a record of the State of Utah, and therefore subject to disclosure under Utah's Government Records Management Act (GRAMA). It is therefore recommended that Offeror review the request in the RFP and provide the information requested to the degree it is able to.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 11:29 AM
MDT

Subject = Formatting Attachment D (Synchronous Technologies Group Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: We understand that we are to use the provided Attachments as templates and to work within those documents without changing them. However, in Attachment D, the "Click or tap here to enter text." area is formatted in bold (Arial 11pt bold), which is harder to read for full sentences or paragraphs. Are we permitted to turn off bold for our response sections of those templates?

Question added by: Lars Helgeson

4/13/2021 9:09 AM MDT

A: Yes, that is appropriate.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/13/2021 11:04 AM
MDT

Subject = Google Meeting Link (ContractPal, Inc)

Public Thread

Q: Can you provide details on the recording for "Offeror Webinar Google Meeting". I cannot seem to find it in any of the documents.

Question added by: David Martineau

4/13/2021 6:53 AM MDT

A: There are 2 attachments published in the Buyer Attachments section for this. First attachment is a link titled - "Recording - Solutions Baed Pre-Proposal Webinar - KM21-47 (4.5.2.21)." Second attachment is a Power Point deck titled - "Solutions Based Pre-Proposal Webinar - KM21-47 4.5.2021".

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/13/2021 9:45 AM MDT

Subject = Confidentiality Clause (Synchronous Technologies Group Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: Can you please clarify the confidentiality clause? As a SaaS in particular, any information that is uploaded to the platform is by definition designed to be shared on the Internet to users and may be exposed through user access, deployment of emails or websites or other methods of communication. Could we include our own Terms of Use and Privacy Policy as exceptions to the confidentiality clause?

Question added by: Lars Helgeson

4/12/2021 8:00 PM MDT

GreenRope Terms of Use.pdf - ../Attachments/QABoardAttachments/GreenRope Terms of Use.pdf

A: It is unclear what confidentiality clause you are referring to. If you are referring to what is provided within Attachment A - NASPO ValuePoint Terms and Conditions please refer to the Prerequisite on "Standard Terms and Conditions (Exceptions and Negotiations)" for the process on submitting exceptions to those terms.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/13/2021 8:55 AM MDT

Subject = Real World Examples website question (Synchronous Technologies Group Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: In the summary document, you list that we need to provide "Real World Examples, specifically "five (5) links/URLs for the evaluation committee to use and test out Offeror's platform. The websites should be available to use without a password. " Can you please clarify what you are looking for with this? Are you looking for URLs to public-facing sites that our clients are using to be integrated with our system? Or are you looking for a sandbox environment of our product where your team can experience the system for themselves? Do you intend that this would be a guided view of the system, or something to allow interactive use? We use passwords on our demo/walkthrough account. Can we provide this login/password since we do not allow use of this without a password? Are the 5 links to 5 unique locations, or for 5 team members to access the same URL?

Question added by: Lars Helgeson

4/12/2021 4:46 PM MDT

A: Generally yes, we are looking to have the URLs be public facing sites. Depending on the ease of use for the proposed system this might also be a sandbox account. It is recommended that Offeror thoroughly review the purpose, goals, and expectations outlined in the published RFP, and provide the requisite information within the capabilities of Offeror's proposed solution / services.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 11:29 AM MDT

Q: Since the requirement specifies 5 URLs, is the assumption correct that it is 1 URL per category rather than 5 per single category.

Question added by: Alan Hansen

4/16/2021 11:52 AM MDT

A: That is not a correct assumption. Individual proposals/responses are required for each Category a vendor is seeking an award in. Response to 1 category is separate from a response to another category.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 11:55 AM MDT

Q: given this response, should the vendor provide 5 distinct links/URLs to the same Sandbox if the same sandbox is used to support all functions in the category?

Question added by: Alan Hansen

4/16/2021 11:58 AM MDT

A: As this is a solutions based RFP, it is up to the Offeror to determine which type of link/URL to propose in demonstrating its solution / services that it is proposing are the best in the industry.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 1:34 PM MDT

Subject = Software Publisher (Incapsulate)

Public Thread

Q: We create Intellectual Property (IP) that is built on the Salesforce SaaS platform that we sell on a subscription basis as accelerators/modules. Are we correct in assuming that this meets the definition of Software Publisher?

Question added by: Bryant Freeland

4/9/2021 2:23 PM MDT

A: It depends on the scope of the solution you are seeking to offer. Another entity besides Salesforce, proposing the Salesforce platform as a solution to meet the Goals, Objectives, and Expectations of this RFP would not meet the definition of Software Publisher as required in the RFP.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 11:30 AM MDT

Subject = Scope of Work/ Requirements (salesforce)

Public Thread

Q: Outside of the "Award Categories" section, I don't see any details on specific requirements or a high level scope of work. Where can these details be found?

Question added by: Cameron Spruill

4/9/2021 2:20 PM MDT

A: The published RFP also includes details on the Expectations for Deliverables. As this is a solutions based RFP, the State has not provided the solution that vendors are to meet in responding to this RFP. Rather, the responsibility is on the Offeror to identify the solution, and then demonstrate through its provided metrics the requirements, features, and characteristics it meets within its proposed solution.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 11:30 AM MDT

Subject = Contracting Entity/ Master Agreement/ NASPO (salesforce)

Public Thread

Q: I see the RFP states: "Contract negotiations for a master agreements (contracts) will only begin with those vendors meeting this award threshold after they have provided a verified request from a an entity eligible to use the Master Agreement indicating the entity's intent and need to use the resulting Master Agreement. Additional Agreement with NASPO - Upon request by NASPO ValuePoint, awarded Contractor shall enter into a direct contractual relationship with NASPO ValuePoint related to Reseller's obligations to NASPO ValuePoint under the terms of the Master Agreement, the terms of which shall be the same or similar (and not less favorable) than the terms set forth in the Master Agreement." I represent a "Software Publisher" which already has an existing contract established with NASPO through our reseller (Carahsoft). My company cannot negotiate a separate contract or "master agreement" directly with the State of Utah as we already have a contract vehicle in place for NASPO through Carahsoft. If this is a requirement, we will not be able to participate with a response. Additionally, the RFP States "Proposals will NOT be accepted from software resellers." Because our reseller (Carhasoft) owns the existing NASPO contract, any response would could provide would have to go through the reseller, not my company directly. Based on these requirements, I don't see how we can provide a valid response to this RFP?

Question added by: Cameron Spruill

4/9/2021 2:01 PM MDT

A: Based on the information you have provided, that is correct. We recognize there is some overlap in the scope of this RFP and other NASPO ValuePoint portfolios as the Cloud Solutions portfolio.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 11:31 AM MDT

Subject = Original Software Publisher vs. Integrator (Cloud Navigator)

Public Thread

Q: If a reseller of a platform has developed original intellectual property that is built on and for a platform it resells in order to adapt that platform specifically for citizen engagement, can this reseller be awarded a contract? To be more specific, my company has developed a solution that can be installed in a Microsoft Dynamics 365 environment to adapt that environment to deliver Citizen Engagement functionality. Should we respond, and can we be selected for award?

Question added by: Mark Alexander

4/9/2021 7:26 AM MDT

A: In the capacity of a reseller for Microsoft Dynamics 365, unfortunately your proposal would not be accepted, unless you are the software publisher for Microsoft Dynamics 365. However, in the capacity of responding as a developer for the built solution, yes what you have described is an acceptable submission.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 11:32 AM MDT

Subject = Platform vs configured system (Microsoft.com)

Public Thread

Q: The RFP does not provide specific capabilities/requirements of the system, or a listing of required capabilities. Is this RFP to establish just the generic SAAS/software platform procurement? If so, then how are you procuring the services needed to the configure the software to match specific needs, the details of which are not provided in the RFP materials?

Question added by: Mike Graef

4/8/2021 8:21 AM MDT

A: As this is a solutions based RFP, the State has not provided the solution that vendors are to meet in responding to this RFP. Rather, the responsibility is on the Offeror to identify the solution, and then demonstrate through its provided metrics the requirements, features, and characteristics it meets within its proposed solution.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 11:34 AM MDT

Subject = Scope of Customer Engagement (Acivilate, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: Is Citizen engagement limited to transactional services (complete a form, pay a fee) or does it extend to relational services (multiple interactions such as child welfare cases)?

Question added by: Louise Wasilewski

4/8/2021 7:47 AM MDT

A: Both offerings that you have described are within the scope of this solicitation.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 11:34 AM
MDT

Subject = Award Categories (CityBase, Inc.)**Public Thread**

Q: Which award category does digital services - digitization of forms, process automation - fit into?

Question added by: Michael Duffy

4/8/2021 7:41 AM MDT

A: As "digital services" encompasses a wide variety of services Offeror is to review the Award Categories within the context of its digital services, and self select and demonstrate how it meets the requirements of that Category. Depending on the extent of Offeror's services, the complete service may also fall within a related value add item as allowed for in the RFP.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/13/2021 8:58 AM MDT

Subject = Award Categories (CityBase, Inc.)**Public Thread**

Q: Which award category does payments fit into?

Question added by: Michael Duffy

4/8/2021 7:40 AM MDT

A: As "payments" encompass a wide variety of options Offeror is to review the Award Categories within the context of its payment offerings, and self select and demonstrate how it meets the requirements of that Category. Depending on extent of Offeror's payment services, payments may also fall within a related value add item as allowed for in the RFP.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/22/2021 8:56 AM MDT

Subject = Award Categories (CityBase, Inc.)**Public Thread**

Q: Please elaborate on the requirements, features, and characteristics of the "Customer Engagement" award category. Does it include activities such as payment?

Question added by: Michael Duffy

4/8/2021 7:40 AM MDT

A: It is the responsibility of the Offeror seeking an award in a given Category to demonstrate it is the industry expert to service that Category. Offeror is to demonstrate through provided metrics the requirements, features, and characteristics it meets within its proposed solution. If Offeror offers activities such as Payment, it may use that as part of its demonstration that it is the industry expert.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/13/2021 9:00 AM MDT

Subject = 3: Vendor's Submission (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)**Public Thread**

Q: Section 3.13 only allows for the upload of one file, but the instructions indicate an Offeror should upload "any exceptions to the Terms and Conditions must be uploaded here in the format outlined in Prerequisites: Standard Terms and Conditions (Exceptions and Negotiations). Further, any vendor terms and end user agreements (EULAs) required by your firm must also be uploaded here in the format outlined in Prerequisites: Standard Terms and Conditions (Exceptions and Negotiations)." Please either modify the procurement site to allow for uploading of the two referenced files or revise the instructions to allow for Offerors to upload one combined file that contains both exceptions to the Terms and Conditions and EULAs.

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/7/2021 4:15 PM MDT

A: Please upload a single zipped folder with the contents requested by the Prerequisite: Standard Terms and Conditions (Exceptions and Negotiations).

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/12/2021 4:30 PM MDT

Subject = 3: Vendor's Submission (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)**Public Thread**

Q: Section 3.11 only allows for the upload of one file, but the instructions indicate an Offeror should "upload your Claim of Business Confidentiality Form (Attachment G) here as well as your redacted proposal." Please either modify the procurement site to allow for uploading of the two referenced files or revise the instructions to allow for Offerors to upload one combined file that contains both Attachment G and the redacted proposal response.

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/7/2021 4:15 PM MDT

A: Please upload a single zipped folder with the requested contents.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/12/2021 4:48 PM MDT

Subject = 2: Vendor Information (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)		Public Thread
Q: Section 2.9 includes instructions indicating an Offeror should "submit an external employment form signed by Offeror's manager at the State of Utah" but no upload option exists for this item. Please modify the procurement site to allow for the upload of a file for this section.	Question added by: Tere Ramserran	4/7/2021 4:15 PM MDT
A: The RFP has been amended to allow for a file upload if an Offeror selects "Yes" to Question 2.9. Question 10 appears to an Offeror who selects "Yes" on Question 2.9.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/12/2021 4:46 PM MDT
Subject = 1: Acceptance of Prerequisites (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)		Public Thread
Q: There is no item 1.5. Was this an intention choice on the part of the procurement team or will an additional item be added to the "Acceptance of Prerequisites" list?	Question added by: Tere Ramserran	4/7/2021 4:14 PM MDT
A: Question 1.5 only appears if you have selected "No" on Question 1.4. Question 1.5 allows for the requisite uploads if "No" is selected on Question 1.4.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/12/2021 4:34 PM MDT
Subject = 1: Acceptance of Prerequisites (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)		Public Thread
Q: Section 1.4 includes instructions indicating an Offeror should "upload such information in the space provided below" if they select "No" for this item, but no upload option exists for this item. Please modify the procurement site to allow for the upload of a file for this section.	Question added by: Tere Ramserran	4/7/2021 4:14 PM MDT
A: Once you have selected "No" the system will provide Question 1.5 where you can upload the requisite information. Until you have selected "No" in response to Question 1.4, Question 1.5 will not appear to you.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/12/2021 4:33 PM MDT
Subject = 3: Vendor's Submission (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)		Public Thread
Q: Section 3.10 only allows for the upload of one file, but the instructions indicate an Offeror should "upload its complete detailed product offering / price catalog here, for each Category it is seeking an award in". Please either modify the procurement site to allow for uploading of multiple files per RFP section or revise the instructions to allow for Offerors to upload one combined file that contains all responses to that Section for the category(ies) an Offeror is seeking an award in.	Question added by: Tere Ramserran	4/7/2021 4:14 PM MDT
A: The RFP has been amended to allow for individual file uploads for each of the required Attachments for each available Award Category.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/12/2021 5:02 PM MDT
Subject = 3: Vendor's Submission (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)		Public Thread
Q: Sections 3.3 through 3.7 only allow for the upload of one file per section, but the instructions indicate an Offeror should "upload a separate, completed" version of the Attachments for each "category you are seeking an award in." Please either modify the procurement site to allow for uploading of multiple files per RFP section or revise the instructions to allow for Offerors to upload one combined file that contains all responses to that Section for the category(ies) an Offeror is seeking an award in.	Question added by: Tere Ramserran	4/7/2021 4:14 PM MDT
A: The RFP has been amended to allow for individual file uploads for each of the required Attachments for each available Award Category	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/12/2021 4:57 PM MDT
Subject = Participating State / Entity Use (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)		Public Thread

Q: If a state participates in the NASPO Citizen Engagement Platform RFP, is that state required to contract for services through the MSA? Or can a state contract outside of the Citizen Engagement Platform MSA?

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/7/2021 4:13 PM MDT

A: That is a State specific determination that we do not have information on what they will require. States named in Attachment I are in no way obligated to sign participating addenda or otherwise utilize the master agreements resulting from this RFP. Any decision to utilize the master agreements—whether exclusively or in addition to other current or future contracts for Citizen Engagement Platform products and services—is at the discretion of each state.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/13/2021 3:15 PM MDT

Subject = Expectations for Deliverables by the Cond. Proc. U (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: How does NASPO define the use of subcontractors? What constitutes a subcontractor?

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/7/2021 4:13 PM MDT

A: For purposes of this solicitation a Subcontractor is includes contractors, manufacturers, distributors, suppliers, or consultants, at any tier, who are not the actual Contractor (contract holder) that are under the direct or indirect control or responsibility of Contractor, including a person or entity that is, or will be, providing goods or performing services pursuant to this Contract.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/16/2021 11:35 AM MDT

Subject = Attachment D. 4 – Real World Use Plan (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: Can NASPO provide additional information about the expected content and/or an example of a completed Real World Use Plan template?

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/7/2021 4:13 PM MDT

A: Please refer to the published Attachment D.5 and Description of Solicitation Process documents. Beyond the information provided therein, it is the responsibility of the Offeror seeking an award in a given Category to determine what content and metrics are appropriate for it to demonstrate in the Real World Use Plan and put forth in an effort to demonstrate it is the industry expert to service that Category.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/13/2021 9:03 AM MDT

Subject = Attachment D.4 – Service Plan (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: Can NASPO provide additional information about the expected content and/or an example of a completed Service Plan template?

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/7/2021 4:13 PM MDT

A: Please refer to the published Attachment D.4 and Description of Solicitation Process documents. Beyond the information provided therein, it is the responsibility of the Offeror seeking an award in a given Category to determine what content and metrics are appropriate for the Service Plan to put forth in an effort to demonstrate it is the industry expert to service that Category.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/13/2021 9:04 AM MDT

Subject = Award Categories (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: For the duration of the contract, are offerors limited to the categories in which they initially seek awards?

Question added by: Tere Ramserran

4/7/2021 4:12 PM MDT

A: To be considered for additional Award Categories that would require Utah to re-open the solicitation, which it has the option to do so. Please refer the section on Future Procurements wherein it is provided - The State of Utah reserves the right and may reopen this solicitation, or create a new solicitation if it determines there may be more competition for the procurement item than when the original solicitation was posted.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/13/2021 3:15 PM MDT

Subject = Purpose of this Solicitation (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)

Public Thread

Q: What states/projects plan for implementations by end of 2021?	Question added by: Tere Ramserran	4/7/2021 4:12 PM MDT
A: This has been removed from the solicitation.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/13/2021 9:04 AM MDT
Subject = Maximus Questions Submitted on April 7, 2021 (MAXIMUS Health Services, Inc.)		Public Thread
Q: See attached file. Please confirm it is permissible to submit multiple questions via attachment as opposed to submitting individual questions via this form. Sincerely, Jacob Whitlow MaximusHealthProposals@maximus.com	Question added by: Tere Ramserran	4/7/2021 1:44 PM MDT
Maximus - RFP KM21-47 - UT Customer Engagement Platform - April 7 Submitted Questions.pdf - ../Attachments/QABoardAttachments/Maximus - RFP KM21-47 - UT Customer Engagement Platform - April 7 Submitted Questions.pdf		
A: Please submit individual questions. Individual questions will then be answered individually.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/7/2021 2:01 PM MDT
Subject = Individual Proposals (Pegasystems)		Public Thread
Q: The summary docket calls out "An individual proposal must be submitted for each Category Offeror is seeking an award in". Does this mean there should be multiple attachment documents to represent the response for each respective category? (example. Multiple submissions of Attachment B, highlighting personal per project category)	Question added by: Bradley Rach	4/7/2021 10:30 AM MDT
A: The RFP has been amended to allow for individual file uploads for each of the required Attachments for each available Award Category.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/12/2021 4:28 PM MDT
Subject = Proposal Submission (Oracle Corp)		Public Thread
Q: Can we submit our proposal/response outside of the portal (Utah Public Procurement Place)?	Question added by: Monica Howard	4/6/2021 4:18 PM MDT
A: No. Proposals must be submitted through the U3P portal as provided in the published RFP.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/7/2021 7:58 AM MDT
Subject = Qualified Bidders (Acivilate, Inc.)		Public Thread
Q: May an original software publisher partner with an integrator to deliver at scale (or is the subcontractor ban explicitly intended to limit scope to large companies with a bench of employee resources?)	Question added by: Terry Wolf	4/6/2021 7:36 AM MDT
A: The software publisher may partner with an integrator. However, the proposal to the State and the resulting master agreement must be with the original software publisher.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/7/2021 3:49 PM MDT
Q: The response to this question on 4/7/2021 at 5:49 PM EDT that "The software publisher may partner with an integrator. However, the proposal to the State and the resulting master agreement must be with the original software publisher." If Company A is the software publisher for a platform (e.g., ServiceNow as traded under NOW on the NYSE, AWS, Salesforce, others) and Company B is a system integrator certified to implement the platform of Company A – can you confirm that only Company A is an offeror eligible for award?	Question added by: Mike Rockenstein	4/14/2021 4:34 PM MDT
A: In the presented scenario, it is correct that only Company A would be eligible to be evaluated for an award.	Answered by: Solomon Kingston	4/19/2021 3:50 PM MDT
Subject = Award Categories (Acivilate, Inc.)		Public Thread
Q: 1. Platform Management indicates Customers are public entities. 4. Customer Engagement says "to manage multiple interactions with customers." Between the public entity and whom are these interactions? Is it citizen interactions with public entities? (i.e. does customer meet citizen in 4?)	Question added by: Terry Wolf	4/6/2021 7:34 AM MDT

A: Yes, that is correct.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/7/2021 3:48 PM MDT

Subject = Expectations for Deliverables item 12 (TaTa Consultancy)**Public Thread**

Q: The RFP states that the successful offeror is the original software publisher for the proposed solution. and that Proposals will NOT be accepted from software resellers. Is it intended that no vendor that is a systems integrator using third party software to propose a solution will not be allowed to submit a proposal. By default, SIs will use software to deliver systems and solutions that are not their own published software. Please clarify and thank you

Question added by: Alan Hansen

4/5/2021 2:19 PM MDT

A: It is correct that proposals will only be accepted from the original software publisher. The original software publisher may nonetheless utilize the resources of a 3rd party systems integrator under the awarded master agreement.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

5/4/2021 8:58 AM MDT

Subject = RE: Citizen Engagement Platform (Oracle Corp)**Public Thread**

Q: Hello, Are you only considering software or SaaS solutions, or would you also be open to a private cloud solution where the hardware lives on site with the state but Oracle manages the hardware, and the state pays a monthly fee, like any cloud solution?

Question added by: Brenda Bellerose

4/5/2021 1:20 PM MDT

A: What you have described is within the scope of this RFP.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/7/2021 3:47 PM MDT

Subject = RFP Query for SS-NIAID-2067766 Professional State (SevenOutsource)**Public Thread**

Q: 1. Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this? (like, from India or Canada) 2. Whether we need to come over there for meetings? 3. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada) 4. Can we submit the proposals via email?

Question added by: Steve Walse

4/2/2021 8:00 AM MDT

A: 1. Please refer to the published terms and conditions (Attachment A), 2. It depends on the requirements of an individual Participating State. 3. It depends on the requirements of an individual Participating State. 4. As provided in this published RFP all responses are to be submitted through the Utah Public Procurement Place (U3P) portal. Emailed proposals will not be accepted.

Answered by: Solomon Kingston

4/2/2021 9:08 AM MDT