

Request for Proposal

RFP No. IT-2014-001: Online Meeting Management Solution



Addendum #1: Questions and Answers

November 27, 2014

Information Technology Department
County of Middlesex
Administration Offices
399 Ridout St. N.
London, ON N6A 2P1

Please note the following questions and answers to the original RFP release*:

<i>Questions Related to Mandatory Requirements of the RFP</i>		
<i>Question #</i>	<i>Question</i>	<i>Answer</i>
1	Is there a questionnaire or excel sheet of questions that we can fill out where the questions are rated? Or, are we expected to compile our own document with our responses to the questions in the RFP?	No, there is no questionnaire or excel sheet to fill out for rated questions. See section 2 of the RFP. It is the responsibility of each respective Proponent to review the RFP and provide a proposal which confirms and demonstrates compliance with all of the stated mandatory requirements. The strength and the ease at which the characteristics of the mandatory features (section 4a 1-13) provided in proposal meet the County's needs will be rated/assessed/ scored by the County in accordance with the Rated Requirements Evaluation Criteria set out in section 5b of the RFP.
2	Is it required for Proponents to be all Canadian?	No, however, the strength of the security characteristics to all non-public content provided in any proposal, a required feature, would be rated/evaluated under the Rated Requirements Evaluation Criteria so long as the proposal met all other mandatory requirements of the RFP.
3	We host data securely with stringent security standards in accordance with the laws of Canada. Our servers are certified in terms of the requirements by law and even more. That said, since we do not offer a customized solution hosted on your end, does this requirement disqualify us as a potential vendor/service provider?	<p>See sections 1 and 4 of the RFP: the County requires an online agenda management solution which uses/integrates with existing County owned infrastructure and software and is able to use/integrate with any existing infrastructure and software of Municipal Partner Entities to host the online agenda management solution. This is a mandatory feature under section 4)a)1. of the RFP.</p> <p>See section 5 of the RFP – Evaluation Methodology. In the event a proposal was provided which did not provide an online agenda management solution which uses/integrates with existing County owned infrastructure and software and is able to use/integrate with any existing infrastructure and software of any potential Municipal Partner Entity to host the online agenda management solution, such proposal would be considered non-compliant with a mandatory requirement, would unable to be saved by the doctrine of substantial compliance because the deviation would not be considered minor, and the strength of the mandatory requirements provided would be unable to be evaluated/scored under the Rated Requirements Evaluation Criteria of the RFP.</p> <p>The County is seeking an online agenda management solution which is hosted by the County for its own use and is hosted either by a Municipal Partner Entity or the County for each of the four Municipal Partner Entities.</p>
4	Is the intention for the	The County requires that the online agenda management

	software to be installed on County servers and the Municipal Partner Entities choose the online environment? or does the County want to provide hosted portals for the Municipal Partner Entities?	solution be installed on County servers for the County's own use and for the Municipal Partner Entities to be able to choose whether the online agenda management solution is installed on its own server or the County hosts the online agenda management solution on behalf of each Municipal Partner Entity. The online agenda management solution needs to fully function if the Municipal Partner Entities choose to host the software or if the County hosts the software on their behalf.
5	Can you provide a list of the five Municipal Partner entities that might be included in the project?	No. The identities of the specific Municipal Partner Entities have not been determined at this time because the intention is for the solution to function for whomever the unspecified Municipal Partner Entities are and for the identities to be determined at a later date.
6	In section 4)a)5., it the RFP states "include a Publish Feature which can notify staff, the public and elected officials through email or iPad app of newly published agendas". Is there a requirement for the public to be able to sign up for notifications via the County website, or is it adequate if a clerk or administration enters the user into the system manually?	Yes. It is a requirement that the public to be able to sign up for notifications using the County web site to receive notification that a newly published agenda has been posted.
7	In section 4)a)7., the RFP states "provide for offline agenda viewing for iPad and PC;". Is the ability to create/edit/use offline annotations on a PC a requirement?	No, the ability to create/edit/use offline annotations on a PC is <u>not</u> a requirement.
8	The infrastructure requirement in section 4)c) appears to be the setup for a web server. What other servers are available at the County for installation? Are windows servers used?	See section 4)c) Existing Infrastructure Requirement: the County is <u>not</u> seeking a public facing Windows based server.
Questions Related to Potential Contract		
Question #	Question	Answer
9	Is there a timeline for a decision being made or implementation starting?	No. Proposals will be evaluated on December 4 th , 2014, however, as noted in section 3 of the RFP, there is no certainty that there will be a contract approved by County

		<p>Council or that there will be a staff recommendation made to County Council at all. In the event there is an award to this RFP, however, the award would be a recommendation made by Staff to County Council with a corresponding ability for the successful proponent to discuss a potential contract with County Council.</p> <p>In the event Council were to ultimately decide to endorse a contract for services with a successful Proponent, however, it would seek to move forward with implementation as soon as possible.</p>
10	<p>Can the County confirm the details in which the security deposit would be held? We are used to 3 year terms, I realize that you specify a 1 year term and 2 extensions of this term – would the deposit be held for the original 1 year term or the full 3 years?</p>	<p>The <i>Municipal Act, 2001</i> requires the County to have a Purchasing Policy for the procurement of goods and services. The County's Purchasing Policy requires a 10% security deposit in service contracts with any consultant/service provider.</p> <p>See Section 3 of the RFP.</p> <p>There is no certainty that there will be a contract endorsed by County Council or that there will be a staff recommendation made to County Council. In the event there is an award to this RFP, the award would be a Staff recommendation and ability to discuss a potential contract with County Council.</p> <p>Any discussion with respect to a draft or form contract at County Council would begin with a form of consultant contract that is generally acceptable to the County (is not a Service Level Agreement of a provider) which includes the General and Special Conditions noted in the RFP and other terms which could be discussed/negotiated during a discussion with County Council.</p> <p>No particular term is definite, for such is ultimately up to County Council, however, the County is considering at this time a potential one (1) year term, which would allow it to sample the online agenda management solution, with potentially two renewal options of three (3) years each at the election of the County. Such idea is under consideration only at this time and the County reserves the right to change its direction with respect to term at any time prior to endorsement of any contract by the County.</p> <p>In the event that County Council were to endorse a contract for a one (1) year term with two renewal options of three (3) years each at the election of the County:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a 10% security deposit on the value of the one year definite term would be held by the County for the one year term, which would be eligible for return at the end of that one year term in the event of complete performance by the consultant/service provider. - In the event a three year extension option was exercised by the County at the end of year 1, a 10% security deposit on the value of the three year definite term would be held by the County for the three year extension, which would be eligible for return at the end of the three year term in the event of complete performance by the consultant/service provider. - In the event the second three year option was exercised by the County at the end of year 4, a 10% security deposit on the value of the additional definite three year term would be held by the County for the additional three year extension, which would be eligible returned at the end of those three years in the event of complete performance by the consultant/service provider.
11	Our SLA's include stringent performance metrics with clear financial implications, is this a suitable alternative to the security deposit?	No. See answer to question 10 above.
12	Can you please outline the occasions which would constitute a breach in contract, such that the security deposit is not returned?	<p>Municipalities hold security deposits on consultant/service contracts in order to ensure that all of the services are completed in the manner set out in the contract and in the event they are not, there is some money on hand for the municipality to use in order to hire a replacement to complete the unfinished or defaulted upon portions of the contract.</p> <p>A breach would include the failure to provide what was promised in such contract. Two examples of a breach are a consultant/ service provider's refusal to provide that which it agreed to provide in the contract or the provision of a deficient product/services which do not meet the promises specified in the contract.</p> <p>The ultimate use of security deposits is not an ideal scenario for municipalities and municipalities prefer for consultant/service provider contracts to be completed without the municipality's use of a security deposit...but as a</p>

		reality in today's environment, the security deposit required.
--	--	--

** Some questions submitted needed to be edited or paraphrased in order to ensure the question and its answer apply to potential proponents to the RFP in generic fashion*