



August 11, 2022

A D D E N D U M #2
To
RFP #22-022
Community Development System

PLEASE FIND LIST OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS BELOW:

1. Will the bid bond be refunded to the unsuccessful bidders upon contract award to the winning bidder?
 - a. Yes, upon award, bonds will be returned to their proposers. An addendum has been issued clarifying this requirement. Please see the City's eBID portal for complete details as issued through Addendum 1. Please review the addendum and include with your proposal submission.
2. Will the City accept an insurance certificate in lieu of detailed insurance policies?
 - a. Yes, insurance certificates would need to be provided upon award. Additional related details can be found on attachment A3, City's Standard Terms & Conditions.
3. What is the City's financial commitment to this project?
 - a. Only funds necessary for the completion of the RFP are included in FY22. However, the City is committed to the transition and has planned to include funds necessary for the project to be tuned based upon pricing received with RFP responses.
4. What are the City's goals related to the timeline of the project and budgetary considerations?
 - a. Upon contract award, our goal is to start implementation as soon as possible, going live with portions of the awarded solution in January, although the schedule will need to be flexible. All proposals must include a preliminary schedule for implementation as outlined in section 6.3.2 of the RFP narrative.
 - b. While budget is a factor in scoring proposals, it isn't the only criteria being considered (see section 1.9 of the RFP narrative). It is the City's desire to minimize to the greatest extent possible the quantity of product features available in order to control scope creep, while meeting all of our functional requirements.
5. Does the City have a dedicated budget for this project? Will the City consider proposal with cost proposals higher than budgeted?
 - a. See questions #3 & #4.
6. When are funds available for the new fiscal year?
 - a. October 1st

7. Was there a consultant that assisted with the RFP development, who was it?
 - a. Yes
 - b. Sciens Consulting
8. Has the City used an outside consultant/firm in assistance with this RFP document? If so, which individuals/firms?
 - a. See question #7.
9. On attachment A2, Functional Requirements Response Form, on the Permits/Inspections tab, there is a section for Service Requests. Is this intentional and can you clarify what the City is looking for?
 - a. Yes, these are intentionally included here as they broadly relate to inspections/requests of various types.
 - b. Inspections are defined broadly as being something as minor as a code compliance report from a resident, to a contractor request for inspection. Whereas in most other tabs the specific workflow for the output parent activity (Planning, Zoning, Code Enforcement) is categorized and defined, here the output activity for the actual inspection (regardless of type and its relation to the parent activity) is categorized and may be slightly different based on the workflow of the parent activity.
10. On attachment A2, Functional Requirement Response Form, are Service Requests intended to address functionality required through the City website?
 - a. Yes. These may occur in any, some, or all scenarios where an outside customer, regardless of type, interacts with the city through a web portal.
11. How many licenses will be required by the City of Keller?
 - a. The City prefers to have a site license with unlimited users as outlined in section 8.1.2 of the RFP narrative. However, this is not a requirement with the City anticipating a need of 30 licenses being used concurrently for the proposed solution.
 - b. The City anticipates having ~41 total users as outlined in section 2.4, with only the aforementioned 30 licenses maximum being consumed by those users at any given time.
12. The RFP narrative doesn't specifically address Business License Management, but a tab exists on Attachment A2, Functional Requirements Response Form, for licenses. Was this included intentionally and should it be included as a part of the scope?
 - a. Yes, this was included intentionally.
 - b. Yes, this should be included as a part of the scope.
13. How many licenses would be required for Business License Management?
 - a. The City prefers to have a site license with unlimited users as outlined in section 8.1.2 of the RFP narrative. However, this is not a requirement with the City anticipating a maximum need of 5 licenses for Business License Management being used concurrently.
14. Why is the city more interested in a site license vs. defined quantity of licenses?
 - a. A site license is preferred in order to reduce confusion when all licenses are consumed. We are willing to consider either option that is the most cost effective for your solution.
15. Of the defined quantity of 30 software licenses, how many of those would be tied to mobile-only and how many would need access to both mobile and desktop versions?
 - a. The City does not anticipate having any mobile-only users.
 - b. All licenses would need to be available for use on desktop versions, with a maximum of 12 concurrent users also needing access to mobile versions of the proposed solution.

16. How many of the 30 users would need a license to perform markups with a 3rd party electronic plan review software?
 - a. The City will have more than 30 users of the solution as outlined in section 2.4 of the RFP narrative, but would have no more than 30 licensed users using the solution at any given time.
 - b. The City prefers a site license with unlimited users as outlined in section 8.1.2 of the RFP narrative. However, this is not a requirement with the City anticipating a maximum need of 20 licenses for electronic plan review used concurrently.

17. How many total users would the City like to have for pricing purposes? How many would be mobile?
 - a. See questions #11, #13, #15 and #16.

18. Does the City have a preference of an on-premise or SAAS solution?
 - a. The City is open to consider either solution as outlined in 1.3.2 of the RFP narrative.

19. What are you trying to avoid this implementation so that our expectations are in line with what you are hoping to achieve with a fully pre-configured solution?
 - a. The City desires a solution which is configured to our business process and/or best practices by the vendor as outlined in section 1.3.2 of the RFP narrative. Over the history of our current solution, we've configured it multiple ways to meet the needs of the time, without consideration of how it would be used in the future, often resulting in disparate or disjointed workflows and data storage. Our intention is to have a system with pre-defined workflows in order reduce the amount of workflow changes over time, streamline staff training time, and provide a positive customer experience. Additionally, it is important to the City that the vendor perform the data conversion functions by cleaning and bringing in our legacy data into the proposed solution.

20. Will staff be available for user acceptance training?
 - a. Yes, staff will be made available for this purpose.

21. What are your biggest challenges with the previous software and what problems are you trying to solve?
 - a. The City sees its main challenge being data warehousing, fragmentation, suboptimal workflows, vendor & external customer support.
 - b. The City desires to solve some of those issues by requiring responsive vendor support (outlined throughout section 4 of the RFP narrative), pre-configured workflows and a comprehensive conversion of existing data by the vendor, or their third-party, to meet the parameters of the new solution.

22. What kind of internal resources does the City have and is willing to dedicate to a project of this scope?
 - a. The City will provide a Project Manager and staff required for user acceptance of the awarded solution. Staff has already been identified and grouped based on roles in the decision making and change management process. Data conversion will primarily be a vendor-led effort with staff providing guidance and decision making as needed.

23. Is environmental health included and do we need to include environmental health processes, inspections, and reporting?
 - a. Yes, environmental health and related processes would be included, however it is not a service that we currently utilize.
 - b. Please include proposed pricing so that we may consider for the future.

24. Has the City met with vendors pertaining to the scope of this RFP in the past 12 months? If so, which vendors? Did demonstrations take place?
 - a. Yes, staff from the City met with various vendors in the last year to learn what solutions were available.
 - b. Either virtually or in a conference setting, staff from the City met with vendors from Tyler Technologies, Novotx, Cityworks, Brightly, OpenGov, iWorq, MyGov, and GovPilot.
 - c. Yes, for iWorq, MyGov, and GovPilot.

25. How many years of data will need to be migrated to the new system?
 - a. All existing data will need to be migrated, equivalent to 20 years of data. See section 6.9 of the RFP narrative for more details.
 - b. Data will need to be exported, cleaned, and imported into the new system by the proposing vendor. If the vendor does not perform these functions, identify a partner firm which you have previously worked with successfully that performs these functions.

26. Approximately how many reports will the City need by go-live?
 - a. The City expects that the vendor will provide a set of pre-canned reports and the option to create City-specific reports for go-live. Please include pricing for each custom report.

27. Does the City currently use Multifactor Authentication (MFA) with any of its deployed systems?
 - a. Yes. The City has recently implemented use of Microsoft Authenticator to a limited number of deployed systems. Several other enterprise applications use SSO with Active Directory.

28. How many data sources does data that needs to be converted currently reside in?
 - a. The City currently utilizes 3 data sources which warehouse this information, one SQL database which contains all data for the current solution, and another for SSRS reports. Attachments for the existing solution are stored on a server locally.

CONTRACTOR INFORMATION:

Company name

Company representative signature

Address

Company representative printed name

City, State & Zip

Title

Area code & telephone number

Date

***** THIS PAGE MUST BE COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED WITH YOUR RFP
OR THE RFP MAY BE REJECTED *****