The following is additional information regarding Request for Proposal # DIT-160105, titled **Development and Implementation of Critical IT Processes:** **Portfolio Management and Business Relationship Manageme**nt. RFP-160105 was released on 06/10/11, and the due date and time for responses is 06/27/16 @ 10am PST. This addendum includes both questions from prospective proposers and the City’s answers, and revisions to the RFP. This addendum is hereby made part of the RFP and therefore, the information contained herein shall be taken into consideration when preparing and submitting a proposal.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item # | Date Received | Date Answered | Vendor’s Question | City’s Response | RFP Revisions |
| 1 |  | 6/16/16 |  | Update RFP-DIT-160108 RFP Title to:  **Development and Implementation of Critical IT Processes: Portfolio Management and Business Relationship Management** | On Page 1 of the RFP Document, and any other document that references of the Title of this RFP, the title shall be updated as follows:  **Development and Implementation of Critical IT Processes– Project Portfolio Management and Business Relationship Management** |
| 2 |  | 06/16/16 |  | Add Attachment G: Seattle IT Contract Terms and Conditions to RFP.  Attachment G will be posted on the Consultant Connection. | On Page 17 of the RFP document, add “See Attachment G” under City’s Terms and Conditions.  **City’s Terms and Conditions**    See Attachment G |
| 3 | 06/16/16 | 06/16/16 | Reading RFP Sections 6, 7.12 and 9.6 together, may vendors submit proposals with proposed amendments and/or additions to the contract terms without being bound to the current terms? | Yes -Consultants may submit proposed changes to the City terms and conditions. However, with that said, the City may or may not negotiate aspects of the terms and conditions. If the consultant who is awarded the contract refuses to sign the Contract form, the City may reject the Consultant. |  |
| 4 | 06/16/16 | 06/16/16 | Alternatively, would the City of Seattle consider use of contract terms previously negotiated and executed with a vendor for this project?” | No – Each contract is its own independent agreement, and stand alone. |  |
| 5 | 06/17/16 | 06/17/16 | How many copies of the proposal are expected? 7 or 8? | Please provide 8 Total copies. 1 marked Original, 7 marked copies.  In addition, provide one electronic copy. | On page 8 of the RFP under **Hard Copy Submittal** replace first paragraph with:  The Proposer must submit seven (8) hardcopy sets of all proposal documents; one (1) set clearly marked original and ~~six~~ seven (7) sets clearly marked copy; and one (1) electronic CD/Flash Drive copy. The original and copies shall be in 3-ring binders. |
| 6 | 06/17/16 | 06/17/16 | Is there a target amount of WMBE participation the City is looking for on this RFP? | There is not a target amount of WMBE participation the City is looking.  Attachment E – WMBE Inclusion Plan will be scored under the following criteria (Found on page 4 of Attachment E):   * Responsible, sincere good faith efforts. * Aspirational goals that are meaningful. City experience on similar projects will provide comparative data for scoring. Such data is available on-line at seattle.gov/business or from the City Project Manager. * WMBE firms integrated into your team and within core work * WMBE firms integrated within value-added work opportunities * Evidence of effective mentoring, training, or capacity-building. * Strategies that assure WMBE utilization in all likely phases. * Evidence of strong past performance using effective models. |  |
| 7 | 06/17/16 | 06/17/16 | What type of time-keeping is in play with the project? A System? | This RFP is for best overall strategy – no tools or systems. |  |
| 8 | 06/17/16 | 06/17/16 | What is driving the work performance time frame September – December? | Seattle IT has already consolidated into one department. We have an urgent need to have set processes and strategies in place. |  |
| 9 | 06/17/16 | 06/17/16 | What type of materials do you want set aside for implementation? | The materials you provide for implementation would be dependent upon the strategy you propose.  While the RFP provides a scope of work and a list of possible tasks, the City is open to your firms’ proposal that would best benefit the City in its current situation.  In Attachment C, Written Proposal under number 2 Statement of Work: there is opportunity for your firm to propose addition/deletion of deliverables the City provides. |  |
| 10 | 06/17/16 | 06/17/16 | Will we have access to City of Seattle SME’s during the RFP engagement to help understand what has worked and what hasn’t? | No – You may ask questions through the RFP coordinator, Laura Park, to ask questions that will help you understand what has worked and what hasn’t.  Once a successful proposer is apparent for award, and then a contract executed, engagement between the selected firm and the Project Managers may begin. |  |
| 11 | 06/17/16 | 06/20/16 | If selected for the project, will the vendor have access to the City’s SME’s during the engagement to help navigate the existing process, templates and so forth. We want to make sure to understand what has worked in the past and what hasn't and typically the best way to accomplish that is from working with SMEs. | Yes. With the help of the project manager the consultant will have access to City’s SMEs to assess existing processes and templates. |  |
| 12 | 6/20/16 | 06/20/16 |  |  | On Attachment D, Financial Proposal Form, update the following:  Scope 1: Tasks 1-~~5~~ 4 $  Scope 2: Tasks ~~6~~ 5-6 $  6/20/16: A new form will be uploaded to Consultant Connection to reflect these changes. |
| 13 | 6/20/16 | 6/21/16 | On page 1 of the RFP, it says “It is critical the BRM program be ready to engage with departments and be ready to begin developing 2018 plans by September 2016.” The engagement is scheduled from September to December 2016. Will the 2018 plans be modified based on the Consultant’s work with the BRM program? Or, will the Consultant’s work with the BRM program help to develop 2019 and future plans? | This is a typo. The city always develop plans in the fall for the following year. That said, we are scheduled to engage with departments for 2017 work plans from October to mid-November of 2016. The consultant’s deliverables will inform the work plans for 2017 but will mostly be used for 2018 and beyond, since the due dates do not align. |  |
| 14 | 6/20/16 | 6/21/16 | Can the city please clarify if Scope 1 and Scope 2 are expected to occur simultaneously or consecutively between September 2016 and December 2016 or is the City requesting vendors submit a timeline of activities? | Scopes 1 & 2 will occur simultaneously, or; there may be a natural sequencing between deliverables of scope 1 and scope 2 that emerges as the requirements are more fully defined.  We also would like to see the timeline and activities from the vendor for that time frame |  |
| 15 | 6/20/16 | 6/21/16 | Do vendors have to submit Attachment A "as provided" by the City or can vendors use their own format to answer the minimum requirements referenced in Attachment A? | Please use the form the City provided. You may format the form to fit your needs, or add additional pages if necessary. |  |
| 16 | 6/20/16 | 6/21/16 | Attachment A requires examples of past performance on similar engagements for named individuals and attachment C requires two public sector references. Can key personnel references (from Attachment A) overlap with the vendor's public sector references as required in Attachment C? | Yes |  |
| 17 | 6/20/16 | 6/21/16 | When identifying content that vendors would like to identify as exempt from public disclosure, the City requires vendors to identify the RCW exemption including the sub-heading (page 4 of Attachment B). Should vendors reference the existing RCW or should vendors cite the updated RCW exemption and sub-heading (if applicable) as shown in the screenshot below? | Please use the most current RCW exemption and subheading. |  |
| 18 | 6/20/16 | 6/21/16 | Pg 3. Last sentence of #1 - Purpose and Background. - ’It is critical the BRM program be ready to engage with departments and be ready to begin developing 2018 plans by September 2016.’  I was looking for clarification on the BRM program mentioned in the above statement. Is the BRM program referring to and including the Scope item - TASK 5 Business Relationship Management on pg.7? Meaning are you looking for delivery/completion of Scope item TASK 5 Business Relationship Management to be by September 2016? | This is a typo. The BRM Program are the deliverables associated with Business Relationship Management. |  |
| 19 | 6/20/16 | 6/21/16 | On Pg 10. Hard Copy Submittal.  'The Proposer must submit seven (8) hardcopy sets of all proposal documents; one (1) set clearly marked original and six (7) sets clearly marked copy; and one (1) electronic CD/Flash Drive copy. The original and copies shall be in 3-ring binders.’  Are you looking for each copy of the proposal (the original and copies) to each be in their own 3-ring binder? Or can all copies be in one 3-ring binder? | We would like the proposals to be in their own binders. |  |
| 20 | 6/20/16 | 6/21/16 | I have a question concerning SIT-160105 - Attachment E - WMBE Inclusion Plan.  Pg 4. - WMBE: WMBE firms are State certified or self-identified (at least 51% woman or minority owned per SMC 20.42). A WMBE shall self-register at: http://www.seattle.gov/html/business/contracting.htm    The link for self-registering as a WMBE does not work. It takes you to a page with the message: Page Not Available. | You can register your business on the City’s Online Business Directory. There you will be able to self-identify as a WMBE firm.  Here is the link to the Online Business Directory:  https:  web6.seattle.gov/FAS/OBD/Logon/Logon.aspx | Note: Attachment E has been updated with the correct link and has been reposted. |
| 21 | 6/21/16 | 6/21/16 | Is there a set funding target or range for this scope of work and can this be shared? Second, as it applies to “Task 6”, Future Planning is this considered over and above a funding target for this proposal scope? | The funding target or range for this scope of work cannot be shared at this time. The City would like to understand how each consultant firm will propose a solution for COS with the most competitive price the firm can offer.  Future Planning is considered within the same funding target for this project scope. |  |
| 22 | 6/21/16 | 6/21/16 | Are the “Wet” signatures truly required for both the Letter of Interest and the WMBE documentation, or will an electronic signature suffice? | Electronic signatures are acceptable. |  |
| 23 | 6/21/16 | 6/23/16 | Can you describe the number of staff that make up The Planning Division and for each of the following:  a. Project Management Office  b. Service Management Office  c. Project Portfolio Office | a) Project Management Office   * 1 – Manager (FTE) * 5 – Sr. Project Manager/Program Manager (5 FTE) * 9 – Sr. Project Manager (2 FTE, 7 Temporary) * 9 – Sr. Business Analyst (3 FTE, 6 Temporary)   b) Service Management Office   * 9 employees   c) Project Portfolio Office   * Citywide IT Portfolio Manager – 1 FTE * Citywide IT Portfolio Systems Analyst – 1 FTE * Citywide IT Portfolio Intern – 9 hours/week leaving in June |  |
| 24 | 6/21/16 | 6/23/16 | Can you describe the current intake process, number of projects per year proposed vs. approved and budget for projects that will be largely sufficient as an intake process? What are the areas of major concern with the current process? | Current Intake Process – See attached – Current process may vary from last documented process.  Areas of Major Concern   1. Inadequate Project/System Development Lifecycle Review Processes - Previous MITIE process reviewed projects at one point in time and was more focused on technology than business case or project management processes. Current processes in transition. Projects/Programs are rarely not approved. 2. Manual Processes – no automated processes, no workflow, no PPM tool 3. Inadequate staff – 2 FTEs for $440+ M portfolio with 174 active projects citywide. 4. • Constant Change in Environment – at every level, processes in flux and undocumented. Requires high level of support from Portfolio team.   Citywide IT Portfolio 2006 through Present     |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Year | # Projects on Portfolio | Dollar Value | | 2006 | 26 | $33,538,675 | | 2007 | 31 | $38,394,579 | | 2008 | 42 | $45,020,934 | | 2009 | 63 | $69,488,016 | | 2010 | 73 | $84,494,104 | | 2011 | 88 | $130,577,478 | | 2012 | 98 | $142,350,816 | | 2013 | 71 | $174,088,779 | | 2014 | 154 | $367,859,806 | | 2015 | 168 | $450,486,532 | | 2016\* | 174 | $440,883,394 |     \*As of 5/31/2016  cid:image003.png@01D1CC91.42AC7E20 |  |
| 25 | 6/21/16 | 6/23/16 | What is the size of the City’s team that the Consultant will interact with? | Seattle IT consists of 600+ employees. There will be representation from each department. So approximately 20-30 stakeholders. |  |
| 26 | 6/21/16 | 6/23/16 | Will the resource/capacity management function need to include non IT staff (e.g., City department staff, stakeholders, sponsors) or just IT staff within Seattle IT | IT staff within Seattle IT |  |
| 27 | 6/21/16 | Pending | How is resource management information currently captured? | • Estimates captured by named resource (or resource role) by week at the project level and operational level.  • Manager, project manager and individual can enter estimates.  • Can be updated weekly and reviewed bi-weekly.  • No actuals are being used. |  |
| 28 | 6/21/16 | 6/23/16 | How is project reporting and ‘dashboarding’ to management currently handled | We have a performance management lead who's developing and managing enterprise IT Dashboards. Project reporting is done via liquid planner. |  |
| 29 | 6/21/16 | 6/23/16 | What existing tools for project management, resource management and portfolio management are currently in place? | MS Project for project management. |  |
| 30 | 6/21/16 |  | Is the City exploring the adoption of a PPM solution/application in the future? | Tools or application is not part of this scope. Focus is needed for process only. |  |
| 31 | 6/21/16 | 6/23/16 | Is there a formal risk management department or organization that will be included in the risk management task 4? Where does this group reside in the organization? | There's no formal risk management department or group. |  |
| 32 | 6/21/16 | 6/23/16 | What is the expected budget for this project? | The expected budget is going to be equal to the value of the deliverables and effort spent to execute the work. We chose early on not to disclose the expected budget. |  |
| 33 | 6/23/16 | 6/23/16 | Will Seattle IT entertain an alternative approach than what is listed out in the scope of work in the RFP? | Yes- The intent of the scope of work and the tasks set forth in the Scope of Work/RFP is to give a guideline of what Seattle IT’s objectives are.  If a proposer has an alternative method that they would like to propose, please explain that alternative method in Attachment C, Written Proposal under Question 2. If a different approach is proposed, a detailed overview is encouraged so that Seattle IT may understand what is being proposed. |  |
| 34 | 6/23/16 | 6/23/16 | Can vendors submit pricing on an alternative approach? | Yes, please submit pricing on the approach your firm is proposing, either reflected in the given Scope of Work in the RFP, or the alternative approach your firm is proposing in Attachment C. |  |