



**CITY OF HOUSTON**  
**FINANCE DEPARTMENT**  
 Strategic Procurement Division

**Annise D. Parker**

Mayor

Carolyn Hanahan,  
 Acting Chief Procurement Officer  
 P.O. Box 1562  
 Houston, Texas 77251-1562  
<https://purchasing.houstontx.gov>

September 4, 2015

MEMORANDUM FOR: ALL PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS

FROM: Finance Department Strategic Procurement Division

SUBJECT: Addendum to RFP T25490 Procurement & Contract Management System

1. Below are the questions and requests submitted by vendors for clarification in accordance with the instructions provided in Part VI of the solicitation. The following changes and/or revisions have been incorporated into RFP T25490. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged

**CLARIFICATIONS TO QUESTIONS**

<b><i>Scope of Work Questions</i></b>	
<b>Question 1:</b>	Since this implementation of the new system will be involving multiple departments, will there be a liaison or project lead assigned as the central point of contact? This person would have the authority and be held accountable for the expedient turnaround of questions, requests and meeting requests with all departments.
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>There will be at least one Project Manager assigned to the project. Vendor is expected to assign a Project Manager for this initiative from their end.</i>
<b>Question 2:</b>	Will access be granted to the individual departments for subject matter expert interviews?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Yes, subject matters experts will be available throughout the project as needed.</i>
<b>Question 3:</b>	What is the City's current reporting system, given the fact that BW and BOBJ are not used?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>This is an incorrect assumption. City currently uses BOBJ with Rapid Mart technology for SAP reports. SAP BW is a project for FY 16. City also uses Tableaus for non-SAP reports.</i>
<b>Question 4:</b>	How much autonomy does each City department have when it comes to procurement and inventory?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>There is some level of autonomy with the department on procurement. Inventory is managed in City's System of Record-SAP. City's Strategic Procurement Division will be the point of contact for information on procurement and inventory.</i>

<b>Question 5:</b>	Is this project an attempt on the City's part to centralize procurement and reduce overall spending?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>yes</i>
<b>Question 6:</b>	What is the platform for the City's catalog solution? Is everything purchased on this site done with P-cards?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>MarketPlace is the only catalog system currently used by City and it uses P-Card as one of the options. The other option is Purchase Orders.</i>
<b>Question 7:</b>	What is the City's expectation for consultant resources to be on site
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>City expects the proposer to provide efficient and effective resources to make the project successful. City is open to onsite, hybrid and any other proven models in the industry that is cost effective.</i>
<b>Question 8:</b>	Will you allow remote work and offshore work?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>See response to Question 7.</i>
<b>Question 9:</b>	How many IT resources will the City assign to the project? Will they be both functional and technical? Will there be business resources available to discuss requirement in detail?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>There will be City resources assigned to the project based on the requirements of the project. See responses to Question 1 and 2. Proposer is expected to provide project team for implementation purposes.</i>
<b>Question 10:</b>	What are the core business hours for the City during which support needs to be provided for the new procurement and contract management system?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Monday to Friday 8.00 am to 5.00 pm CST is the core business hours for the City. However, support may be needed during non-core business hours in case of emergency situations.</i>
<b>Question 11:</b>	Does the City own the trouble-ticketing tool in use today? Do you require the vendor you select to use your current ticketing tool or may your vendor bring their own?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>City has a trouble-ticketing tool in use today. Vendor is not required to use City's ticketing system.</i>
<b>Question 12:</b>	Does the City have a preference on the support model for the new system? (We ask because we would like to know if there is an expectation to adapt to your current model of support for the SAP system.)
<b>COH Response:</b>	<p><i>Yes. City has a preferred support model:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Level 1 and Level 2 support will be provided by the City and Level 3 support is vendor. Please note definitions of Level 1 and Level 2 support.</i></li> <li>• <i>Level 1 - Level 1 is the initial support level responsible for basic customer issues, any business process questions or system functionality and/or password resets.</i></li> <li>• <i>Level 2 is technical support level. Examples include basic configuration changes and troubleshooting, management, prioritization, minor enhancements, break fix activities, problem management, stability analysis, etc.</i></li> <li>• <i>Level 3: This level is the vendor support and includes all issues that cannot be resolved by Level 1 and Level 2.</i></li> </ul>

*Partnering to better serve Houston*

<b>Question 13:</b>	Our understanding is that Level 1 service/help desk support is not in scope. Can you confirm?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Level 1 and Level 2 support will be provided by the City. Please see response to Question 12.</i>
<b>Question 14:</b>	What are the service levels that the City requires proposers to adhere to?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Attached, please find the minimally required SLA. (Attachment 1)</i>
<b>Question 15:</b>	Do you expect any enhancements to be included as part of the fixed annual charges for support?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Enhancements that are vendor recommended should be included as part of the fixed annual charges for support.</i>
<b>Question 16:</b>	What type of procurement information will be stored in the contract repository?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Please refer to Section F part 2 in RFP (Page 7 or 75).</i>
<b>Question 17:</b>	Is Houston asking whether the solution can reassign the owner user or the owning organization of the document? Or the workflow assignment? Please clarify. (With regards to Form 1, c. Workflow and Approvals, 2) System shall provide the flexibility for reassignment of projects between and within user organizations.)
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Need further clarification from the vendor.</i>
<b>Question 18:</b>	Can the City of Houston confirm that because this is SaaS, no source code escrow is required?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>That is accurate, no source code escrow is required if the proposed product is SaaS.</i>
<b>Question 19:</b>	Do you plan to have an additional requirements gathering phase available to short-listed vendors to refine our estimates?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Yes.</i>
<b>Question 20:</b>	Can the City confirm that section 3.15 is not applicable because hardware and equipment are not being provided?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>3.15 doesn't exist in this RFP.</i>
<b>Question 21:</b>	How many buyers are at central procurement?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>There are approximately 30 buyers.</i>
<b>Question 22:</b>	What is the number of purchasing / buyer users at the department level doing formal solicitations?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Refer to Part 1, section on page 4 of 75</i>
<b>Question 23:</b>	How many users are doing informal bids?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>There is approximately 185 users performing informal bids</i>
<b>Question 24:</b>	What is the number of end-user approvals?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>The City is finalizing this requirement and will provide the details to short listed candidates.</i>

*Partnering to better serve Houston*

<b>Question 25:</b>	How many people have access to editing and / or approving contracts?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Please refer question #22</i>
<b>Question 26:</b>	Does the CoH MarketPlace allow the catalogs to be set up as punch-outs (cXML)?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Yes – CoH MarketPlace allows the catalogs to be set up as Punch-outs.</i>
<b>Question 27:</b>	How many contracts does the City currently manage?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Refer Part 1, first paragraph of section B on Page 4 of 75.</i>
<b>Question 28:</b>	Are expositions needed for all required criteria in the Technology specifications in Part II – Scope of Work / Technical Specifications?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Comprehensive description is expected for all “Required” criteria both technology and functional.</i>
<b>Question 29:</b>	How many users does the system need to accommodate? How many concurrent users are anticipated?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Approximately 500 users are expected to use this system on a daily basis. System should be able to accommodate 500 concurrent users. Please refer Part 1, first paragraph of section B on Page 4 of 75.</i>
<b>Question 30:</b>	Is there a need for the system to accommodate all City departments at once, or can it be rolled out in phases?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>City is open to both options. The preference is for phased approach.</i>
<b>Question 31:</b>	Who are the business owners and stakeholders for this initiative?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Finance- Strategic Purchasing Division is the business owner. All City Departments are the stakeholders for this initiative.</i>
<b>Question 32:</b>	What is the term of the desired contract, including the start date, duration, and end date?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Please refer to Page 1 and Part 1 Paragraph D on Page 4.</i>
<b>Question 33:</b>	The City clearly outlined each component of the evaluation criteria. Will you please provide a weight associated with each?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>The evaluation criteria is not weighted however, the proposals are evaluated on a qualitative process.</i>
<b>Question 34:</b>	Does the PCM system need to be integrated in their SAP ESS Portal to make it a single centralized portal?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>If the product is owned by City we expect that it is integrated with SAP ESS Portal. If not, vendor is expected to provide an alternate design that is SAP certified.</i>
<b>Question 35:</b>	Can PCM be a standalone web portal? If so, does it have to be SAP certified portal or can it be a native web application portal?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Refer to response to question # 34.</i>
<b>Question 36:</b>	Does the portal need to support multi-languages?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>No. Portal is required to support US English language.</i>

*Partnering to better serve Houston*

<b>Question 37:</b>	Does the UME authentication need to happen in the central SAP ECC system or via LDAP?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>LDAP</i>
<b>Question 38:</b>	Does the role based authorization need to happen in the Portal or backend SAP system?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>If the proposed solution is an SAP Solution, then role based authorization will be in SAP Backend. If not, it is expected to be best industry practice compliant.</i>
<b>Question 39:</b>	Is the vendor portal standalone or integrated in the PCM system?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>City is open to options.</i>
<b>Question 40:</b>	What type of access controls to be setup during development and contract negotiation phase?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Further clarification is needed from the Vendor in order to answer this question.</i>
<b>Question 41:</b>	Does the full text search repository/document management need to be a SAP certified engine? Ex: TREX
<b>COH Response:</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Question 42:</b>	As understood, we need to build a portal and integrate the new system SAP Procurement, add digital signature, procurements and existing data or have to implement SAP Procurement in the existing portal?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Further clarification is needed from the Vendor in order to answer this question.</i>
<b>Question 43:</b>	Is the vendor portal standalone or integrated in the PCM system?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Refer to response for Question #39</i>
<b>Question 44:</b>	Is COH considering hosting the solution with a 3rd Party Cloud/ASP provider or does it expect the infrastructure to be built in house.
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Preference is a hosted solution.</i>
<b>Question 45:</b>	Does COH require reuse of any existing hardware?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>It is not a requirement</i>
<b>Question 46:</b>	What is the expected load (number of users, number of records, disk storage requirements etc.) for sizing the hardware capabilities?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Please refer to responses to questions 22, 25, 27 and 29.</i>
<b>Question 47:</b>	Is there a COH requirement for Disaster Recovery site? If so, what is the expected RPO/RTO?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Based on Service Level Agreements (SLA). Please refer to minimal required SLA.</i>

*Partnering to better serve Houston*

<b>Question 48:</b>	If COH is open to infrastructure being hosted on cloud/ with a third party provider, what is the necessary certification and compliance required?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>SSAE #16, SOC 2 TYPE II Report Annually provide report.</i>
<b>Question 49:</b>	Is COH open to procuring commercial licenses/ support or does it expect the solution to be primarily open source/community supported?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>City may own the licenses. If that is not a proposed solution, all cost of license should be included</i>
<b>Question 50:</b>	Is there a requirement for the solution architecture to be compliant to standards like TOGAF/DoDAF?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Compliance to TOGAF is preferred.</i>
<b>Question 51:</b>	Apart from Web services/File exports, what integration options is COH looking at? Enterprise Service Bus, MoM, Message Queues, etc.
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>No preference. Interfaces/connectors are expected to be SAP certified.</i>
<b>Question 52:</b>	In addition to standard web services, we recommend the use of additional security layers like WS-Security. Can we expect all systems consuming the web services to be compliant to this standard (May not work well with legacy systems)?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Any integration is expected to be SAP compliant</i>
<b>Question 53:</b>	Is there an existing BPM engine that the business processes defined in this application could be orchestrated with?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>No, City does not have an existing BPM for Contract Management</i>
<b>Question 54:</b>	Among the documents being indexed by the search engine, Do you expect any scanned documents to be indexed, which would require an OCR?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>This is not a "REQUIRED" feature, it is a "Nice to Have"</i>
<b>Question 55:</b>	Is there any list of compliances/ audit requirements that the application is required to meet?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Yes, there are compliances and audit requirements</i>
<b>Question 56:</b>	Is the City looking for a fixed bid or a time and material implementation?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Firm Fixed Price proposal</i>
<b>Question 57:</b>	Is the City looking for a hosted solution or on premise solution?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Hosted environment is preferred</i>
<b><u>GENERAL QUESTIONS</u></b>	
<b>Question 1:</b>	Please provide clarification for Part IV, Submission of Proposal (item 7): If we submit 2 years of tax return, are we still required to provide CPA letter of opinion, balance sheet, schedules, and related auditor's notes?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Submission Requirements, please see page 19</i>

*Partnering to better serve Houston*

<b>Question 2:</b>	Will the City consider extending the proposal deadline from September 15 to October 1, to allow respondents sufficient time to review the City's responses to vendors' questions prior to proposal submission?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>September 22, 2015.</i>
<b>Question 3:</b>	<p>The RFP suggests - Part VII – “Required Forms to be Submitted By Awarded Vendor Only” is not submitted as part of the RFP response, which is due September 15. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attachment 1 &amp; 2</li> <li>• Form 1 to Form 4 (Includes Requirements Response)</li> <li>• Exhibit I to Exhibit VI</li> </ul> <p>Please clarify? The table of contents &amp; the details inside the documents seem not to match and there seems to be some confusion on what is required as part of RFP submission.</p>
<b>COH Response:</b>	<p><i>The Index states that “ Part VII-Required Forms to be Submitted by Award Vendor Only” is discussed on page 23 and there you will find a list of the required forms.</i></p> <p><i>The Index is not stating that “Attachment 1 &amp; 2” need to be submitted with your proposal.</i></p>
<b>Question 4:</b>	We assume Appendix I required for contract red-line is same as T25490 Contract Sample.pdf. We could not find any Appendix I in the RFP document.
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>“Appendix I” should be changed to read “Part VI, Instructions to Proposers; E. Exceptions to Terms and Conditions.”</i>
<b>Question 5:</b>	Is the City of Houston asking for one (1) original proposal, along with 10 copies (totaling 11 copies)? Or is the one proposal marked original included in the 10 total (1 original, 9 copies)?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Part IV-Submission of Proposal: Submit ten (10) copies total of the proposal, which should include one (1) original that is signed in blue ink. Also, please submit ten (10) electronic thumb drives that include your proposal.</i>
<b>Question 6:</b>	Has a budget been established for this key initiative?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>Yes.</i>
<b>Question 7:</b>	Can a list of M/WBE attendees at the Pre-Proposal meeting be posted?
<b>COH Response:</b>	<i>The attendance list was posted on August 20, 2015. Please see <a href="http://www.houstontx.gov/obo">http://www.houstontx.gov/obo</a> for a current list of CoH certified M/WBE vendors.</i>

2. The proposal due date has changed from *September 15, 2015 @ 2:00* to **September 22, 2015 @ 2:00.** Proposals must be submitted to the City of Houston's Strategic Procurement Division. Thank you for your continued interest in this requirement.

  
 ASHLEY ALESSANDRINI  
 Senior Procurement Specialist

*Partnering to better serve Houston*

**Council Members:** Helena Brown Jerry Davis Ellen Cohen Wanda Adams Mike Sullivan Al Hoang Oliver Pennington Edward Gonzalez  
 James G. Rodriguez Mike Laster Larry Green Stephen C. Costello Andrew Burks Melissa Noriega C.O. "Brad" Bradford  
 Jack Christie **Controller:** Ronald C. Green

## ATTACHMENT 1

<b>SLA#</b>	<b>SLA Name</b>	<b>SLA Metrics</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Credits</b>
1	Response Time	Priority 1 – 30 mins Priority 2 – 30 mins Priority 3 – 90 mins	The time taken by vendor to acknowledge receipt of the incident	
2	Resolution Time	Priority 1 – 8 clock hrs Priority 2 – 18 clock hrs Priority 3 – 24 business hrs	The time taken by vendor to resolve an issue or provide a workable work around solution for the City	
3	Application Availability	99.5% availability	Availability of module is percentage of time when system is operational	
4	Security	Annually provide report SSAE #16, SOC 2 TYPE II Report	Audit reporting of hosted environment	
5	Recovery Time Objective(RTO)	12 hours	The recovery time objective (RTO) is maximum tolerable length of time that solution can be down after a failure or disaster occurs.	
6	Recovery Point Objective(RPO)	8 hours	The recovery point objective (RPO) is data point that must be recovered from backup storage for normal operations to resume if the solution fails.	
7.	Root Cause Analysis(RCA)	24 hours	RCA is a tool designed to help identify what and how an event occurred, and why it happened. The details should be shared with the City in the specified time.	
8	Disaster Notification	4 hours of occurrence		