

Answers to Questions on RFP Manual 2015

Maryland Board of Public Works

Consulting Services/Procurement Manual

April 7, 2015

- 1) *Can you confirm the contract type for this RFP as described in COMAR 21.06.03.02 is "firm fixed price"?*

The resultant contract will be a firm fixed price contract.

- 2) *Please see the RFP Sec 2.19. Can you confirm if payment is intended at the end of each of the four phases based upon an accepted work product and an invoice submitted for each phase?*

Payment is intended at the end of each phase upon acceptance by the Board of the work product and submission of a proper invoice.

- 3) *Please see the RFP Sec 3.3-1c. Would on line access to files with the Procurement Manual available through the BPW web site meet the requirement of "The Procurement Manual shall be made available online through a State server"?*

Yes. However, the Board does not have unlimited online storage space. Proposals should avoid solutions that exceed one gigabyte.

- 4) *Please see the RFP Sec 3.3-1c(1). Would an Adobe .pdf file containing the Procurement Manual posted on the BPW website that is viewable through access by a web browser meet the requirement of "readily available on line through a variety of screens such as desktop, phone or tablet"?*

PDF produces a larger file size (particularly when images are included), does not scale very well on mobile platforms, and may produce legacy problems down the line as technology moves on from the format. A responsive design website similar to those used by State agencies would be preferable to an Adobe PDF solution.

- 5) *Please see the RFP Sec 3.3-1c(2). Would the "find" function in an Adobe .pdf file meet the requirement of "easily searchable by subject"?*

The find function in Adobe PDF would not meet the requirement because current PDF readers on mobile devices do not uniformly support it.

- 6) *Please see the RFP Sec 3.3-1c(3). Would a Word file containing the Procurement Manual, converted to a .pdf file, and posted on the BPW web site using the existing BPW staff-owned content management system meet the requirement of a "content management system that provides non-web developers the ability to generate and publish updates"?*

Yes, this would meet the minimum requirement. However, converting to PDF might be problematic when trying to make changes from an offsite location. Again, it should be noted that solutions should avoid requiring more than one gigabyte storage space. A PDF solution may require more space.

7) *Please see the RFP Sec 3.3, Project Assumptions. The assumption that the Board anticipates at least one revision of each deliverable raises the point of the standard the Contractor must meet to have a deliverable accepted. The RFP contains no such standard--the SOW does not require or state any minimum level of quality needed to earn acceptance from the project manager. Therefore, the Contractor is at risk of never being able to satisfy the State's project manager. Such uncertainty and the Contractor's need to mitigate the risk suggests the budget is insufficient to meet all Contract requirements. Can the State mitigate the risk by setting minimum quality standards that add certainty and which will result in lower prices? Can the State also mitigate the risk by setting a maximum number of revisions required by the project manager?*

The Board will not amend the RFP to establish: 1) additional standards other than the existing requirements of the RFP; or 2) a maximum number of deliverable revisions.

The RFP at Sect. 3.3 *Deliverables* will be amended to further specify the responsibilities of the Board regarding the acceptance of deliverables.