State of Nevada
Department of Administration
Purchasing Division
515 E. Musser Street, Suite 300
Carson City, NV 89701

Brian Sandoval
Governor

Jeffrey Haag
Administrator

SUBJECT:	Amendment 1 to Request for Proposal 3432
RFP TITLE:	Nevada Department of Wildlife Business Support System
DATE OF AMENDMENT:	May 15, 2017
DATE OF RFP RELEASE:	May 1, 2017
OPENING DATE:	May 31, 2017
OPENING TIME:	2:00 PM
CONTACT:	Teri Becker, Procurement Staff Member

The following shall be a part of RFP ***3432.*** If a vendor has already returned a proposal and any of the information provided below changes that proposal, please submit the changes along with this amendment. You need not re-submit an entire proposal prior to the opening date and time.

---

1. Typically, vendors are given 6 – 8 weeks to respond to an RFP. Given the comprehensive level of your RFP, and the number of questions submitted for the state to respond to by potential bidders, would the state consider extending the deadline to submit a proposal to allow vendors time to adequately respond to all requirements?

   The State wishes to maintain the original proposed time schedule in order to meet the tight deadline for the implementation phase.

2. Section 1.1.1.4 States "Deliver durable products where necessary". Would state specify what products require durability? Would state specify the type of durability required?

   Tags, licenses, permits and decals products need to withstand Nevada's harsh climates

   - *Weather resistant*
   - *Cold resistant*
   - *Water resistant*
   - *Heat resistant*
   - *Tear resistant*

   Durable licensing and tag documents. Personal Computer Point of Sale (POS) licensing and tag documents would be of a material that is water and tear resistant.

   Application Hunt tag stock must be tear resistant, high heat resistant, scuff resistant, water proof and durable. The printing and paper must withstand outdoor conditions after being attached to the carcass and endure abuse of moisture, sweat, blood and high heat conditions without losing legibility or falling apart.

The paper must be durable enough to be perforated without falling apart at the perforations after being folded.

Vessel Registration decals –
Decals must be pressure sensitive with permanent adhesive on reverse side and of flexible type to adhere to irregular and curved surfaces.

Decals are required to withstand exposure to rain, sand, dust, sleet, fresh and salt water, and temperatures from 0 to 250 degrees Fahrenheit for multiple years.

Decals must have abrasion resistance to industry standard specifications which include withstanding 1,500 cycles on a Taber Rotary Platform Abrasion Tester using CS-17 wheels with 1000-gram weights.

Decals must, for <u>at least</u> one (1) year, retain their color, appearance and identification without fading, straining, curling, peeling, blistering or dissolving under normal vessel use including washing with strong soaps, detergents, petroleum products, acetone, carbon tetrachloride and ultra-violet (UV) exposure.

Guaranteed fade resistance UV ink.

Decals will be required to adhere to paint, wood, varnish, plastic, metal, fiberglass, rubber, canvas and neoprene with impregnated nylon.

Decals will have toner applied to the paper carrier and face of decal by various printers. Toner required to stay on face of decal for at least one-year.

3. Section 1.1.6.2 States, "Interface with Nevada Driver's License file and other agencies if applicable". Would state specify what other data interfaces will be required?

   Other required interfaces are listed in 3.3.13.

4. Section 3.3.1.3: Is the vendor expected to cleanse data during the data import/conversion? For example, would vendor be required to look for duplicate records, orphaned records, etc.?

   Yes.

5. Section 3.3.2: What type of fulfillment would be required? For example, for vessel registration, are there vessel decals that must be fulfilled? If so, is contractor or state responsible for providing decals and fulfilling?

   The state would coordinate with the vendor on format to meet the fulfillment function. The state is open to vendor supplied or state supplied fulfillment options, including digital formats.
   Currently licenses, tags, vessel and AIS decals and registrations require physical fulfillment however that may change with license simplification.

6. Section 3.3.5 Hardware: What is the minimum requirement for POS hardware? What components should be included and how many hardware sets should be included in pricing?

   Vendor must propose a solution for the POS Hardware. Reference Attachment I – Project Costs.

7. Section 3.3.10.1 Given the cost to produce a training video, would the state consider removing this requirement?

   Yes, this requirement is removed.

8. Section 3.4.12/3.4.13: Is Internet and Agent Help Desk hours the same as for NDOW staff, 7:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.)?

   The state anticipates the solution provided by the vendor to be intuitive such that help desk demand diminishes over time. The state is open to vendor recommendations based on expected demand and costs of operating the help desk.

9. Section 3.4.27/3.4.27.28: Is there a charge for applications or is the customer charged only if successful and at the time of award? Is it expected that the contractor would store credit card information and charge the customer if successful in draw?

   There is a charge for applications even if unsuccessful. It is expected that the vendor charge the customer in a successful draw under Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI DSS) compliance.

10. Section 3.4.27/3.4.27.28: Who is responsible for printing and mailing tags and licenses, the state or the vendor? Are tags/licenses printed on the same stock as all other licenses?

    The vendor is responsible for printing and mailing tags and licenses. Currently tags and licenses are printed on different stock; however the vendor may propose alternate solutions to standardize stock.

11. Section 4.5.2 Activities: Is the vendor or the state responsible for mailing postcards, renewal notices, letters, etc.? Who is responsible for mailing costs, i.e. postage?

    Please see the Responsible Party column in the Activities Table in section 4.5.2. Vendor is welcome to propose cost saving solutions.

12. Section 4.5.2 Activities: Do customers/clients have the ability to mail-in applications, renewals, etc.? If so, is contractor or state responsible for handling incoming mail?

    No mail-in applications will be accepted. Mail-in renewals and other activities are dependent on vendor proposed solutions, as is the responsibility for handling incoming mail.

13. Section 7.2 States that payment will be made only after deliverables are accepted in writing by the state. Would state define "system acceptance"? Once the system goes live, does that constitute system acceptance?

    System acceptance is a written statement from the state declaring that individual components, as defined by the vendor's proposal, of the system meet requirements.

14. Section 7.4 Would the state explain the purpose of the 10% hold back?

    This is intended to protect the state from unfulfilled contracts.

15. Section 11.1.10 Just for clarification, what are the specific sections in the RFP that vendors should respond to in their proposal?

    Please reference Section 4.

16. Cost Schedule: Would the state clarify how they would like to see pricing? Does state want a price per license/transaction? Or can vendors propose a one-time development/hardware costs with a flat monthly maintenance/support rate for the duration of the contract?

    Vendor has discretion to propose pricing based on their business model. Please reference Attachment I – Project Costs

17. Whether companies from Outside USA can apply for this?
    (like, from India or Canada)

    Yes, the state will consider all possible solutions as in the best interest of the Department of Wildlife and our constituents.

18. Whether we need to come over there for meetings?

    Yes, see section 3.4.20.1.

19. Can we perform the tasks (related to RFP) outside USA? (like, from India or Canada)

    Yes on some tasks, however the vendor must still meet the requirements to be in attendance in person for certain tasks (i.e. commission meetings, draws, etc.)

20. Can we submit the proposals via email?

    No. Reference Section 11.1.1.

21. Section 1.1.2.5 States a goal of the new system is to "create intuitive tools for agent use that enable marketing opportunities". Can you cite the system requirements that you expect to achieve this?

    System requirements are to be proposed by the vendor to meet this expectation.

22. Section 2.1.1 Can you provide more information on how the simplification bill will create additional revenue for the department?
    How do you anticipate the bill will affect the transaction volumes upon which vendors are basing their pricing proposals?

    The state believes the license simplification bill in conjunction with the new Business Support System will make the licensing process more intuitive and appealing to the public and increase new customer recruitment and improve existing customer retention. The state anticipates an increase in the number of customers, but a decrease in the number of transactions per customer, however no official projections have been made.

23. Section 2.2.4.1, 2.3.1 Who is the contractor that administers and supports AHS and NWDS? Who is the contractor that delivers the Volunteer Program?

Systems Consultants, Inc. is the contractor that administers AHS and NWDS. Samaritan Technologies delivers the Volunteer Program.

24. Section 2.4.4, 2.4.7 States that software written by the current contractor for the NWDS system is the property of NDOW, but AHS and Volunteer Program are not referenced. Are these also property of NDOW?

    NDOW owns all of the data in the NWDS, AHS, and Volunteer Program systems. However, NDOW does not own the software for the Volunteer Program.

25. Section 2.7.3 Is the State Project Manager dedicated to the project or what percentage of time commitment does NDOW anticipate the Project Manager can commit to this project?

    NDOW will commit as much time as necessary in this joint venture.

26. Section 2.7.5 Is the Quality Assurance Monitor an NDOW staff person, other agency representative or contractor?

    Quality Assurance Monitor is an NDOW staff person.

27. Section 3.1 RE: indicate "percentage of time subcontractor(s) will spend on those tasks": Is it acceptable to indicate the % of work that will be completed by the subcontractor on a task , instead of time?

    Yes.

28. Section 3.3.3.2 The requirement for providing a receipt is included under the subtitle "Fulfillment". Is an electronic receipt instead of an acceptable means of fulfilling receipts?

    Certain transactions, such as vessel registration and AIS decals and hunting tags, require physical receipts. For other transactions, electronic receipts are acceptable.

29. Section 3.3.5.3 Does the reference to printer (singular) mean that all output at NDOW and license agent locations are printing the same types of materials?

    This would be nice for consistency but up to the vendor's model or proposal.

30. Section 3.3.5.4 Will all locations using the system (NDOW, agents) provide their own connectivity to the network?

    Yes.

31. Section 3.3.9.2, 3.3.9.3 If vendor wishes to propose these additional devices as an optional part of the configuration, how should it be shown in pricing proposal?

    Optional parts of the configuration should be clearly denoted in the cost proposal.

32. Section 3.3.13.4 Regarding Nevada Circuit Court Interface "web services interface to accommodate receipt of adjudication information" from courts. Please explain what data comes into the new system regarding adjudication information and how it is connected to the customers in the database.

New adjudication information includes the case disposition in the courts. This is linked to customers in the new data system by client ID, case number, and citation number. The state requests that the vendor provide recommendations or solutions to address this need.

33. Section 3.3.13.6 States that the DMV "may" provide a link. Has it been confirmed by NDOW that the DMW will provide the link if necessary?

    The state requests that the vendor provide recommendations or solutions to link between NDOW and the DMV. The DMV has been contacted and believes they can provide access to their data system.

34. Section 3.3.13.8 This section is headed "Interfaces to proposed system" but for Spillman does not specify the nature of the interface. Is it for Law Enforcement inquiry purposes or is there data coming into the system?

    Yes, the interface between the proposed system and Spillman is for Law Enforcement inquiries. The vendor should propose how to connect customer transaction and reporting data in the new system to Spillman using a common customer ID.

35. Section 3.3.17.2.A.4 Regarding Print-to-Mail, what products are batch processed, in what volume, and who is responsible for providing the materials, printer, mailing service, postage, etc.?

    Refer to the Activities Table in Section 4.5.2 for which products are batch processed for mailing, expected volume, and responsible party.

36. Section 3.3.17.2.A.6 Does NDOW manage and distribute these orders in-house or are contracted services involved?

    Currently NDOW manages and distributes these orders in-house. However, the state requests that the vendor provide recommendations or solutions to address this need.

37. Section 3.3.17.2.A.6 What are "registration" agents?

    Registration agents refer to license agents.

38. Section 3.3.21.2 There may be some misplaced or incomplete phrases in this requirement; please restate requirement.

    Section 3.3.21.2 should read "The solution must allow for various levels of security for each element of the administrative user and agent interfaces. All data manipulations and administrative transactions should be logged, including the type, date, time, and UserID."

39. Section 3.3.22 Should this certificate of compliance be included in response at Section IV-F?

    Yes.

40. Section 3.4.1.3 Have existing customers been required to provide their SSN in the current system so the already-assigned customer numbers are associated with an SSN?

    Yes.

41. Section 3.4.1 Are vessel owners assigned customer IDs in the current sysetm?

No, the current system tracks vessel registration by vessel ID. However, the state requests that the vendor provide recommendations or solutions to address this need.

42. Section 3.4.2.1 Are the current Business ID Numbers generally associated with an FEIN?

No, the current system does not contain Business ID numbers. However, the state requests that the vendor provide recommendations or solutions to address this need.

43. Section 3.4.13 This states vendor is responsible for license agent support but 3.3.17.2.A.5 requires a tool to track agents' communications with contractor and NDOW helpdesk staff regarding hardware and software issues. Does NDOW intend to staff an agent help desk in addition to vendor's?

Yes, NDOW intends to provide some level of agent help desk support during regular business hours. However, the state is open to vendor recommendations based on expected demand and costs of operating the help desk.

44. Section 3.4.14.5; 3.4.21.1 Does "services offered" refer to actions available to the customer through their account on the website?

Yes, services offered refer to the customer's ability to perform transactions and manage their account information within the same website.

45. Section 3.4.17.2 It appears there may be a heading/title is missing from this subsection, since A - G are activity requirements the same as ability to add/modify/delete, which should be A on the list. Please verify no information is missing in 3.4.17.2.

Section 3.4.17.2 should read "NDOW must have the ability to add/modify/delete items on the agent supply list. System functionality shall include, but not be limited to, the following:"

46. Section 3.4.17.2.F & G What are the system requirements related to F and G, and who is responding and writing?

The vendor should provide a solution to meet the requirements of Sections 3.4.17.2.F & G. The vendor is entity responding to correspondence and inquiries.

47. Section 3.4.21 As "current system requirements" does "this" system mean the new system will integrate these databases?

Yes.

48. Section 3.4.22 By "volume" does this mean the number of items in each category that were issued (either with/without a fee)?

Yes.

49. To what do you attribute the significant decline in fishing licenses?
Section 3.4.22; 3.4.23 What is "AIS"?

Drought is the number one cause for the decline but we see an anticipated turnaround with the recent precipitation. AIS refers to Aquatic Invasive Species.

50. Section 3.4.25 There are several references in the RFP to managing citations, case tracking for citations, etc. Does Law Enforcement enter citations after they are written in the field? Please provide more specific description of the minimum functionality the new system is required to provide related to citations and revocations.

    Law Enforcement enters citations after they are written in the field. At a minimum, the functionality should include the ability to enter, store, track, and report citations by customer ID and track revocation status, adjudications, and fines by customer ID. However, the state requests the vendor to propose solutions for meeting the requirements.

51. Section 3.4.26.1 Do hunters currently get a HIP number either by phone or online? Can this be done at agent locations currently? What method(s) for HIP validation and number issuance will be in place in the new system and are all methods the responsibility of vendor to include in the system?

    Customers can obtain a Federal HIP number by phone or online. This cannot be done at license agent locations. The vendor may propose and are responsible for the methods for HIP validation and number issuance. The state requests the vendor to propose solutions to establish obtaining the HIP number online only.

52. Section 3.4.27 By "Administrator" do you mean the vendor chosen to provide the system?

    Yes.

53. Section 3.4.27.30 Do you also expect that that customer account would include the information summarizing the customer's draw results, providing them online access to this information?

    Yes. The customer account should provide information on all of the customer's transactions, activities, and results.

54. Section 3.4.27.45 With the new system, would NDOW be providing these lists of public information, or do you intend the vendor to continue to sell the lists?

    The data belongs to NDOW and there are no expectations that the vendor will sell any lists. Data and custom queries will be approved by the department with an allowable proposed cost recovery rate.

55. Section 3.4.27.46 Section 3.4.27 is about NDOW's big game application and draw, through 3.4.27.45. 3.4.27.46 relates to Volunteer Program. Can vendors assume that the Volunteer Program is a separate program that would be integrated in the new system with all other programs 3.4.22, 3.4.23,3.4.24, etc.?

    Yes. The Volunteer Program is a separate system that may be integrated with the new system.

56. Section 4.1.1 Should proposers assume that a "task" (for limit of no more than 5-pages per task) is each numbered requirement?

    Yes.

57. Section 4.5.2 States contractor is responsible for mailing harvest questionnaires and processing returned questionnaires. Are these currently scanned and/or data entered?

Harvest questionnaire responses are not currently scanned. The data can be entered online or mailed in. The data is currently entered. However, the state requests that the vendor provide recommendations or solutions to address this task for online moving forward.

58. 4.0 (pg 30) says "the program" processes the tag return card questionnaires and provides a call center for the program. What is vendor's call center responsibility related to harvest questionnaires? Is completion of paper questionnaire the only method to be available to hunters to meet harvest registration? 3.4.14.4 states new solution allows customers to submit harvest data via Internet - please explain.

The state anticipates the solution provided by the vendor to be intuitive such that call center demand diminishes over time. The state is open to vendor recommendations based on expected demand and costs of operating the call center. The state expects to reduce the amount of paper questionnaires in favor of online questionnaires to meet harvest registration. The vendor should propose a solution to collect and manage harvest data submitted via Internet.

59. Section 4.5.2.17 Is contractor responsible only for collecting the online penalty payments? What is the average penalty fee per customer and what amount was collected online, and how much was collected through other method (if any)?

Yes, the contractor is responsible for collecting penalty payments online. The average penalty fee is $50.00 per questionnaire not returned. Approximately $62,900 in penalty payments was collected in FY16. The current system cannot differentiate between payment methods. The state is open to alternative models to address this need.

60. Section 5.1.2 Is vendor required to register as a foreign corporation prior to proposal submission or not until receiving notice of award?

A vendor may propose without registering with the Secretary of State', but may not begin work until a Nevada Business License is obtained (see Section 5.1.3).

61. Section 5.1.3 This refers to the "selected" vendor, but then asks for a response. Is a license required in order to submit a proposal response?

No.

62. Section 5.3 Since the references are returned directly to the State, should the response to 5.3 include the list of customers to whom proposer mailed Attachment E form?

Yes

63. Section 6.1.2 - 4 Where are these prices to be entered in Attachment I?

Vendor has discretion to propose pricing based on their business model and format their cost schedule accordingly. Please reference Attachment I – Project Costs.

64. Section 7 & 11.4.2.2 How is contractor to be paid and on what frequency, and are all costs the responsibility of the State/NDOW or are there any fees that customers pay directly to and retained by vendor?

The vendor has discretion to propose invoicing based on their business model. See Section 7 for payment information. The vendor has discretion to propose cost and fee structures based on their business model.

65. Section 11.1.11 If there are requirements for which the answer/response is the same as a response to another requirement, is it acceptable to refer to the answer in the other section in order to achieve a more concise response (especially in light of page limitations), or does NDOW prefer that the same response be repeated for completeness of response to each requirement, regardless of repetition and redundancy?

The state prefers that the response be repeated for clarity.

66. Section 11.2.2.5 Is Section V to include response to all of RFP Section 3 - System Requirements?

Yes.

67. Section 11.2.2.6 States response Section VI is to include response to RFP Section 4. However, in 4.1 Vendor Response to Scope of Work, 4.1.1 states to describe approach to Sections 4.4 through 4.5 (with page limitations related to "tasks"). Please advise on the RFP sections that require a response in Section V, and what page limitations apply.

Sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 provide instructions and context for responses. The vendor should respond to Section 4.4 and 4.5.

68. Section 11.2.2.7 Is a specific response to RFP 5.4 Vendor Staff Skills/Experience required in Section VII or Section VIII, or should the resumes in Section VIII include this information and be considered response to the qualification requirements?

Vendor staff skills and experience should be provided in Section VIII. Section VII should include company background and references.

69. Section 11.2.2.9 Is there significance to this being designated as Tab IX (while all the others are Sections) that proposers should be aware of?

This should be designated as Section IX.

Section 11.4.2.2 & 14-Submission Cklist Is the document Cost Schedule from Appendix I - Project Costs to be inserted in Part II, Section II of response? Is the requested detailed backup to be included in this section as well?

Yes, Part II of the response should include the Cost Proposal as described in Section 11.4. Vendors may disregard the statement requiring detailed backup for all cost schedules completed.

70. Section 13.3.4.1; 5.6.6 Please confirm that the vendor's project management staff is to be located in Carson City.

No, this requirement is removed.

71. Section Attachment I Page 1 states "possibly website hosting" and page 2 Additional Costs to be Considered refers to "Web Hosting (if available)". However RFP requirements appear to require a vendor-hosted solution. Is vendor required to provide all host services and price accordingly?

    Yes.

72. Section Attachment I Please define "transactions" as used in the tables on page 1. Is it an interaction that could include more than one item/product, or an individual item? Please explain the difference in the numbers for fee-related licenses and stamps here (=136,895) vs. the licensing volume table in 3.4.22 (=307,220).

    Transactions refer to individual interactions with the vendor system which may include the purchase of more than one item or product. License volume refers to the number of individual licenses issued to customers. Transaction volume refers to the number of transactions made by customers. Transactions could include the purchase of many licenses.

73. Section Attachment I Is this schedule to be included in response? If so:
    On page 2, it is unclear what the columns represent and what vendor is to complete in Additional Costs table. The Additional Costs table on page 3 appears to be similar but there are also no column headings on it. Please explain. The transaction tables on pages 2 and 3 are similar to those on page 1; it is not clear what, if anything the vendor is to add/fill in on these tables.

    Yes, Part II of the response should include the Cost Proposal as described in Section 11.4. The table included in Attachment I is simply to provide information and context to assist the vendor in determining pricing. Vendor has discretion to propose pricing based on their business model and format their cost schedule accordingly. Please reference Attachment I – Project Costs.

74. Section Attachment I In Additional Costs to be Considered, please define "Point of Sale" and where the 90 computers and printers are to be located. Are these the estimated number of POS agent locations that would each get one equipment configuration each, or is this an estimate of the additional point of sale devices (3.3.9.1) that agents may wish to acquire from vendor?

    Point of Sale refers to the hardware and software configuration necessary for state license agents to perform transactions. The 90 POS locations refer to the existing license agents located throughout the state.

75. Section Attachment I In Additional Costs to be Considered, please explain the 20 printers for NDOW locations.

    The 20 printers are for existing NDOW office locations to support license transactions.

76. Section Attachment G Please verify this Statement of Understanding is not expected to be included in response.

Correct, this is for informational purposes only. This document will be required prior to start of work and each of the staff assigned by contractor and/or subcontractor will be required to sign.

77. Section Attachment E Please explain the significance of the highlights to the lists in Part E of the document embedded in the RFP. Is there a special instruction related to the highlights?

    Attachment E contains no highlighting as posted on the Nevada State Purchasing Division website.

78. Section 3.3.4/3.3.10.2 B Would state clarify what type of monitoring they are requesting? Is this in reference to POS devices? Monitoring of all POS devices/peripherals would not possible.

    System monitoring refers to the central functionality of the data management infrastructure and website interface. The state requests that the vendor provide recommendations or solutions to address this need.

79. Schedule of Events/Timeline Given the contract may not be finalized until August, implementation in December/January timeframe is not realistic. Would the state accept a proposal that included a more realistic development/implementation timeline?

    Yes, proposals will be accepted that include implementation timelines beyond December/January.

80. "1.1.8.1 Utilize point of sale (POS) infrastructure for multiple business functions." Assuming this refers to the use of the POS machines for purposes outside of those described in this RFP, can NDOW please provide examples of the intended business functions? (RFP Ref: 1.1.8 Leverage Investment)

    The state requests the vendor may propose solutions that meet business requirements while maximizing the existing POS infrastructure. The state does not currently have any specific examples and is open to any recommendations from the vendor.

81. Who is NDOW's current Volunteer Program System contractor? (RFP Ref: 2.3.1 Concurrent Impacts/Projects)

    Samaritan Technologies delivers the current Volunteer Program.

82. To decrease cost, is NDOW willing to accept support requirements of a customer service agent being available 7:30am-5:00pm PST? (RFP Ref: 3.3.13.3 Department of Justice Link System Interface)

    The state requires 24/7/365 functionality of the interface with the Department of Justice Link System. The vendor may propose support solutions to meet this requirement.

83. Once a purchase is made online or by telephone, does the customer need to receive a hard copy official license in the mail? If so, who is responsible for the fulfillment, the vendor or NDOW? (RFP Ref: 3.3.17.2.A.4 Print-To-Mail)

If physical fulfillment is required, the vendor is responsible for fulfillment. However, the state requests the vendor to propose solutions that include digital license documentation whenever applicable.

84. Is NDOW looking for the same hours of operation (7:30am-5:00pm PST) for Technical System Support Help Desk, Internet Customer Help Desk Support and Agent Help Desk? (RFP Ref: 3.4.11 Technical Support Help Desk)

The state anticipates the solution provided by the vendor to be intuitive such that help desk demand diminishes over time. The state is open to vendor recommendations based on expected demand and costs of operating the various help desks.

85. Please confirm that the processing of sales transactions via phone is not a required function of the internet Customer Help Desk. (RFP Ref: 3.4.12 Internet Customer Help Desk Support)

The state confirms that the intention of the Internet Customer Help Desk to provide support for customers to utilize the online purchasing platform. However, the vendor is free to propose solutions that include processing transactions over the phone.

86. Please confirm that credit card transactions for online sales will be processed through the State's banking entity and that all associated fees will be paid by the state. (RFP Ref: 3.4.15.8 NDOW Banking)

The state confirms that online sales are processed by the State's banking entity and pays all associated fees.

87. Can NDOW clarify the nature of screen content control as it is related to graphics/maps? Is the requirement that NDOW can update images and static map images or is interactive map functionality required? (RFP Ref: 3.4.17-D Screen Content Control)

Interactive map functionality is not required; however, the vendor may propose solutions that include this functionality.

88. Is NDOW willing to receive digital files instead of printed copies of written deliverables? (RFP Ref: 4.2.1.1)

Yes, the state is willing to accept digital files.

89. "11.2.2.9 Tab IX – Preliminary Project Plan" – Did you mean to say Section IX? (RFP Ref: 11.2.2.9)

Section 11.2.2.9 should read "Section IX".

90. Please confirm what needs to be live by December 2017 and outline, at a high-level, subsequent target release dates with associated functionality. (RFP Ref: 4. Scope of Work)

Section 4.5.2 Activities details the deadlines for system functionality. The state prefers that vendors propose implementation strategies that meet these deadlines in calendar year 2017-2018, but the state will consider proposals for implementation in calendar year 2018-2019.

91. As the proposal due date is 2 days after Memorial Day and there is a risk of packages not being delivered on schedule, is NDOW willing to accept electronic submissions (via email or FTP) in place of a USB? (RFP Ref: Multiple)

No. The proposal packaging requirements are detailed in Section 11.7. Proposals must meet these requirements to be considered.

92. Please confirm that NDOW's expectation regarding a cost submission is that the vendor should submit costs, in any format / business model of their choosing, to fully implement and maintain the system (in accordance with the requirements of the RFP) for 1 year based on the 2016 sales data. (REF Ref: Attachment 1 Project Costs)

Yes.

93. "Vendors must place their written response(s) in bold/italics immediately following the applicable RFP question, statement and/or section." Please verify that this statement refers to Section 3 – System Requirements. (RFP Ref: 11.2.2.5 Section V – System Requirements)

This refers to all sections that vendors respond to.

94. Please confirm the location of Vendor Staff Resumes – Attachment H. Should the response be a part of Section VII (RFP Section 5.5), Section VIII or both? (RFP Ref: 11.2.2.7; 11.2.2.8)

Vendor staff skills and experience should be provided in Section VIII.

95. Please confirm the location of Preliminary Project Plan. Should the response be a part of Section VII (RFP Section 5.6), Section IX or both? (RFP Ref: 11.2.2.7; 11.2.2.9)

The Preliminary Project Plan should be provided in Section 11.2.2.9 Tab IX (corrected to Section IX).

96. Is NDOW willing to remove the requirement for "The contractor shall be required to have its project management located in Carson City for the duration of the project." If significant on-site presence is accounted for and communication plans are in place throughout the implementation and maintenance of the system? (RFP Ref: 13.3.4.1 Contractor Space)

Yes. This requirement is removed.

97. The insurance requires in #4 Technology E&O/Professional Liability coverage with limits of $5 Million Each Claim/Annual Aggregate, and in #5 Network Security (Cyber) and Privacy Liability coverage with limits of $5 Million Per Occurrence/Annual Aggregate, which cross references the errors and omissions policy. Typically, Network Security (Cyber) coverage is included as part of the Technology E&O insurance, please confirm that the State will accept both types of insurance coverage on a 'claim' rather than 'occurrence' basis. (RFP Ref: Attachment D)

This could be acceptable as long as the policy can meet the following criteria:

> *a. In the event that any professional liability insurance required by this Contract is written on a claims-made basis, Consultant warrants that any retroactive date under the policy shall precede the effective date of this*

Contract; and that either continuous coverage will be maintained or an extended discovery period will be exercised for a period of two (2) years beginning at the time work under this Contract is completed.

98. Section 5.1.1 includes a field that says "Number of employees locally with the expertise...". Does "local" here mean local to the vendor (headquarters) or local relative to Nevada?

Local relative to Nevada.

99. Section 1 Project Overview:
    a. Bullet 5: NDOW requests a system that leverages cloud-based solutions for online usage. Does NDOW desire a cloud based solution for the entire system?

The vendor may provide recommendations or solutions to best meet this goal.

100. Section 1 Licensing and Registration System:
    a. Bullet 3: Can NDOW expand on how it intends to use the system to improve recruitment of customers?

The vendor may provide recommendations or solutions to best meet this goal.

101. 1.1.1.11: States: Provide innovative methods relating to recruitment, retention and reactivation. Can NDOW expand on how it intends to use the system for recruitment? i.e. send eMails or texts from contact lists sourced from external entities?

The vendor may provide recommendations or solutions to best meet this goal.

102. 1.1.3.1: Has NDOW selected a device for wardens that will have adequate off-line storage capacity for license, boat registration and tag data or is it expected that wardens will always have cell or satellite connectivity?

All Law Enforcement wardens have devices with adequate off-line storage. Due to Nevada's remote landscape, Wardens will not always have cell or satellite connectivity.

103. 1.1.3.5: Can NDOW provide examples of the kinds of information law enforcement is interested in acquiring?

The vendor may provide recommendations or solutions to meet the goal of improving law enforcement effectiveness in the field.

104. 1.1.3.6: Will weather and safety alerts be posted by NDOW or is it expected that the alert will originate from sources like the National Weather Service?

The vendor may provide recommendations or solutions to meet the goal of improving public outreach using location driven technologies.

105. 1.1.6.1: Is it expected that the vendor will promote self-service options by engaging in an advertising campaign of print media or radio spots? Can NDOW provide examples of promoting self-service options?

No, however the vendor may provide recommendations or solutions for promoting self-service options.

106. 1.1.8.3: Can NDOW provide a list of related systems the system is expected to interface with?

See Section 3.3.13 of the RFP.

107. 2.6.3: To clarify will the state purchase server licenses? i.e. SQL, web servers, and Visual Studio? If so, are the prices to be included in the system implementation cost in the cost proposal?
The state will not purchase server licenses for system development. The vendor may propose pricing to address these costs in the cost proposal. Section 2.6.3 confirms that the state will acquire the necessary software to operate the delivered solution based on vendor recommendations.

108. 3.3.4: Is the monitoring intended for POS devices? Is it expected that the vendor will monitor state employee computers as well?

No, system monitoring refers to the central functionality of the data management infrastructure and website interface. The state requests that the vendor provide recommendations or solutions to address this need.

109. 3.4.12.1: Is it expected that the vendor will sell licenses and accept HIP and mandatory harvest reports over the phone?

The state prefers online transactions, however, the vendor should propose a solution to sell licenses and accept HIP and mandatory harvest reports that meets the needs of all customers.

110. 3.3.13.1: Can NDOW provide more details on for the State Accounting System Interface? i.e. will these be G/L and, or JV transactions reflecting Sales and receipts to DAWN?

NDOW will provide General Ledger (G/L) and Journal Voucher (JV) accounting codes to the successful vendor in order to interface with the State Accounting System.

111. 3.3.13.3: Will the interface be more than the current boat lookup facility that Justice Link has, such as access to license holders? Can NDOW elaborate on the data the Department Of Justice Link System needs to access?

Yes, the state requests that the vendor provide recommendations or solutions on how to expand the interface between the proposed system and Justice Link to meet NDOW and Department of Justice needs. The vendor should work with Justice Link to identify these needs.

112. 3.4.1.5: How will foreign clients who do not have an SSN be handled?

The state requests that the vendor provide recommendations or solutions to address this need.

113. 3.4.15.10: Can NDOW provide examples of the user defined parameters?

The vendor should provide solutions to allow the user to define their own queries and reports based upon user-defined parameters. The system should accommodate selecting parameters from any of the fields in the database.

114. 3.4.16.1: We are not sure what "hits to all options of customer marketing and other options to ensure NDOW's ability to retain and recruit customers" means. Perhaps this is about tracking if someone comes to the consumer web site from Google, from a banner advertisement, etc. etc. Can NDOW please clarify?

"Hits" refers to tracking customer response to digital marketing efforts, such as emails and banner ads, using website analytics.

115. 3.4.17.1.D: Can NDOW provide examples of where uploaded text, maps and graphics will appear in the POS device? In addition, does the state wish to accommodate the slower performance of PC POS dial-up connections by having the system NOT display maps and graphics, which require substantial band-width for agents identified as using these slower connections?

The state requests that the vendor provide recommendations or solutions on how to provide NDOW with screen content control and address slower internet performance issues.

116. 3.4.17.2.D: How will graphics and maps will be used in the agent supply list?

Graphics and maps will be used for NDOW branding and messaging to agents on the agent supply list web interface.

117. 3.4.19.1: Will the contractor, his staff, employees, and immediate family be excluded from Fishing, Upland Game hunting or owning a boat? Or, will the exclusions applying to contractor, staff and immediate family be restricted to just applying for big game tags that are subject to be drawn?

Exclusions are only applied to the contractor, staff, employees, and immediate family that are subject to game tag draws.

118. 3.4.22: Will the vendor earn a commission for tags or licenses sold?

The vendor has discretion to propose pricing based on their business model and structure commissions as needed.

119. 3.4.23:
   a. Will the vendor earn a commission for boat registrations?

      The vendor has discretion to propose pricing based on their business model and structure commissions as needed.

   b. Will NDOW need the ability to register boats without titling?

      Yes.

   c. Will NDOW need the ability to identify documents used as proof for Titling or Title Transfers?

      Yes.

d. Does the system need to produce the annual report of registrations for the USCG?

Yes.

e. Are out of state boats that are not registered in Nevada sold AIS decals and need these sales be tracked by Boat ID?

Out of state boats may require AIS decals. Currently AIS decals do not need to be tracked by Boat ID, however, the vendor may provide recommendations or solutions on how to improve this system.

f. Will the owners of boats (registered, lienholder and beneficiary) be linked and tracked with Client records?

Yes.

g. How are stolen boats to be recorded and handled?

The state requests that the vendor provide recommendations or solutions on how to best handle stolen boat information.

h. Will there be mass mailings for registration renewals each year?

Registration renewal notifications will be required on a recurring basis. The vendor may provide recommendations or solutions on how to improve the registration renewal notification process.

i. Will the history of all ownerships (prior owners, current owners, etc.) be tracked?

Yes.

j. What are the edits that correlate Boat codes (Hull, Propulsion, Type, etc.) with motor information, etc.?

Changes to boat codes and motor information are mandated by the US Coast Guard. Further information can be found at https://www.uscgboating.org/regulations/federal-regulations.php

120. 3.4.26: Will the vendor earn a commission for HIP reports taken via the phone?

The vendor has discretion to propose pricing based on their business model and structure commissions as needed.

121. 3.4.26.1: Does this statement apply only to HIP reporting?

Yes.

122. 3.4.27: Will clients be allowed to submit paper applications for the draws or over-the-counter tags, or will all applications be submitted on-line?

All applications will be submitted on-line.

123. 3.4.27.1.C: Is there a maximum number of sportsmen in a party?

No.

124. 13.2.1.7: Is the money order or cashier's check made payable to the General Services Division the fee for the background check performed by Integrascan in 3.2.1.4.A? If not, what is this fee?

Yes, the fee is for the state background check.

125. 13.3.4.1: Are there exceptions to the requirement of the contractor locating its project management in Carson City?

Yes, this requirement has been removed.

126. 13.3.4.6: Is this space located in Carson City, or is it at NDOW's headquarters in Reno?

Contract space will be available at NDOW's Headquarters in Reno.

127. Attachment C Contract Form: Within the document, there are references to attachment BB. Where is attachment BB located?

Attachment BB refers to the State's Solicitation or RFP 3432. RFP 3432 will be incorporated into the contract as Attachment BB.

128. Attachment I Project Costs: Should a minimum number of applications and licenses be proposed in the costing along with overage costs?

The vendor has discretion to propose pricing based on their business model. The vendor may use 2016 transaction volumes if the vendor business model requires these statistics. Please reference Attachment I – Project Costs

129. The RFP appears primarily focused on Licensing and Certification but includes some Volunteer Management Software requirements. As a Volunteer Management Software provider, would the State allow Samaritan Technologies to integrate with or act as sub contractor to a prime contractor?

Yes, but the relationship will be between Samaritan and a prime and not between Samaritan and the State.

130. From our review of the RFP, it's clear that the State put a lot of thought and effort into its preparation. The RFP contents, coupled with information in the online Reference Library compiled by the State, show considerable attention to detail. In turn, we believe a responding proposal should show similar thoroughness.

It is our belief that the current submission date of May 31, 2017, does not allow enough time to produce a carefully researched and considered proposal. One that is designed to provide the State with the best possible solution for a potential 10-year contract term. With answers to questions due on or around May 15, 2017, that leaves about two weeks for the proposal. On the one hand, two weeks. On the other, potentially ten years.

We have no doubt that the State considered many variables when assembling the RFP's calendar of events. But we are respectively asking the State to extend the proposal submission deadline.

Will the State move the proposal submission due date from May 31, 2017 to July 31, 2017, or at least no sooner than June 30, 2017?

No.

131. We have a number of lower-level, detailed, technical questions regarding the RFP. We're not asking those questions at this point in time for a couple of reasons. First is a matter of practicality and courtesy. If the answers to the high level questions short lists us off, why squander the State's time with questions that may be more in the weeds. Second, if the State will extend the proposal submission due date, then the calendar of events may allow for a bidders' conference or at least a second round of Q&A. We believe the interactive, back-and-forth dialogue nature of a bidders' conference will yield clarity sooner than Q&A. Sometimes subtly, nuance, intent, desire, can get lost.

Consistent with our previous question, we believe that this should be far enough in advance of the extended proposal submission deadline to give vendors sufficient time to consider what they learned at the conference (or in the second round of answers) while preparing a final version of their proposal.

Will the State hold a bidders' conference to discuss this RFP, or at least offer a second round of Q&A?

No.

132. RFP Section 4 on page 51 states that the new system must be implemented on December 15, 2017 or December 15, 2018. RFP Section 4.5.2, beginning on page 59, contains a detailed list of deliverables with implementation dates beginning in December 2017.

Can the State clarify this issue and confirm that a proposal containing a project schedule with an implementation date of December 15, 2018 would be considered responsive to the RFP requirements?

Section 4.5.2 Activities details the deadlines for system functionality. The state prefers that vendors propose implementation strategies that meet these deadlines in calendar year 2017-2018, but the state will consider proposals for implementation in calendar year 2018-2019.

If a December 15, 2018 date is considered responsive, then should the dates in RFP Section 4.5.2 be extended by a calendar year?

Section 4.5.2 Activities details the deadlines for system functionality. The state prefers that vendors propose implementation strategies that meet these deadlines in calendar year 2017-2018, but the state will consider proposals for implementation in calendar year 2018-2019.

All other things being equal, would a proposal containing a December 15, 2018, implementation date be given the same consideration/scoring weight as one with a December 15, 2017 implementation date?

The state prefers that vendors propose implementation strategies that meet these deadlines in calendar year 2017-2018, but the state will consider proposals for implementation in calendar year 2018-2019.

133. There are several sections in the RFP with verbiage that requires the stationing of project staff onsite in Carson City. Section 5.6.6 states that vendors shall provide information on the staff that shall be located onsite in Carson City. Section 13.3.4.1 states that the contractor shall be required to have its project management located in Carson City for the duration of the project. Section 13.3.10 states that most design, development and testing activities shall occur in Reno (except those activities mutually agreed to be performed at the contractor's facility). Section 13.3.4.6 states that the State shall provide space for six (6) contractor personnel.

If fortunate enough to be awarded this contract, we intend to use our top developers and project management staff to complete the project. These talented individuals, who have spent years designing and implementing top notch solutions for states, are not the type that you can relocate around the country for project work.

As the RFP is written, it seems as if a vendor could get the checkmark by locating junior level developers/staffers wherever the oversight agency dictates. RFP satisfied. Maybe. Lesser resources working in local offices does not seem to necessarily increase the likelihood of a successful project implementation and subsequent operation.

We are committed to having the best resources involved with this project, working where they can make the most meaningful contributions. We can make this commitment because we don't over-commit ourselves. We look forward to spending time with our new State partner. To forging those bonds. Our A-Team would be in-state whenever it makes sense. For kickoff meeting, JADs, periodic status meetings, … And quite honestly, if the State felt we weren't meeting its expectations, senior management, including the President and Director of Operations, would be on the next flight. References should be able to point out responsiveness.

Would a proposal with a staffing plan that does not include in-state staffing be considered non-responsive by the State?

The requirement in Section 13.3.4.1 that project management be located in Carson City is removed. Section 13.3.4.6 states that the state will provide space for up to six staff, if necessary, but this is not a requirement. Out of state staffing plans will be considered.

134. There are several sections in the RFP that address intellectual property rights and State ownership of software developed by the contractor. Section 13.3.11.4 states that all computer source and executable programs, including development utilities, and all documentation of the installed system enhancements and improvements shall become the exclusive property of the State and may not be copied or removed by the contractor or any employee of the contractor without the express written permission of the State. Section 13.3.11.12 states that title to all portions of the system shall be transferred to the State including portions (e.g., documentation) as they are created, changed and/or modified. So both these sections indicate that the State will own the developed software.

On the other hand, RFP Section 13.3.11.1, Source Code Ownership, states that the contractor agrees that in addition to all other rights set forth in this section the State shall have a nonexclusive, royalty-free and irrevocable license to reproduce or otherwise use and authorize

others to use all software, procedures, files and other documentation comprising the Nevada Department of Wildlife Business Support System at any time during the period of the contract and thereafter. This section appears to imply that the contractor owns the software, since they are giving a license to the State.

We absolutely want to partner with the State in developing innovative, future-looking products and services. We fully understand the State's need to protect itself in the event of a contractor default or termination for cause. Placing software in escrow for scenarios such as these makes perfect sense and we do so in other contracts. Likewise, we fully understand that the data is the State's. We are the custodians of the data, not the owners. But just as the State needs to protect itself, so too do we need to protect ourselves. Those products and services are how we make our living. Those innovations and intellectual properties provide competitive advantage. As the RFP is currently written, those are jeopardized.

From our reading of the RFP, we believe there may be some inconsistencies in the sections mentioned above. If our interpretation is incorrect, will the State clarify? If an inconsistency does exist, will the State resolve it?

Will the State consider changing the software ownership requirements in the RFP to address the issues we raised above?

Sections 13.3.11.4 and 13.3.11.12 are intended to protect the state's right to acquire the Business Support System software without claiming the intent to do so. In practice, the state intends to operate under a software license agreement with the vendor and are open to vendor recommendations and solutions that best serve the state's needs while protecting vendor intellectual property. No matter the software ownership or licensing terms, the data contained within the Business Support System is the sole property of the state.

Will a proposal that does not comply with the RFP sections covering the State's IP ownership, be considered non-responsive?

The state will consider vendor proposals that demonstrate how state IP ownership concerns will be addressed. If IP ownership is not addressed, then the proposal will be deemed non-responsive.

135. If we're reading the RFP properly and using the Online Reference Library correctly, the existing NWDS database has approximately 250 tables consisting of 68 pages of fields. Application Hunt has another 85 pages of fields. Impressive and complex databases and related systems. Databases and systems that evolved over the years as enhancements were requested, rules changed, etc.

A vendor may choose a very different database design. A fresh start. One that capitalizes on all of the lessons learned through history. But not necessarily bound by it.

Sometimes states use the data in these databases to feed other systems. For instance, the State may use its replicated database to feed its marketing or internal accounting/financial systems. Those other systems might need to be changed if the NWDS, Application Hunt and Volunteer systems changed. And if they had to change, those changes would have to be coincident and coordinated with the NWDS, Application Hunt and Volunteer system changes. A non-trivial undertaking that is not entirely contained under this RFP's umbrella.

Does the State require that the replacement database adhere to the same database design/schema, e.g., tables names, column names, data types and sizes, etc.?

No.

ALL ELSE REMAINS THE SAME FOR RFP 3432.

Vendor must sign and return this amendment with proposal submitted.

Vendor Name: _____

Authorized Signature: _____

Title: _____ Date: _____

This document must be submitted in the "State Documents" section/tab of vendors' technical proposal.