October 5, 2018

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

ADDENDUM 13
RFP 341901 Integrated Technologies Collaborative

Please note the following answers to questions that were asked prior to the deadline for inquiries date of 10/09/18 at 3:00 P.M., MST.

Q1: Per a question in Addendum 11, we have been instructed to contact you for an updated Exhibit C document which has drop-down values for column E (Service Provided By). Can you provide? The one you send on 8/28 does not have the values populated.
A1: Column E of Exhibit C is to be used to briefly indicate how vendors intend to provide the solution being proposed, e.g., direct, through sub-contracted entities, via strategic alliances, etc.

Q2: Is the page limit for responses specific to a response in its entirety or is it per partner within a response?
A2: The page limit is for per partner within a response.

Q3: For the sustainability questionnaire – are we able to submit one form representing our entire partnership. Or does each company in the response need to fill out their own?
A3: This question has been answered under Addendum 11, A145.

Q4: Is ASU looking for a mobile app development platform for mobility, low-code development platform, MBaaS, or any of the options?
A4: ASU is open to recommendations to be fully described in respondents’ proposals. ASU has not stipulated specific requirements in the area of mobile development or mobile back-end platform services.

Q5: What experience does your team have with have developing and delivering mobile apps?
A5: The ASU mobile development team has fairly extensive experience building and managing mobile applications.

Q6: What are several of the larger enterprise backends (i.e. SAP, Salesforce, etc.) that will need to be incorporated into the mobility vision?
A6: Salesforce and Oracle PeopleSoft Enterprise.

Q7: RFP 341901 Exhibit A – Specifications/Scope of Work General: Are proposers expected to respond to each heading area (i.e.; Universal Learning framework, Unified Communications & Collaboration, etc.) in the Exhibit as part of our response to Section V? Or is the Exhibit for information only, to aid in responding to Exhibits B and C?
A7: Exhibit A is meant to inform providers regarding ASU’s vision, current state, and desire for innovative solutions. Providers are not expected to respond to each heading area in Exhibit A; however, those sections and headings correlate to the sections and headings in the questionnaire and are meant to provide some framework for organization of responses.
Q8: RFP 341901 Section IV – 9 Proprietary: If proposer is submitting any information that they consider proprietary, what is the timing and process for the Chief Procurement Officer to determine if it will be considered proprietary and not considered public information? To give as much critical information for ASU to make an informed procurement decision, it would be beneficial for this determination to be made prior to proposal submission. If it is determined after proposal submission, it puts too much risk on the proposer and may limit the amount of potential proprietary information that may be shared in a proposer’s bid submission.

A8: The Chief Procurement Officer reviews and makes a determination, after the close of the RFP, based on the supporting documentation submitted by the supplier with their proposal. The sealed proposals are submitted to the Chief Procurement Office by the Buyer, as part of their initial review, timing is contingent on the number received, as well as, the level of detail provided to support the request. Trademarks, patents, and copyrights are examples of information that would be deemed proprietary.

Q9: RFP [Section XII], Arizona State University Standard Terms and Conditions, section 16.c); Please indicate which services (if any) within the RfP scope are restricted to be performed within the borders of the United States. Reason: Please provide as much detail as possible on this topic for evaluation by supplier.

A9: The referenced section identifies types of services that are restricted. For example, as outlined in the scope of the RFP, providers may have access to ASU data and, in the course of providing the services outlined, providers may modify and/or develop software/apps/scripts/IP for ASU.

Q10: On the W9 & the Vendor Authorization Form you state on the bottom of your documents that: “NOTE: IF BOTH PAGES OF THIS FORM ARE NOT COMPLETED THE FORM WILL BE RETURNED TO YOU. Arizona State university (ASU) is fulfilling a mandate associated with state agencies increasing procurements from Arizona Small and Diverse Businesses.” The concern is that you only provided one page not two, so we will only be responding with one page.

A10: Pages 53 and 54 of the RFP document are required Mandatory certifications per the instructions on Section X.

Q11: Regarding ASU’s response to Question 5 of Addendum 10, where the University has stated that a deadline extension is not currently being planned, we would like to ask if ASU would reconsider a two-week extension at this time for the following justification criteria:

- **Enabling Comprehensive Responses** - The University has stated that its preference is to receive comprehensive team responses that cover the majority of the requested scope. Due to this being a novel RFP and ASU being the first university in the country with a scope of this nature, many of the ‘Orchestrator Prime’ proposers have just now been able to complete our risk reviews and agreements, in order to form the complete teams that would meet this stated goal of a comprehensive response. With the remaining time allotted, it will be a challenge to develop a submission that fully and thoughtfully addresses the University’s request for a comprehensive approach, as well as one that provides ASU with the best technical and business model options to choose from. While an extension will delay the beginning of the evaluation process, we believe that this additional time to enable comprehensive team proposals will save the University time on the back-end by increasing the likelihood of negotiations with a comprehensive team awardee versus many individual vendors. This will ultimately allow ASU to maintain its current overall award schedule and program kick-off date.

- **Enabling Competition** - It is our understanding that without an extension, many of the Orchestrator Prime proposers will either bid their own services without a comprehensive team, or alternatively be forced to withdraw from bidding altogether. Healthy competition from a number of credible comprehensive proposals is in the best interest of ASU. A two-week extension will enable a significant additional number of comprehensive team proposals that will ensure the University has a range of options to make a selection from, rather than a small number that may limit its choice or require an additional RFP process.
A11: After reviewing similar requests for an extension of the RFP proposal response deadline, ASU has extended the timeline by one week, to allow respondents additional time to prepare proposals. As referenced in Addendum 12, please note the new deadline is 3:00pm, October 30, 2018.

Q12: We will be collaborating with a number of Partners for this bid. Will we need to include the RFP Checklist/Cover Page and associated Sections 1 through 7 for each partner within our hard copy and electronic version submission?
A12: If collaborating with a group of partners, only one RFP Checklist/Cover Page is required.

Please remember that Proposals are to be mailed or delivered to Arizona State University Purchasing and Business Services 1551 S. Rural Rd. Tempe, AZ 85281, no later than 3:00 P.M., MST, 10/30/18.

If you have any questions regarding this notice, please contact me at 480-965-3849 or Lorenzo.Espinoza@asu.edu. You may also find RFP 341901 and any updates at http://www.asu.edu/purchasing/bids/index.html