October 19, 2018

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

ADDENDUM 2
RFP 341903 Open Source Learning Technologies Development Services

Please note the following answers to questions that were asked prior to the deadline for inquiries date of 10/19/18 at 3:00 P.M., MST.

Q1: I simply don’t understand what Section 5.9 is asking for me to do. For example, consider question 1 “Does the proposal demonstrate a deep understanding of current learning technologies and trends?” I’m sure that I’m not supposed to say “Yes.” But what am I supposed to write? Shouldn’t my answers to all of the previous questions have convinced you that we have such an understanding?
A1: For Section 5.9 Miscellaneous of the RFP, ASU is looking for the proposer to detail their experience and knowledge of their provided goods and services and can draw upon relevant experience, references, and past projects in response to the provided questions. Some questions are broad that should allow for creative responses while some ask for more direct answers.

Q2: “20. Arizona State University is a member of various co-operative organizations, in accordance with A.R.S Sections 11-952 and 41-2632. Under these Cooperative Purchasing Agreements, the University may share and distribute a contract resulting from a solicitation. In the absence of a statement to the contrary, the University will assume that you do wish to grant access to any contract that may result from this request for Proposal.” -- Does this mean that your partners can also purchase services on the same terms of contract that is declared for the ASU or this means that the results of the contract can be freely distributed to use among organization who participate in these co-operative organizations?
A2: ASU will only release this contract to cooperative organizations upon request.

Q3: Is there a requirement to provide resumes with personal information (such as First and Last Names), or can they be impersonal?
A3: Yes, ASU wants to know which members will be working on future projects and their credentials.

Q4: Given the limitations on the size of text for each part of proposal form where vendor describes its products and services, we would like to attach additional information as appendices and reference these appendices from our responses to the parts of proposal form. Would such approach work? What are the formatting requirements we need to follow to make sure our submission is accepted?
A4: The proposer must respond per the requirements of Section V for ease of evaluation. Appendices that are appropriately labeled and referenced may be used, but will count to the overall maximum page requirement of 25 pages per the instructions of Section X. There are no formatting requirements - we expect the proposer to exercise good judgement when formatting their proposals so that the evaluation of your proposal will be productive to ASU.
Q5: Newest VPAT is Section 508 Refresh (VPAT2). The one in the RFP represents an older VPAT version. That said, should we fill in VPAT2 instead of VPAT, or do you need us to fill in an older version of VPAT provided in the RFP?
A5: A separate addendum will be issued to address this question.

Q6: Section XII.42 Performance and Payment Bonds: Will projects under these RFP require provision of the bonds? If yes, how the amount of the bonds will be determined and what is the process of providing these bonds from ASU’s standpoint?
A6: There are no plans for performance or payment bonds for projects under this RFP. Bonding and bonding limits, if any, will be determined based on the scope of work awarded.

Q7: Do projects under this RFP involve the use of United States federal funds and is there a requirement for the Vendor to be compliant with the terms of Sections XII.67.a and XII.68 to participate in the RFP (and all the referenced regulations)?
A7: Federal funds may or may not be used for this contract.

Q8: Section IV.21 Administrative Fees: do we understand correctly that this fee is referring to any other projects awarded to Vendor where Vendor explicitly used the fact of being awarded an ASU project under this RFP as a reference? Also:
- how will ASU provide support for such Vendor reference (being subject to Administrative Fees)?
- does this clause refer only to product offerings or to service/custom development under this RFP as well?
- please comment on the scope of the clause given the following phrase: “or any other similar entity in any other state”
A8: The 1% administrative fee is paid by the awarded proposer of this RFP from any resulting sales of goods or services from other Arizona Entities or other similar entities in any other state who utilize this contract as part of Arizona State University's Cooperative Purchasing Agreements. The administrative fee is then paid back to ASU per the instructions of paragraphs 20-22 of Section IV of the RFP.

Q9: XII.16.c Off Shore: we are planning to submit proposal from [company], which is a small business (<100 employees). Most of our development for this contract would be carried out at an offshore development center, represented by a fully-affiliated contractor [company]. Does this structure comply with your RFP requirements?
A9: The referenced section identifies types of services that are restricted. Any ASU data cannot be housed outside the United States.

Q10: [Company] is incorporated in [state], where there is no requirement to check and confirm compliance with ARS § 23-214(A). For the purpose of this RFP, would it be OK if we confirm the capability to comply with ARS § 23-214(A), but we carry out the e-verify for [company] employees after we are awarded the contract? Finally, is this requirement applicable to the affiliated offshore subcontractors, or only to the main contractor?
A10: The proposer must comply with the stated provision. Proposer should reference paragraph 58 of Section XII Agreement - Terms & Conditions in regards to the applicability of subcontractors.

Q11: Our current insurance fits all the requirements of the Exhibit A (Insurance Requirements) except for E&O (we have $1,000,000) and the requirements that are specific to Arizona state. Are the Insurance requirements negotiable? In case they are, when these requirements are discussed?
A11: All exceptions with justification and alternative language must be submitted with the proposal. This includes terms and conditions and insurance requirements under Section XII.

Q12: For E-commerce integration is there a recommended payment gateway or is it something we should suggest?
A12: We have PayPal and Nelnet payment gateway integration on current projects. However, we will consider other payment integrations as well. We would like to know the level of expertise you bring with regards to e-commerce and payment gateway integration if we require a custom build for a project.

Q13: Is there a technology/framework which we need to consider by default or as priority?
A13: We do not mandate that vendors use a particular framework. However, we expect a certain level of expertise on the frameworks used by Open Source applications (if you are pitching development expertise in a particular open source app). E.g. Django on Open edX or Symfony on Drupal 7. In terms of web frameworks, we have projects that use Angular, React and Vue. Our philosophy is "best fit" engineering, not "best of breed."

Q14: Is it a valid assumption that ASU will set up the infrastructure for system administration work?
A14: If the vendor is proposing an already existing app or tool hosted by the vendor then our engagement can be subscription based with a separate development contract for custom integrations (if required). If the vendor is proposing development services or an app/tool that can be hosted on ASU infrastructure then yes, ASU will setup DEV OPS and CI/CD pipelines and our managed hosting partner will setup monitoring and alerts etc. Even in internal hosting scenarios, we will require an SLA with the vendor to manage the application and provide some level of support over time.

Q15: Is there a need for multilingual content? If yes, is it a valid assumption that the ASU will provide the translated content?
A15: Depending on the tool or project at issue, ASU may require translations. It is not expected that awarded vendors under this RFP will be responsible for translation but we expect the vendor to support the translation effort. ASU will provide the translated content or engage with a 3rd party to do the translations, including any translated materials. However, it will be an advantage to highlight past experience in building multilingual apps using localization frameworks and tooling and familiarity with translation platforms like Transifex.

Q16: Is there a requirement for the development/execution to happen on site / within the US? Can we make use of our global development centers’ (e.g. India, or South America) resources to optimize cost and efficiency?
A16: ASU prefers on-shore development and execution. Information security protocols at the University restrict ASU’s ability to have services performed offshore. Depending on the sensitivity of data at issue or the type of tool at play, offshore work may or may not be permitted. A good response will note where there are offshore development sites that can or will be used if a contract is awarded.

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, 11/01/18.

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 341903 and any updates at http://www.asu.edu/purchasing/bids/index.html