

DISTRICTWIDE STUDENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
Contracts Office
770 Wilshire Boulevard, 6th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017

RFP Number: 10-19
Addendum Number: 05
Date: August 31, 2011

NOTICE TO PROPOSERS: THIS ADDENDUM SHALL BECOME PART OF THE RFP, AND PROPOSERS SHALL ACKNOWLEDGE, IN WRITING, RECEIPT AND INCORPORATION OF ALL ADDENDA AND CLARIFICATIONS IN THEIR RESPONSE. FAILURE OF THE PROPOSER TO RECEIVE ADDENDA SHALL NOT RELIEVE THE PROPOSER FROM ANY OBLIGATION UNDER ITS PROPOSAL AS SUBMITTED. THE PROPOSER SHALL IDENTIFY AND LIST IN ITS PROPOSAL ALL ADDENDA RECEIVED AND INCLUDED IN ITS PROPOSAL; FAILURE TO DO SO MAY BE ASSERTED BY THE DISTRICT AS A BASIS FOR DETERMINING THE PROPOSAL NON-RESPONSIVE.

1. Bidders are reminded that LACCD will only accept Systems Integration proposals that are made on a “Fixed Cost for Fixed Scope” basis. The fixed scope includes creating all necessary deliverables, as defined in RFP and Addendum documentation, to successfully address all of LACCD’s needs. Bids that propose other pricing model will be considered non-responsive. Bids that propose providing only a portion of the work on this basis will be considered non-responsive.

2. CLARIFICATIONS REQUESTED BY PROPOSERS

Number	Question	LACCD Response
01	How would you like the responses in DD2 coded for the items removed from scope (CRM, Document Management, Parking and Credit Card Processing)?	LACCD asked Advantiv to remove CRM, Document Management, Parking and Credit Card Processing requirements from DD2. However should you find a requirement referencing one of these items, indicate in the Comment section – “This is not in scope” and we will make sure all of these are removed before the scoring is done
02	Would you like vendors to submit our responses as an addendum to the previously submitted RFP response, with changes to the original RFP response clearly identified and cross-referenced in the addendum response? Or, would you like us to make changes in the	Bidders should just provide the requested documentation and, if items in the original proposal are changed, provide only changed documentation with a clear reference back to the changed proposal section.

	Original response and re-submit the entire proposal?	
03	<p><u>Addendum No. 4; Item No. 8</u></p> <p>LACCD requires proposers to provide both proposer and LACCD hours for the project. Is it only the “LACCD Projected Full-Time SIS Staff” for which the proposer needs to provide hours? Do we also need to estimate hours required of LACCD/College staff who will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend meetings, • Provide information pertaining to the SIS project, • College staff who have been involved with the implementation then participate in training • College staff who have NOT been involved with the implementation and need to be trained, etc. <p>(For example, Provide hours for the full time SIS Project team, Plus, the average of five (5) campus staff attending all meetings involving business and configuration rule decisions)</p>	<p>The vendor should provide projected hours for both the proposer’s staff and for ALL LACCD staff that the vendor feels are needed to make the project a success. This will include “LACCD Projected Full-Time SIS Staff”, described in the addendum, as well as other campus and District office staff that will be needed to participate in meetings, workshops, testing and other project-related tasks. Bidders should assume that a minimum of 5 college/district staff members who will be at each meeting.</p> <p>Bidders should also propose additional full-time LACCD staff where it feels that they are needed.</p>
04	<p><u>Addendum No. 4; Item No. 10</u></p> <p>LACCD requires proposers to include both “proposer pricing and the <i>cost of internal LACCD staff project time.</i>” Can we assume you only need hours and you already have costs identified per person? Is the LACCD staff project time limited to the “LACCD Projected Full-Time SIS Staff”? Is it correct to assume that the proposer does NOT need to include the hours required of LACCD staff (not enumerated among the LACCD Full-Time SIS Staff) who will attend meetings, provide information pertaining to the SIS project, participate in training, etc?</p>	<p>Yes, bidders only should provide the hours for LACCD staff.</p> <p>The vendor should provide projected hours for both the proposer’s staff and for ALL LACCD staff that the vendor feels are needed to make the project a success. This will include “LACCD Projected Full-Time SIS Staff”, described in the addendum, as well as other campus and District office staff that will be needed to participate in meetings, workshops, testing and other project-related tasks.</p> <p>Bidders should also propose additional full-time LACCD staff where it feels that they are needed.</p>
05	<u>Addendum No. 4; SOW-AA (change mgmnt)</u>	As described during previous responses to questions, the process maps

	<p>In the new LACCD comments in the change management section (AA), proposer is required to use the business process maps in the implementation process.</p> <p>Can we get a copy of the “existing LACCD current/future state process maps” now? It would help us understand the scope of the process models</p>	<p>will be provided to the selected vendors upon award. LACCD has worked towards creating common processes across the enterprise.</p>
<p>06</p>	<p><u>Optional Products</u></p> <p>We understand we should not include optional solutions in our bid and in DecisionDirector -- only proposed solutions. Some optional solutions were included in the demonstration scripts, yet not specifically described in DecsionDirector. Now what we have a better understanding of the District’s needs and how they relate to DecisionDirector requirements, can we change these products from “optional” to “proposed”</p>	<p>Bidders should review the RFP and all associate Addendum and propose the solution that best meets LACCD’s needs.</p>
<p>07</p>	<p><u>Project Full-Time SIS Staff: Doc.,Comm., Training</u></p> <p>The Addendum describes staff support for documentation, communications and training. Would the vendor develop content and the District SIS staff would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain Approval <p>Distribution where needed?</p>	<p>Bidder should use all of the information that it has obtained in this procurement process to bid the final set of products that LACCD will need to have a complete solution for its needs. This may include previously defined “optional” products. Bidders may also propose different products, not previously proposed, to address all of LACCD’s needs. If new products are proposed, please include sufficient documentation for LACCD to understand the capabilities of these products. Vendors should insure that if any LACCD requirement in DD2 is satisfied by a particular product that it is listed as being the source of the requirement solution within DD2.</p>
<p>08</p>	<p><u>College Support</u></p> <p>Would both the District and the Vendor have access to the subject matter experts at the Colleges? (The average of 5 representatives). Can the College Subject matter experts be members of the various</p>	<p>There may be subject matter experts at the Colleges that will be on the project. The Vendor will have access to the SME’s through the District Project Manager. LACCD expects that some SME’s will be members of the various implementation organization teams. If, in the implementation vendor’s view, a particular LACCD functional or technical area is not</p>

	implementation organization teams?	properly represented, it should escalate that to the LACCD Project Office for resolution.
09	<p><u>SOW Worksheets</u></p> <p>There are a number of sections of the SOW Worksheets that have no directives. If there is no change from our original proposal, can we simply reference the original proposed SOW and add comments where appropriate? Or should we assume you did not like our original response.</p>	If there is no directive in a section of the SOW Worksheet than you can assume that LACCD does not require any further clarification from you regarding that section and you can simply reference your original proposed SOW and add comments if appropriate.
10	<p><u>Addendum No. 4; Item G; Interfaces</u></p> <p>The addendum lists several interfaces/integration points for existing products (SAP, LMS, SARS, CCCApply, CI Track). Additionally, during the recent Addendum vendor conference, it was made clear we must also include interfaces for Document Management and Credit Card processing-approval systems. You have asked us to describe in detail our approach to developing interfaces to existing LACCD Systems. We have included costs for these interfaces where appropriate. However, since the request was open ended (“... existing LACCD systems including, but not limited to the following”) can we assume you are asking for the development approach for unspecified District/College systems and not interface costs?</p>	Bidders should clearly define their approach for developing interfaces/integration points.
11	The Addendum Number 4 document lists four products that have been removed from scope (section 2. Removal of RFP Scope). The four products are CRM, Document Management, Parking Systems and Third Party Credit Card Processor. During the pre-addendum response conference, it was stated that implementers should include interface effort for Document Management and Third Party Credit Card Processor. However, the Systems Implementation Statement of Work (Exhibit K) in section G lists SAP, LMS, SARS, CCC Apply, and CI Track as the existing LACCD systems that need	Vendors should also include the work and costs associated with developing and testing interfaces for Document Management, Parking Systems and Third Party Credit Card Processor but should not include interface effort for CRM.

	<p>interfaces.</p> <p><u>Question 1:</u> Please confirm that LACCD wishes to have the interface effort added for Document Management and Third Party Credit Card Processor added to the SOW.</p> <p><u>Question 2:</u> Should implementers also include interface effort for CRM and Parking Systems?</p>	
12	<p>In the Systems Implementation Statement of Work (Exhibit K) document, in section 2C, #5 states “LACCD has determined that they will be using a 3rd party credit card payment system so any activities/staff/hours proposed for implementing this need to be included in the SOW”.</p> <p>Question: Please confirm that the 3rd party credit card payment system will be implemented by the credit card payment vendor and that an interface between SIS and credit card payment product is what is needed.</p>	<p>The wording in the SOW is in error. Bidders should only be bidding the hours and costs for creating, testing and deploying this interface. The work needed to implement the 3rd party credit card/payment system will be included in a separate RFP and is out of scope for this RFP.</p>